

Designing Human and Generative AI Collaboration

Authors: Kartik Hosanagar^{1*} and Daehwan Ahn²

Abstract: We examined the effectiveness of human-AI collaboration designs in creative work. Through a human subjects experiment in the context of creative writing, we found that while AI assistance improved productivity across all models, collaboration design significantly influenced output quality, user satisfaction, and content characteristics. Models incorporating human creative input delivered higher content interestingness and overall quality as well as greater task performer satisfaction compared to conditions where humans were limited to confirming AI outputs. Increased AI involvement encouraged creators to explore beyond personal experience but also led to greater story and genre similarities among participants. However, this effect was mitigated through human creative input. These findings underscore the importance of preserving the human creative role to ensure quality, satisfaction, and creative diversity in human-AI collaboration.

¹ Operations, Information and Decisions Department, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania; Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA.

* Corresponding author. Email: kartikh@wharton.upenn.edu

² Financial Planning, Housing and Consumer Economics Department, University of Georgia; Athens, GA 30602, USA.

Main Text: Generative AI is fast gaining adoption in organizations. While some of the applications are around complete automation of tasks, interest in human-in-the-loop (HITL) systems is also growing. This is partly because tasks requiring judgment, creativity, and empathy—like leadership and creative writing—remain challenging for AI to handle effectively without human participation. Additionally, there is a growing call for AI to align with social goals, aiming to enhance productivity while preserving human participation (1). Early studies show that generative AI boosts worker productivity in a wide range of tasks including software development (2), customer support (3), sales (4), consulting (5), and professional writing (6).

Despite the push for HITL approaches, sometimes referred to as Intelligence Augmentation (7) or centaur systems (8), the literature provides limited guidance on how human-AI collaboration should be structured and what design tradeoffs are involved. For example, human-AI collaboration design is an exogenous element in the aforementioned productivity studies, and the collaboration design itself varies across them. Jia *et al.* (4) explore human-AI collaboration in sales, where AI handles “low-level” tasks like lead generation using a sales script while humans engage in more creative tasks like sales persuasion. Hitsuwari *et al.* (9) and Köbis and Mossink (10) consider an alternative design in creative writing in which AI performs all the tasks but humans have the final say in accepting or rejecting AI-generated output. Alternatively, AI can serve as a copilot, augmenting humans in all tasks, as seen with GitHub Copilot [e.g., (2)]. All these approaches are popular in practice, but we do not know which is a better design for human-AI collaboration and why.

In short, while there is widespread recognition that the future of work involves human-AI teams, there are many open questions regarding how to design the collaboration. For example, which design approaches work better? Do different designs affect individuals with different skill levels differently? What is the impact of human participation or exclusion from creative tasks on their task performance and satisfaction? What are the tradeoffs when holistically considering multiple organizational objectives such as achieving high levels of efficiency, quality of work, worker satisfaction, and creative diversity?

We explore these question in the context of human and Large Language Model (LLM) collaboration in creative writing. Creative writing provides a compelling context for studying human-AI collaboration because people generally enjoy the creative process and don't want to outsource it entirely to machines. Moreover, AI still struggles with writing novels or even short stories with 1,000 or more words (11), despite successes in very short formats ranging from several sentences to a few paragraphs (12, 13), leading to the use of HITL methods in story writing (14).

Methods

Many frameworks exist for mapping the creative work process (15). A common approach divides it into two phases: pre-production (sometimes referred to as design or generation) and production (execution or implementation) (16, 17). The pre-production phase consists of brainstorming/ideation and planning/structuring, while the production phase involves implementing the plan through prototyping and reviewing/refinement (15, 18). Our study operationalizes this framework in the context of creative writing through the following four steps: ideation and outlining (pre-production) and drafting and editing (production) (11, 14, 19, 20).

Creativity is commonly defined as the production of work that is both novel and valuable (21, 22). While both pre-production and production phases involve divergent and convergent

thinking, which are central to creativity, their predominant cognitive activities differ. The pre-production phase places a stronger emphasis on divergent thinking (19, 23), characterized by the generation of multiple ideas and the exploration of possibilities, which are essential for developing novelty. This phase marks the origination of innovation and aligns closely with the theoretical understanding of creativity as the process of generating novel concepts. In contrast, the production phase—including drafting and editing—prioritizes refining, organizing, and enhancing the value of pre-existing ideas (24). While this phase plays a critical role in ensuring the utility and coherence of creative outputs, it contributes less to the generation of original ideas. Hence, we conceptualize the pre-production phase as being the more creative phase.

We conducted an IRB-approved classroom experiment to examine the effects of different AI collaboration models during pre-production and production phases of creative writing. 285 students participated in a two-day study, writing 1,000-word stories without AI (Day 1) and with AI assistance (Day 2).

On Day 1, participants completed an initial survey assessing participant heterogeneity: English proficiency, creative writing skills and experience, and a Divergent Association Task (DAT) test to measure their verbal creativity (25). They then wrote a 1,000-word story without any AI assistance during a session that lasted 105 minutes, following a seven-sequence structure commonly used in fiction writing [Supplementary Materials (SM) B.2.4]. Upon completion, they filled out an exit survey that captured the time spent on each writing stage, their writing experience (the flexibility and effectiveness of the process), and their satisfaction with and willingness to reuse the process.

On Day 2, participants wrote a new 1,000-word story during a 105-minute session using ChatGPT 3.5, following their assigned collaboration model. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three AI collaboration models: *Human Confirmation*, where the AI handles all tasks and humans confirm or reject the output; *Human Creativity*, where humans perform pre-production (i.e., ideation and outlining) without AI assistance, while the AI executes production phase (i.e., drafting and editing) with humans confirming or rejecting AI output like in Human Confirmation design; and *Copilot*, where humans and AI collaborate throughout the entire process from ideation all the way to editing (detailed instructions for each group are provided in SM B.2). While other potential designs could theoretically be explored, the decision to focus on these three models was informed by their widespread use in prior academic research and organizational practice (4, 9–11). After receiving training in prompt engineering techniques to address AI-skill disparities, participants completed the task and an exit survey identical to Day 1, with additional questions about AI effectiveness, collaboration satisfaction, and AI's contribution. Participants also submitted a 2-page reflection on their collaboration experience along with their full ChatGPT interaction history.

The study focused on four main outcomes: completion time, story quality, user satisfaction, and content diversity. Story quality was evaluated by two internal (fellow participants) and two external raters (recruited from the University) using a 1-7 Likert scale for overall quality, originality, interestingness, writing quality, and coherence. Completion time and user satisfaction were measured through exit surveys. Content diversity was analyzed by comparing story similarities and genres across AI collaboration models. Additionally, we conducted an analysis of reflective feedback to gain a deeper understanding of participants' writing experiences.

A total of 549 stories were produced, each receiving four evaluations, totaling 2,196 scores. To understand the impact of human-AI collaboration design, this study focused on analyzing

between-subject differences across treatment groups on Day 2, with data from Day 1 serving as a baseline measure of writers’ skill level without AI support.

Descriptive statistics about the sample are available in Table 1. The supplementary materials include a full description of our experiment design, relevant instruction materials and survey questionnaires, definitions of variables, and additional texts, figures, and tables validating and extending our main results.

Category	Variables	N	Mean	SD
Personal Characteristics (Initial Survey)	DAT Score	280	82.28	7.13
	Creative Writing Experience	280	1.62	0.71
	Creative Writing Ability	280	1.90	0.67
	English Language Proficiency	280	2.77	0.43
Quality Metrics (Rated by 4 Evaluators per Story)	Overall Quality	2,196	4.91	1.35
	Originality	2,196	4.97	1.38
	Interestingness	2,196	4.87	1.46
	Writing Quality	2,196	5.21	1.37
	Coherence	2,196	5.20	1.36
Satisfaction with the Writing Process (Exit Surveys on Day 1 and 2)	Process Satisfaction	508	4.90	1.53
	Flexibility	508	4.95	1.47
	Process Effectiveness	508	4.73	1.57
	Intent to Reuse Process	508	0.72	0.45
Satisfaction with the AI Support (Exit Survey on Day 2)	Satisfaction with AI	248	5.47	1.42
	AI Effectiveness	248	5.23	1.65
	AI’s Contribution	248	0.76	0.17

Table 1. Descriptive statistics. This table presents descriptive statistics for our dataset.

Results


We next analyze differences in completion times, writing quality, writer satisfaction, and content diversity across treatment groups. We also present results from Day 1 for comparison.

Completion Time

As shown in Fig 1A, participants experienced an average 36.2% reduction in total completion time, with the most significant gains during the drafting stage (68.6% reduction). These improvements can be attributed to AI assistance and any learnings from having previously completed a similar task. The reduction in completion time aligns with the 40% reduction reported in professional writing by Noy and Zhang (6). Interestingly, editing time increased across all three groups. This may be because writers were less involved during the drafting stage and needed additional editing to align the output with their preferences. Another possibility is that faster completion of earlier stages by AI freed up more time for writers to focus on editing in the final stage. While AI drives overall writing productivity gains in all collaboration models, each model influences time allocation differently among writing stages. Copilot group showed

smaller productivity gains in drafting but spent less time editing. The Human Creativity group spent more time outlining but compensated with greater time reduction in drafting. Despite these differences, a difference-in-differences test revealed no statistically significant variations in total completion time across groups (SM C.2 and Table S.3).

A. Completion Time Across Groups



B. Completion Time Inequality Decreases With AI




Fig. 1. Treatment effects on completion time. (A) Graph of mean self-reported completion time (total and across writing stages) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for collaboration groups, without AI (Day 1) and with AI (Day 2). (B) Relationship between Day 1 and Day 2 completion times. The line is the regression line based on raw data for each collaboration group. The slope indicates the relationship: a slope of 1 indicates Day 1 and Day 2 times are perfectly correlated, while a slope of 0 means that AI equalized completion time irrespective of time spent on Day 1. Also plotted are observations binned by Day 1 completion times, with larger markers representing bins with more observations.

We next examine whether participants who needed more time without AI continued to be slower even with AI. The results varied across collaboration models (Fig. 1B). In Copilot, while completion times reduced overall, a productivity gap remained across participants ($b = 0.70$, $P < 0.001$). The Human Creativity model eliminated this productivity gap ($b = 0$, $P = 0.956$), with participants demonstrating similar completion times on Day 2 regardless of their Day 1 completion times. This may be because participants' main role in this model is to drive the early


creative tasks, which anyway constitute a relatively small portion of the total completion time. The Human Confirmation model showed a significant but smaller effect compared to Copilot ($b = 0.32, P < 0.05$), with participants who needed more time on Day 1 continuing to spend more time on the task.

Writing Quality


As shown in Fig. 2A, without AI assistance (Day 1), overall story quality was not statistically different across groups. With AI collaboration (Day 2), the Human Confirmation group, where AI managed creative tasks, produced lower-quality stories compared to the Human Creativity ($\text{difference} = 0.34, P < 0.01$) and Copilot groups ($\text{difference} = 0.32, P < 0.01$), where humans performed or collaborated in creative tasks. No significant differences emerged between the latter two groups. These findings suggest that human involvement in creative aspects of writing enhances overall quality when using AI assistance. Fig. 2C suggests that the decrease in overall quality for the Human Confirmation group is mainly driven by a drop in interestingness and coherence of stories (and to some extent, differences in writing quality between groups) but not by differences in originality.

We studied the impact of AI collaboration on writers with different levels of writing proficiency, as measured by their Day 1 performance (Fig. 2B). AI reduced skill-based disparities in writing quality, as seen from Day 2 versus Day 1 quality plot (slopes $\ll 1$). This aligns with other studies that suggest that AI bridges skill-based performance gaps (2, 6). Human Confirmation design, which minimized human creative input, shows the lowest slope (not significantly different from zero) whereas Human Creativity and Copilot designs displayed similar patterns but with higher positive slopes, both statistically significant. Notably, the lower slope with Human Confirmation was driven by higher-skilled writers being less effective in this design and not because lower-skilled writers benefited more from it. These results suggest that allowing human involvement in creative tasks provides more opportunity for high-skilled writers to excel.


A. AI Effect Varies Among Groups




B. Quality Inequality Decreases



C. Additional Quality Metrics Among Groups



D. AI Support Removes DAT Inequality



E. AI Effect Varies Among DAT Groups





Fig. 2. Effects on overall story quality. (A) Means and 95% CIs for overall story quality by collaboration group, without AI (Day 1) and with AI (Day 2). (B) Relationship between overall quality on Day 1 and on Day 2. The line is the regression line based on raw data for each collaboration group. A slope of 1 indicates perfect correlation, while a slope of 0 indicates AI support equalized quality gaps. Plotted observations are binned by Day 1 overall quality. (C) Mean values of additional quality metrics and 95% CIs by collaboration group, without AI (Day 1) and with AI (Day 2). (D) Relationship between DAT score and overall story quality for each day. Observations are binned by DAT score, with the line representing a regression line based on raw, unbinned data. (E) Mean values and 95% CIs of overall story quality on Day 2 (with AI) across collaboration groups, categorized by low, average, and high DAT scores. With a typical range for DAT scores in the general population being 74 to 82 (25), we defined the 'average DAT' group as scores within this range, and the 'low' and 'high' groups as below 74 and above 82, respectively.

Participants' DAT score provides an alternative measurement of participant creativity or skill. As shown in Fig. 2D, participants with higher DAT scores initially produced higher quality writing on Day 1, without AI assistance ($b = 0.014$, $P < 0.05$). However, AI support on Day 2 removed this performance gap based on writer creativity level ($b = -0.001$, $P = 0.933$). The impact of AI varied across collaboration designs (Fig 2E): the Human Creativity and Copilot models, which allowed human participation in creative tasks, enabled writers in the Average and High DAT groups to produce higher-quality stories compared to the Human Confirmation model, which excluded such participation.

User Satisfaction

Participant satisfaction varied significantly across AI collaboration models (Fig. 3A). The Human Creativity and Copilot groups reported higher satisfaction, flexibility, and effectiveness of the process compared to the Human Confirmation group. When comparing AI-assisted to human-only writing (Day 2 vs Day 1), the Human Confirmation group showed no improvement in satisfaction, along with decreased flexibility and a reduced willingness to reuse the process. In contrast, the Human Creativity and Copilot groups experienced increased satisfaction, effectiveness, and intent to reuse the process, with these results being statistically significant (SM Table S.10). Despite acknowledging greater AI contribution in the final output, the Human Confirmation group reported lower AI effectiveness and satisfaction with the AI (Fig. 3B). These findings indicate that human involvement in creative tasks enhances satisfaction with AI-assisted processes.

A. Satisfaction with the Writing Process Across Groups and Days



B. Satisfaction with AI Assistance Across Groups




Fig. 3. Effects on satisfaction. (A) Participants rated their overall satisfaction, flexibility, and process effectiveness on 7-point Likert scales. They responded to three questions: "How would you rate your overall satisfaction with the writing process?", "Did the writing process allow for flexibility to achieve what you wanted?", and "Do you feel confident that you will be able to achieve your writing goals with this process?" Additionally, participants indicated whether they would use the same process again (binary Yes/No) by answering: "Did the writing process help to achieve what you wanted? Would you use the same writing process again in the future?" **(B)** Participants evaluated aspects of AI support. They rated the effectiveness of AI assistance by answering: "How satisfied are you with the AI's help in your writing, including the quality of its suggestions and how much it boosted your productivity?" Their satisfaction with AI support was assessed through the question: "How satisfied were you with the AI-human collaboration experience you were asked to follow?" Lastly, participants quantified AI's contribution by answering: "Please specify ChatGPT's contribution to generating the story, using a scale from

0% to 100% (where 0% indicates you contributed 100%, 100% indicates ChatGPT contributed 100%, and 50% indicates an equal contribution from both)."

Content Diversity

GPT-4o was used to classify all stories into one or more of nine popular literary fiction genres (26). Greater AI involvement increased the number of genres per story. The Human Confirmation group showed the highest average number of genres per story (mean = 4.07, 95% CI = [3.90, 4.23]), followed by Copilot (mean = 3.76, 95% CI = [3.60, 3.92]), Human Creativity (mean = 3.55, 95% CI = [3.40, 3.69]), and writing without AI (mean = 3.45, 95% CI = [3.36, 3.53]). These findings suggest that AI assistance leads stories becoming more multifaceted in their genre composition.


An analysis of story genres revealed notable shifts with increasing AI involvement (Fig. 4A). Young Adult fiction, which dominated the non-AI condition, decreased sharply as AI took on more creative tasks, particularly in the Human Confirmation group. Meanwhile, genres requiring more imaginative elements such as Fantasy, Mystery/Crime, and Sci-Fi showed significant increases. This pattern indicates that greater AI involvement shifts writing from personal experience-based narratives toward imaginative genres, likely also reflecting the prevalence of these popular genres in AI training data.

To assess the variance of genre composition within any group, we computed the genre similarity between stories. Story genres are primarily determined during ideation and outlining phases. Figure 4B demonstrates that when humans were excluded from ideation and outlining, genre similarity increased within groups. The Human Confirmation group demonstrated significantly higher genre similarity (mean = 0.592, 95% CI = [0.585, 0.598]) compared to writing without AI (mean = 0.532, 95% CI = [0.530, 0.534]). In contrast, other conditions which continued to involve human participation in ideation and outlining showed no statistically significant increases in genre similarity compared to writing without AI (Human Creativity: mean = 0.533, 95% CI = [0.526, 0.539]; Copilot: mean = 0.527, 95% CI = [0.521, 0.534]).


An analysis of story similarity (Fig. 4C) shows that AI-assisted writing leads to increased semantic similarity among stories within treatment groups. The Human Confirmation group, where AI had the greatest role, showed the highest similarity (mean = 0.779, 95% CI = [0.767, 0.790]), followed by Copilot (mean = 0.743, 95% CI = [0.731, 0.755]), Human Creativity (mean = 0.710, 95% CI = [0.700, 0.720]), and writing without AI (mean = 0.647, 95% CI = [0.642, 0.653]). These differences were statistically significant, suggesting that AI use reduces aggregate content diversity. However, human involvement in creative tasks mitigates this effect, with the Human Creativity model producing the most diverse stories among AI-assisted groups.

The synthesis of findings from Figures 4A, 4B, and 4C suggests that AI support may encourage creators to explore genres, themes, and writing styles that are further from their comfort areas, but because all writers are nudged in similar directions by the AI, aggregate diversity may nonetheless decrease.

A. Genre Distribution Across Treatment Groups



B. Genre Similarity Between Stories Within Groups



C. Semantic Similarity Between Stories Within Groups




Fig. 4. Treatment effects on content diversity. (A) Genre distributions across AI assistance types are shown as percentages (above), with differences from non-AI writing displayed as percentage point changes (below). Since stories can belong to more than one genre, the cumulative percentages exceed 100%. (B) Kernel density plots (left) and means with 95% CIs (right) illustrate genre similarity within conditions. Genre similarity was calculated using cosine similarity between each story's genre vector—a vector comprising nine binary values where a genre classification is indicated by 1 and others by 0—and the average genre vector of other stories within the same group. (C) Kernel density plots (left) and means with 95% CIs (right) illustrate story (semantic) similarity within conditions. High similarities indicate that the stories share close semantic features, such as narrative structure, themes, and linguistic style. Story similarities were calculated using cosine similarity between each story's embedding and the average embedding of other stories in its group, based on OpenAI's 'text-embedding-3-large' model (27).

Reflective Feedback

In their exit survey, participants shared feedback on what worked well and what challenges they faced when writing with AI support. Following Ludan *et al.* (28), we extracted the main positive and negative topics from the feedback. Our analysis identified three key benefits of LLMs in creative writing: *Efficiency*, with AI improving structure, reducing writing time, and aiding planning; *Creativity and Idea Generation*, as AI helped with diverse storylines and iterative refinement; and *Language and Structural Support*, enhancing grammar, coherence, and fact-checking. However, three main challenges also emerged: *Authenticity and Emotional Depth*, where AI lacked the human touch and emotional richness; *Technical and Logical Consistency*, with AI struggling to follow complex instructions and maintain a consistent voice and storyline; and *Originality and Nuance*, where AI produced predictable content and had difficulty with novel ideas and subtle humor. A full list of topics mentioned in the reflective feedback (and their frequency) is provided in the SM C.1 and Table S.1 and S2.

Our analysis also revealed distinct experiences across collaboration models (SM C.1). The Human Confirmation group reported significant frustration and detachment from their final stories. Participants felt removed from content creation, struggled with prompting AI to produce content fully aligned with their vision, and found AI-generated stories lacking personal touch, resulting in reduced ownership. For instance, one participant mentioned feeling "super removed from the content of the story," which led to a final product they were "far from proud of."

In contrast, the Human Creativity group appreciated greater creative control, maintaining their "vision" despite lack of control over AI during the drafting process. The Copilot group benefited from a flexible, collaborative approach, describing it as a "true partnership" enhancing human creativity. Both groups experienced stronger ownership and satisfaction with their final products.

These findings suggest AI is most effective as a supportive tool enhancing human creativity, with Human Creativity and Copilot models demonstrating productive and fulfilling AI-human collaborations in the creative process.

Discussion

While multiple papers have studied the productivity implications of Generative AI, our study differs in its focus on collaboration model as a design variable available to organizations. Further, we extend the literature by considering the tradeoffs between multiple organizational

objectives such as time savings, quality of work, worker satisfaction, and creative diversity. The study revealed three main findings.

First, collaboration design matters; while all designs reduced task completion time, the Human Confirmation model yielded lower quality outputs, decreased user satisfaction, and reduced content diversity compared to other approaches. Regarding quality, the Human Confirmation group was notably the only condition where story interestingness decreased during AI collaboration. This finding is particularly significant given that interestingness was the strongest predictor of overall story quality (SM Table S.5). Reflective feedback noted AI struggled to generate novel ideas or capture human emotional depth. These limitations may have affected story interestingness and underscore the crucial role of human input in creative processes. Regarding user dissatisfaction, participant feedback revealed it stemmed from two main factors: difficulty in getting AI to align with their creative vision and a diminished sense of ownership over the final product.

Second, AI helps boost the quality of work of low-skilled writers much more than that of high-skilled writers, thereby narrowing the gap between high- and low-skilled writers. A potential explanation emerges from DAT scores: participants in our study had DAT scores between 65 and 95, with a mean of 82.2. We also administered the DAT test to ChatGPT 3.5—the version of the tool that was used by participants. ChatGPT's average DAT was 85.7, with all DAT scores falling between 82 and 88 across twenty different tests. In short, while ChatGPT outperformed the study participants on average, it generally did not match the verbal creativity scores of the more skilled participants in our study. This suggests that while current AI models can boost the creativity of less experienced writers, they may fall short of matching the most skilled practitioners.

Finally, different designs impact writers differently based on their skill level: lower-skilled writers improved across all models, but higher-skilled writers produced lower-quality work when restricted merely to prompting and judgment roles in the Human Confirmation model. While AI can potentially increase efficiency for writers of all skill levels, creative participation of high-skilled writers can lead to greater satisfaction and quality.

Limitations

We note several important limitations of our study. First, our findings focus on creative writing with AI, and caution should be exercised when generalizing to other domains such as AI use in innovation, software development or research. Second, while we used ChatGPT 3.5 (the leading language model at the time), newer models may yield different results in terms of time savings, output quality, writer satisfaction, and content diversity. Third, our study was limited to 1,000-word creative writing tasks due to experimental constraints; more complex projects like writing a novel may require longer timeframes or different collaboration models. Finally, while the Human Confirmation design showed limitations in our creative setting, it may be better suited for routine, repetitive tasks that neither provide personal satisfaction nor require nuanced understanding beyond AI's capabilities.

Despite these limitations, we believe our main conclusion—that collaboration design significantly influences productivity, quality, satisfaction, and content diversity, with the Copilot and Human Creativity models, which allow human participation in creative tasks, providing the most balanced approach—is broadly generalizable. Other creative work also involves both a preproduction/design phase followed by a production/implementation phase, with similar tradeoffs. For instance, in product development, teams first engage in a design/pre-production

phase where they ideate and design new products, followed by a production phase involving manufacturing. Similarly, in advertising, there is a pre-production phase focused on conceptualizing campaigns, crafting messages, and designing visuals, which is then followed by a production phase where advertisements are produced and disseminated. Finally, while newer LLM models may offer greater productivity gains than ChatGPT 3.5, we focus on the relative impacts of collaboration designs, which are less likely to be affected by ongoing model improvements.

Implications

The literature on work design has extensively explored collaboration within human teams. However, the design of Generative AI and human collaboration remains underexplored due to its relative nascency. Given the anticipated scale and scope of Generative AI's impact across various industries and job functions, studying the design of AI-human collaboration is both critical and timely.

Our policy recommendations for managers emphasize that while multiple collaboration designs can yield time savings, excluding humans from creative tasks can negatively affect both worker satisfaction and work quality. Additionally, collaboration design must consider worker skill levels, as higher-skilled workers may experience greater adverse effects when excluded from creative responsibilities. To preserve high levels of creative diversity, organizations should retain significant human involvement or intentionally train and prompt AI systems differently to generate more diverse outputs.

Moreover, our reflective feedback from participants indicates that AI can enhance human creativity in two distinct ways: as a collaborative partner in creative exploration and as a productivity enhancer that frees humans to focus on more creative tasks. Specifically, 29.4% of participants emphasized AI's role as a co-pilot in creative tasks such as ideation, while 36.5% highlighted AI's ability to streamline routine tasks like drafting, thereby freeing up time for more complex, creative thinking. Importantly, our results showed that humans should maintain significant creative roles for these enhancements to be achieved.

References and Notes

1. A. Korinek, A. Balwit, “Aligned with whom? Direct and social goals for AI systems” (National Bureau of Economic Research, 2022).
2. S. Peng, E. Kalliamvakou, P. Cihon, M. Demirer, The impact of ai on developer productivity: Evidence from github copilot. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.06590* (2023).
3. E. Brynjolfsson, D. Li, L. R. Raymond, “Generative AI at work” (National Bureau of Economic Research, 2023).
4. N. Jia, X. Luo, Z. Fang, C. Liao, When and how artificial intelligence augments employee creativity. *Academy of Management Journal* **67**, 5–32 (2024).
5. F. Dell’Acqua, E. McFowland, E. R. Mollick, H. Lifshitz-Assaf, K. Kellogg, S. Rajendran, L. Kraymer, F. Candelon, K. R. Lakhani, Navigating the jagged technological frontier: Field experimental evidence of the effects of AI on knowledge worker productivity and quality. *Harvard Business School Technology & Operations Mgt. Unit Working Paper* (2023).
6. S. Noy, W. Zhang, Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. *Science* **381**, 187–192 (2023).
7. H. Hassani, E. S. Silva, S. Unger, M. TajMazinani, S. Mac Feely, Artificial intelligence (AI) or intelligence augmentation (IA): what is the future? *Ai* **1**, 8 (2020).
8. N. Case, How to become a centaur. *Journal of Design and Science* **3** (2018).

9. J. Hitsuwari, Y. Ueda, W. Yun, M. Nomura, Does human–AI collaboration lead to more creative art? Aesthetic evaluation of human-made and AI-generated haiku poetry. *Computers in Human Behavior* **139**, 107502 (2023).
10. N. Köbis, L. D. Mossink, Artificial intelligence versus Maya Angelou: Experimental evidence that people cannot differentiate AI-generated from human-written poetry. *Computers in human behavior* **114**, 106553 (2021).
11. K. Yang, Y. Tian, N. Peng, D. Klein, Re3: Generating longer stories with recursive reprompting and revision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.06774* (2022).
12. J. Han, H. Yoo, Y. Kim, J. Myung, M. Kim, H. Lim, J. Kim, T. Y. Lee, H. Hong, S.-Y. Ahn, “RECIPE: How to integrate ChatGPT into EFL writing education” (2023), pp. 416–420.
13. Z. Wang, Computer-assisted EFL writing and evaluations based on artificial intelligence: a case from a college reading and writing course. *Library Hi Tech* **40**, 80–97 (2022).
14. A. Coenen, L. Davis, D. Ippolito, E. Reif, A. Yuan, Wordcraft: A human-AI collaborative editor for story writing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.07430* (2021).
15. T. I. Lubart, Models of the creative process: Past, present and future. *Creativity research journal* **13**, 295–308 (2001).
16. D. Callele, E. Neufeld, K. Schneider, “Requirements engineering and the creative process in the video game industry” (IEEE, 2005), pp. 240–250.
17. L. L. Watts, L. M. Steele, K. E. Medeiros, M. D. Mumford, Minding the gap between generation and implementation: Effects of idea source, goals, and climate on selecting and refining creative ideas. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts* **13**, 2 (2019).
18. G. Wallas, The art of thought. *Franklin Watts* (1926).
19. Q. Wan, S. Hu, Y. Zhang, P. Wang, B. Wen, Z. Lu, “It Felt Like Having a Second Mind”: Investigating Human-AI Co-creativity in Prewriting with Large Language Models. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* **8**, 1–26 (2024).
20. L. Flower, A cognitive process theory of writing. *Composition and communication* (1981).
21. T. M. Amabile, The social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization. *Journal of personality and social psychology* **45**, 357 (1983).
22. R. J. Sternberg, T. I. Lubart, The concept of creativity: Prospects and paradigms. (1999).
23. J. P. Guilford, The nature of human intelligence. *New York: Macgraw Hill* (1967).
24. A. Cropley, In praise of convergent thinking. *Creativity research journal* **18**, 391–404 (2006).
25. J. A. Olson, J. Nahas, D. Chmoulevitch, S. J. Cropper, M. E. Webb, Naming unrelated words predicts creativity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118**, e2022340118 (2021).
26. S. Jackson, Types Of Novels: A Guide To Fiction And Its Categories, *Jericho Writers* (2022). <https://jerichowriters.com/types-of-novels/>.
27. A. R. Doshi, O. P. Hauser, Generative AI enhances individual creativity but reduces the collective diversity of novel content. *Science Advances* **10**, eadn5290 (2024).
28. J. M. Ludan, Q. Lyu, Y. Yang, L. Dugan, M. Yatskar, C. Callison-Burch, Interpretable-by-Design Text Classification with Iteratively Generated Concept Bottleneck. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19660* (2023).
29. J. Nielsen, Ideation Is Free: AI Exhibits Strong Creativity, But AI-Human Co-Creation Is Better, *Jakob Nielsen on UX* (2023). <https://jakobnielsenphd.substack.com/p/ideation-is-free-ai-strong-creativity>.
30. D. Cropley, Is artificial intelligence more creative than humans?: ChatGPT and the divergent association task. *Learning Letters* **2**, 13–13 (2023).

31. K. F. Hubert, K. N. Awa, D. L. Zabelina, The current state of artificial intelligence generative language models is more creative than humans on divergent thinking tasks. *Scientific Reports* **14**, 3440 (2024).
32. R. D'Souza, What characterises creativity in narrative writing, and how do we assess it? Research findings from a systematic literature search. *Thinking skills and creativity* **42**, 100949 (2021).
33. A. R. Fabbri, W. Kryściński, B. McCann, C. Xiong, R. Socher, D. Radev, Summeval: Re-evaluating summarization evaluation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* **9**, 391–409 (2021).
34. G. Adams, A. Fabbri, F. Ladhak, E. Lehman, N. Elhadad, From Sparse to Dense: GPT-4 Summarization with Chain of Density Prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.04269* (2023).

Supplementary Materials for
Designing Human and Generative AI Collaboration

Kartik Hosanagar and Daehwan Ahn

Corresponding author: kartikh@wharton.upenn.edu

The PDF file includes:

Materials and Methods
Supplementary Text
Figure S1
Tables S1 to S12

Other Supplementary Materials for this manuscript include the following:

MDAR Reproducibility Checklist

A Methods

A.1 Study Design

Our experiment adhered to ethical guidelines and was approved by the University of Georgia's Human Research Protection Program (IRB ID: PROJECT00008677).

Participants This study utilized data from a classroom exercise in an elective course on emerging technologies, where students applied prompt engineering principles to creative writing tasks. A total of 285 students successfully participated in the experiment.

Participant Recruitment Students were invited to participate in a two-day research study designed to explore the effects of AI support on creative writing. Each day of the study included a 105-minute creative writing session and 15-minute surveys. The surveys, administered either before or after the writing tasks, were designed to capture participants' experiences and reflections. Over the course of the study, participants completed two distinct 1,000-word creative writing tasks: one without AI support and the other with the assistance of AI.

To encourage active and high-quality participation, a two-tier incentive structure was implemented to recognize both participation and performance: all participants received a base level of credits for their participation, while additional credits were awarded for exceptional engagement and quality in their responses to the reflection questions.

In accordance with ethical research guidelines and to uphold voluntary participation, students who chose not to participate in the study were provided with an alternative assignment. This alternative task was designed to offer an equivalent opportunity for earning bonus credits, ensuring that all students had a fair means of accessing additional credit regardless of their decision to participate. This approach was intended to respect students' autonomy, allowing them to select their preferred method of earning extra credit while preserving the rigor and integrity of the experimental design.

We included all stories submitted during the experiment period in our analysis. While the recommended writing time was 105 minutes, a small number of participants (7 on Day 1 and 3 on Day 2) needed additional time to fully express their ideas and complete their stories. This simply reflected differences in writing pace across subjects and we included their to fully account for AI's impact on all participants, including those who need more time.

Experiment Design Following the literature, we decomposed the writing task into four components – ideation, outlining, drafting, and editing. Participants were assigned to one of three models for human-AI collaboration (detailed instructions for each group are provided in SM B.2):

1. **Human Confirmation:** In this model, AI performs all tasks, and humans either confirm or reject AI-generated output (9). This model seeks to combine AI's advantages in low-cost "idea [and content] production with the judgment of experienced humans to select the best option." (29). Participants delegated all tasks, from ideation to editing, to AI. Their role was limited to writing prompts for ChatGPT and deciding whether to accept the output or request a regeneration. During prompt writing, participants were explicitly restricted from introducing their own ideas.
2. **Human Creativity:** Humans are responsible for pre-production, which we operationalize as the primary creative tasks, while AI handles production (4). In our setting, participants were fully responsible for story ideation and outlining before using ChatGPT to

subsequently draft and edit the story. During drafting and editing, participants' roles were limited to writing prompts and deciding whether to accept or regenerate ChatGPT's output. They were explicitly restricted from introducing additional ideas during prompt writing.

3. **Copilot:** Humans and AI collaborate throughout the process with AI refining human work or vice-versa [e.g. see Peng *et al.* (2)]. Participants could initiate tasks independently or request AI input or feedback at any stage.

Day 1 Task: Writing without AI On Day 1, participants completed an initial survey to record their self-reported baselines for English fluency and creative writing abilities and experience. They also took a creativity baseline test (Divergent Association Task, DAT) and wrote a 1,000-word story manually (i.e., without AI assistance) within 75 minutes. The DAT is a psychological test for creativity in which participants name ten nouns that are as different as possible, and the semantic distance between these words is then calculated. We chose the DAT test in our study because it is a relatively short and simple test that generates a numerical score that has been shown to be reliable at measuring verbal creativity (25). All participants were trained on a seven-sequence story structure that is commonly used in fiction writing (see SM B.2.4). Upon completion, students filled out an exit survey capturing time spent on each stage (ideation, outlining, writing, and editing), satisfaction, flexibility, whether they were able to achieve their goals, and willingness to use the process again.

Day 2 Task: Writing with AI On Day 2, students wrote a new 1,000-word story in 75 minutes, but this time with ChatGPT assistance under the rules of their assigned collaboration model. They were trained in prompt engineering techniques, including few-shot prompting, chain of thought, emotion prompts, being clear and specific about creative goals, and the value of experimentation with prompts. Upon completion, participants completed an exit survey, which contained all the questions from Day 1 as well as additional questions to gauge AI's effectiveness, their satisfaction with the AI-human collaboration process, and the extent to which their final output was shaped by AI (i.e., AI contribution). The surveys from Day 1 and Day 2 are provided in SM B.3.

Additional Task: Reflective Writing Participants also wrote a 2-page reflection on the collaboration process (what aspects worked well or were frustrating), effective prompting strategies, and possible improvements to the collaboration model into which they were assigned. They also submitted their full ChatGPT prompt and response history for analysis.


Recruitment of Evaluators Stories were evaluated by two internal (fellow participants) and two external assessors (research assistants), with participants' identities and collaboration models hidden from evaluators. As internal evaluators, experiment participants assessed two stories. For external evaluations, we recruited nine students from the same university, all of whom were fluent in English and had experience in writing courses or other relevant experience. Each external evaluator was compensated at a rate of \$15 per hour.

Evaluation Assessors rated each story on originality, interestingness, writing quality, coherence, and overall quality. Detailed evaluation criteria are provided in SM B.4. To maintain objectivity, evaluators assessed only the story text, without information on the authors' identities or treatment groups. The study's objective was withheld from evaluators until they completed all evaluation tasks. Internal evaluators were instructed to score objectively, understanding that their assessments would impact the study's validity but not affect their own or their peers' course grades.

Reflective Survey Participants were asked to complete two-page reflective essays after completing the two-day writing tasks and surveys. The questions included: (1) their experience collaborating with AI on the creative writing task (what worked and what didn't), (2) their proposed model for optimal human-AI writing collaboration, and (3) their strategies and approaches for crafting prompts to achieve the best results. Additionally, we collected the full prompts and generated outputs created during the writing tasks. These essays were analyzed to gain deeper insights into participants' experiences with writing using AI.

Our study analyzed between-subject differences across treatment groups on Day 2, using Day 1 data as a baseline to assess writer skill levels without AI assistance.

Figure S.1: Experimental Design



A.2 Data and Variables

The experiment involved 285 participants over two days. A total of 549 stories were produced (278 from Day 1 and 271 from Day 2), each receiving four evaluations (two internal and two external), resulting in 2,196 evaluation scores across five categories: overall score, originality, interestingness, coherence, and writing quality.

Participant Characteristics To account for participant heterogeneity, data on four key participant characteristics were collected: self-reported writing experience, self-reported writing ability, self-reported English proficiency, and verbal creativity. Verbal creativity was assessed using the Divergent Association Task (DAT), developed by Olson *et al.* (25) and widely used in literature (30, 31). Olson *et al.* reported an average DAT score of 78 in the population, with most individuals scoring between 74 and 82. Our cohort showed a higher average DAT score (82) compared to the general population.

Outcomes of Interest We focus on four main outcomes in this study:

1. **Completion time:** We evaluate whether AI reduced writing time and differences across the treatment groups. We evaluate the time taken for ideation, outlining, drafting, and editing, all of which are self-reported by the participants.
2. **Writing Quality:** We follow prior literature and assess the overall quality of the story, originality, interestingness, writing quality, and coherence (6, 32–34). These scores are generated by human evaluators on a 1-7 Likert scale.
3. **User Satisfaction:** Surveys measured satisfaction with the writing process, which covered the level of flexibility supported by the process, the effectiveness of the process in helping them achieve their goals, their willingness to use the same writing process again, and overall satisfaction. Additionally, on Day 2, participants rated the effectiveness of and their satisfaction with AI assistance.
4. **Content Diversity:** We also analyze how AI changes the type of stories participants write, both in terms of story genres as well as the similarity between stories generated with AI support.

Definitions of Variables The definitions of variables are as follows. Detailed survey questionnaires covering these variables are provided in SM B.2.

A.2.1 Personal Characteristics

- **DAT Score** This is a proxy of verbal creativity of participants, based on the Divergent Association Task (DAT) test in which participants list ten nouns that are as different from each other as possible.
- **Creative Writing Experience** Self-assessed level of experience in creative writing, categorized as: (1) Limited exposure, (2) No professional experience but some experience, or (3) Some professional or academic experience.
- **Creative Writing Ability** Self-assessed creative writing ability compared to peers, categorized as: (1) Below average, (2) Average, or (3) Above average.
- **English Language Proficiency** Self-assessed comfort level with the English language, categorized as: (1) Not fluent, (2) Not-native but fluent, or (3) Native communicator.

A.2.2 *Quality Metrics*

- **Overall Quality** The effectiveness of the story in conveying its main ideas creatively, interestingly, coherently, and with good writing, measured on a 7-point Likert scale from "Extremely bad" to "Extremely good".
- **Originality** The originality of the story, including novel themes, plot, setting, structure, ending, and style, assessed on a 7-point Likert scale from "Extremely uncreative" to "Extremely creative".
- **Interestingness** The story's ability to provide an engaging and immersive experience for readers through literary devices and vivid imagery, evaluated on a 7-point Likert scale from "Extremely uninteresting" to "Extremely interesting".
- **Writing Quality** The clarity and comprehensibility of the language, including correct grammar, punctuation, and spelling, rated on a 7-point Likert scale from "Extremely poor writing quality" to "Extremely good writing quality".
- **Coherence** The level of organization and structure in the story, judged on a 7-point Likert scale from "Extremely poor coherence" to "Extremely good coherence".

A.2.3 *Self-reported Satisfaction with the Writing Process*

- **Process Satisfaction** Overall satisfaction level with the writing process, measured on a 7-point Likert scale from "Extremely dissatisfied" to "Extremely satisfied".
- **Flexibility** The degree to which the writing process allowed for flexibility in achieving desired outcomes, assessed on a 7-point Likert scale from "Extremely disagree" to "Extremely agree".
- **Process Effectiveness** Confidence in achieving writing goals using this process, rated on a 7-point Likert scale from "Extremely disagree" to "Extremely agree".
- **Intent to Reuse Process** Likelihood of using the same writing process in the future based on its effectiveness, indicated as a binary Yes/No response.

A.2.4 *AI Collaboration Evaluation (Day 2 Only)*

- **Satisfaction with AI** Overall satisfaction with the AI-human collaboration experience, evaluated on a 7-point Likert scale from "Extremely dissatisfied" to "Extremely satisfied".
- **AI Effectiveness** Satisfaction with AI's assistance in writing, focusing on suggestion quality and productivity boost, measured on a 7-point Likert scale from "Extremely dissatisfied" to "Extremely satisfied".
- **AI's Contribution** Percentage of ChatGPT's contribution to story generation, specified on a scale from 0% (user contributed 100%) to 100% (ChatGPT contributed 100%).

A.3 Analysis Details

Regression Specifications We employ two primary regression specifications: one applicable when the outcome variable is evaluator-assigned grades (due to the presence of multiple evaluations per story), and another for non-grade outcomes.

For the non-grade outcome specifications (e.g., completion time, satisfaction with writing and AI support), we utilize a participant-level dataset. Let i denote individual participants, and y_i represent the outcome for participant i . The corresponding regression model is specified as:

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_i + \theta_{char(i)} + e_i$$

where D_i is an indicator variable representing the group to which each participant is assigned, $\theta_{char(i)}$ denotes fixed effects for participant characteristics (such as DAT score, creative writing experience, creative writing ability, and English language proficiency), and e_i is the error term.

For regressions where the outcome variable consists of evaluator-assigned grades (e.g., overall quality, originality, interestingness, writing quality, coherence), let i represent a story and j an evaluator. Define y_{ij} as the grade assigned to story i by evaluator j . The regression model for this specification is given by:

$$y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 D_i + \theta_{char(i)} + e_{ij}$$

where in addition to the variables above, and e_{ij} is the error term.

Inequality Results As explained in the figure note, these figures are created from a participant-level dataset for each collaboration group, with the lines representing raw slopes. For the overall quality measure, each participant has four evaluations per story across different days, so we average these evaluations for each story. The printed coefficients, meanwhile, come from a regression of the form

$$y_{id} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{id} + \theta_{char(i)} + e_i$$

where y_{id} is the y-axis variable and x_{id} is the x-axis variable of participant in treatment group d .

Group Differences on Completion Time We investigate how completion time varies for participants from Day 1 (writing without AI) to Day 2 (writing with AI) across different collaboration designs. This analysis uses a difference-in-differences approach, modeled with the following regression specification:

$$y_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 C_i + \beta_2 D_t + \beta_3 (C_i \times D_t) + \theta_{char(i)} + e_{it}$$

In this model, y_{it} represents the total completion time for participant i on day t , where t is either Day 1 (0: writing without AI) or Day 2 (1: writing with AI). C_i is an indicator for the collaboration condition assigned to participant i , while D_t captures the day of writing. The interaction term $C_i \times D_t$ identifies the coefficient β_3 , which measures the "difference in slopes," representing changes in completion time between collaboration groups across the two conditions. Additionally, $\theta_{char(i)}$ accounts for participant-specific characteristics, and e_{it} is the error term.

B Materials

B.1 Day 1 Instruction

Experiment Instructions Day 1

Write a 1,000-word Short Story without ChatGPT

Step 1: Verify Your ID and Group Number

Click [here](#) to check your ID and group number from the Google Spreadsheet. This will be ready before class (no advance action needed).

Step 2: Take the DAT Creativity Test

- Please take the [DAT creativity test](#) and keep your score for the survey. The test takes only a couple of minutes but please make sure to be in a distraction-free environment when taking the test.

Step 3: Complete the Initial Survey

Fill out the [initial survey](#) to provide baseline data before beginning the experiment.

Step 4: Duplicate and Rename the Submission Template

1. Access [this Google Document template](#) to create a copy.
2. Rename your file name to include the day, your ID, and group number (e.g., "Day1-7A" or "Day1-18B").
3. Upload your doc to Canvas (day 01).

Step 5: Write Your Short Story

Your task is to write a 1,000-word short story manually. As such, keep in mind the following bullet points.

- Your goal is to write a story that is original and interesting, coherent (well structured), clear and comprehensible, and is of high overall quality.
- You may choose any genre for your story.
- Utilizing a well-defined narrative structure as a guide can facilitate the process of crafting your own compelling story. I have attached a tutorial on good narrative structure in the appendix. You do not have to strictly follow the format but it can serve as a guide given the limited time to write the story.
- **Do not use ChatGPT or any AI support** for day 1 writing.

- This is an experiment. In order to ensure the data is not corrupted in any way, please do not discuss the assignment with fellow classmates. Please ask the TA or instructor if you have any questions.

Writing Process:

Follow the steps below. Please note down the time when you begin the assignment.

1. **Ideation:** First, figure out what the story is about.
2. **Outlining the story:** Create a rough outline of your story, providing one or multiple bullet points for each of the seven sequences of the narrative structure.
3. **Writing the story:** Write the story based on the outline.
4. **Editing the story:** Review the story end to end and edit the story.

Step 6: Submit Your Short Story

Upload your completed document to Canvas under the assignment section titled "Experiment Day 1."

Step 7: Complete the Exit Survey

Finally, please complete the [exit survey](#) to wrap up the Day 1 experiment.

B.2 Day 2 Instruction

B.2.1 Human Confirmation

Experiment Instructions: Day 2

Write a 1,000-word Short Story Using ChatGPT

Step 1: Verify Your ID and Group Number

Click [here](#) to check your ID and group number from the Google Spreadsheet.

Step 2: Duplicate and Rename the Submission Template

1. Access [this Google Document template](#) to create a copy.
2. Rename your copy to include the day, your ID, and group number (e.g., "Day2-7A").

Step 3: Write Your Short Story

Your task is to write a 1,000-word short story in collaboration with ChatGPT. Keep in mind the following guidelines:

- Your goal is to write a story that is original and interesting, coherent (well structured), clear and comprehensible, and of high overall quality.
- You may choose any genre for your story.
- Utilizing a well-defined narrative structure as a guide can facilitate the process of crafting your own compelling story. I have attached a tutorial on good narrative structure in the appendix. You do not have to strictly follow the format but it can serve as a guide given the limited time to write the story.
- Review the prompt engineering guidelines from class. Please use ChatGPT but only as outlined below for your group.

Writing Process:

Follow the steps below. Please note down the time when you begin the assignment.

1. Ideation: First, figure out what the story is about
2. Outlining the story: create a rough outline of your story. For example, one bullet for each of the 7 sequences of the narrative structure
3. Writing the story: Write the story based on the outline
4. Editing the story: Review the story end to end and edit the story.

Collaboration with ChatGPT:

Here is how we would like you to collaborate with ChatGPT to accomplish the task:

- **Group B: ChatGPT will handle all phases of the project, including ideation, outlining, writing, and editing. Your role is to assign tasks to ChatGPT through prompts, evaluate its work, and then either approve the results or ask ChatGPT to try again. Please do not offer any additional ideas to ChatGPT during all stages of the process.**
 - **Ideation:** Ask ChatGPT to generate a list of potential story ideas. Review the ideas and select one, or ask ChatGPT to generate more options if needed. Do not provide the idea to ChatGPT but feel free to change your prompt or regenerate responses until you find an idea you like.
 - **Outline:** Request ChatGPT to create an outline based on the chosen story idea. When asking ChatGPT to create the outline, please share the 7-sequence story structure and ask ChatGPT to generate the outline based on that structure. You can either ask it to generate the 7-step outline at once or one by one in seven steps. Examine the outline, and if it meets your expectations, approve it. If not, ask ChatGPT to regenerate it.

- **Writing:** Ask ChatGPT to expand your approved outline into a full story of 1,000 words. There are many ways to do this. For example, you can share the outline and then ask it to write the text for each sequence in the outline (one sequence at a time). Alternatively, you can ask it to write the story all at once. If you are dissatisfied with the text for any sequence (or the full story) as written by ChatGPT, feel free to ask for a rewrite. If it aligns with your expectations, accept it.
- **Editing:** Ask ChatGPT to edit the story to improve its readability and ensure a consistent tone and flow throughout or to bring in a specific writing style, continuing until you are satisfied with the final story. If you think further revisions are needed, instruct ChatGPT to edit again.

Step 4: Submit Your Short Story

Upload your completed document to _____ in the assignment section labeled "Experiment Day 2."

Step 5: Complete the Exit Survey

Conclude by filling out the exit survey.

B.2.2 Human Creativity

Experiment Instructions: Day 2

Write a 1,000-word Short Story Using ChatGPT

Step 1: Verify Your ID and Group Number

Click here to check your ID and group number from the Google Spreadsheet.

Step 2: Duplicate and Rename the Submission Template

1. Access this Google Document template to create a copy.
2. Rename your copy to include the day, your ID, and group number (e.g., "Day2-7A").

Step 3: Write Your Short Story

Your task is to write a 1,000-word short story in collaboration with ChatGPT. Keep in mind the following guidelines:

- Your goal is to write a story that is original and interesting, coherent (well structured), clear, comprehensible, and of high overall quality.

- You may choose any genre for your story.
- Utilizing a well-defined narrative structure as a guide can facilitate the process of crafting your own compelling story. I have attached a tutorial on good narrative structure in the appendix. You do not have to strictly follow the format but it can serve as a guide given the limited time to write the story.
- Review the prompt engineering guidelines from class. Please use ChatGPT but only as outlined below for your group.

Writing Process:

Follow the steps below and record the amount of time spent on each of them:

1. Ideation: First, figure out what the story is about
2. Outlining the story: create a rough outline of your story. For example, one bullet for each of the 7 sequences of the narrative structure
3. Writing the story: Write the story based on the outline
4. Editing the story: Review the story end to end and edit the story.

Collaboration with ChatGPT:

Here is how we would like you to collaborate with ChatGPT to accomplish the task:

- **Group A: You will be responsible for ideation and outlining and ChatGPT will do all writing and editing (based on your prompts). Please do not offer any additional ideas to ChatGPT during writing and editing stages of the process.**
 - **Ideation:** You are responsible for the high-level tasks of ideating and outlining your story. Please complete this step manually, without using ChatGPT. Generate one or more story ideas. Select one that you feel best suits the task and proceed to the next step.
 - **Outline:** Please complete this step manually, without using ChatGPT. Write an outline of the story that roughly follows the seven-step story sequence highlighted in the appendix.
 - **Writing:** Writing and editing should be done by ChatGPT. Your role will be to (a) write the prompts to get ChatGPT to write or edit the story and (b) to review the results of its output—not to directly write or edit yourself. Specifically, ask ChatGPT to expand your manually created outline into a full story of 1,000 words. There are many ways to do this. For example, you can share the full outline and then ask it to write the text for each sequence in the outline (one sequence at a time). Alternatively, you can try to write the story all at once. If you are dissatisfied with the text for any sequence (or the full story) as written by ChatGPT, feel free to ask for a rewrite.

- **Editing:** Once the writing process is complete, ask ChatGPT to edit the story to improve its readability and ensure a consistent tone and flow throughout or to bring in a specific writing style, continuing until you are satisfied with the final story. If you think further revisions are needed, instruct ChatGPT to edit again.

Step 4: Submit Your Short Story

Upload your completed document to _____ in the assignment section labeled "Experiment Day 2."

Step 5: Complete the Exit Survey

Conclude by filling out the [exit survey](#).

B.2.3 Copilot

Experiment Instructions: Day 2

Write a 1,000-word Short Story Using ChatGPT

Step 1: Verify Your ID and Group Number

Click [here](#) to check your ID and group number from the Google Spreadsheet.

Step 2: Duplicate and Rename the Submission Template

1. Access [this Google Document template](#) to create a copy.
2. Rename your copy to include the day, your ID, and group number (e.g., "Day2-7A").

Step 3: Write Your Short Story

Your task is to write a 1,000-word short story in collaboration with ChatGPT. Keep in mind the following guidelines:

- Your goal is to write a story that is original and interesting, coherent (well structured), clear and comprehensible, and of high overall quality.
- You may choose any genre for your story.
- Utilizing a well-defined narrative structure as a guide can facilitate the process of crafting your own compelling story. I have attached a tutorial on good narrative structure in the appendix. You do not have to strictly follow the format but it can serve as a guide given the limited time to write the story.

- Review the prompt engineering guidelines from class. Please use ChatGPT but only as outlined below for your group.

Writing Process:

Follow the steps below. Please note down the time when you begin the assignment.

1. Ideation: First, figure out what the story is about
2. Outlining the story: create a rough outline of your story. For example, one bullet for each of the 7 sequences of the narrative structure
3. Writing the story: Write the story based on the outline
4. Editing the story: Review the story end to end and edit the story.

Collaboration with ChatGPT:

Here is how we would like you to collaborate with ChatGPT to accomplish the task:

- **Group C:** Collaborate with ChatGPT as a co-pilot through every stage, including ideation, outlining, writing, and editing. You can initiate the task with your own ideas and refine them through feedback from ChatGPT or let ChatGPT start the task, and then you can provide feedback and further refine. Engage in an iterative working relationship where you can either guide ChatGPT through each task or ask it to provide suggestions and guidance as you see fit. Repeat this process until you reach a satisfactory result as follows.
 - **Ideation:** Begin the process by either (a) sharing your initial story ideas with ChatGPT and asking ChatGPT to provide suggestions or insights to refine and expand upon your concept or (b) Alternatively, you can ask ChatGPT to generate story ideas based on a specific theme you provide, or even without any particular theme at all. Once you receive ChatGPT's suggestions, actively contribute your additional ideas or suggest new directions for the story. Feel free to combine elements from different suggestions offered by ChatGPT. Engage in a collaborative, iterative dialogue, continuously building upon each other's input until you are satisfied with your story idea.
 - **Outlining:** Based on the developed idea, write an outline of the story that roughly follows the seven-step story sequence highlighted in the appendix. To do so, either request ChatGPT to generate an initial outline that you can then refine together or create an outline manually and ask ChatGPT for additional input and suggestions for improvement. Once you are satisfied with the outline, proceed.
 - **Writing:** Collaborate with ChatGPT in writing the story based on the outline. You can write sections yourself and use ChatGPT to fill in parts, or you can ask ChatGPT to write the story and provide feedback for revisions. Maintain an iterative and collaborative approach, continuously refining and enhancing the narrative to ensure it aligns with your vision and meets your

standards. You can choose to write the seven sequences one by one but you can also come back and refine a previous sequence.

- **Editing:** Collaboratively edit the story with ChatGPT. You can ask ChatGPT to suggest edits, edit the text yourself, or provide specific feedback on your own preferred edits to improve the readability and ensure a consistent tone and flow throughout or to bring in a specific writing style, continuing until you are satisfied with the final story.

Step 4: Submit Your Short Story

Upload your completed document to _____ in the assignment section labeled "Experiment Day 2."

Step 5: Complete the Exit Survey

Conclude by filling out the exit survey.

B.2.4 Appendix: Narrative Structure

Appendix: Narrative Structure

If you do not have experience with creative writing or feel time-constrained in developing your story structure, consider using the below story structure that is from ScriptLab. The below structure is not a requirement nor is it set in stone. You can modify the story structure to suit your needs.

SEVEN SEQUENCE STORY STRUCTURE

SEQUENCE ONE – Status Quo & Inciting Incident

Establishes the central character, his/her life, and the status quo and the world of the story. It usually ends with the POINT OF ATTACK or INCITING INCIDENT.

SEQUENCE TWO – Predicament & Lock In

Sets up the predicament that will be central to the story, with the first hint of possible obstacles. The main tension will be established at the end of this sequence. The sequence ends when the main character is LOCKED IN the predicament, propelling him/her into a new direction to obtain his/her goal.

SEQUENCE THREE – First Obstacle & Raising the Stakes

The first OBSTACLE to the central character is faced. The sequence shows the alternatives available to the character but these are eliminated. Since our character is

locked into the situation and can't simply walk away, the stakes are high – there is a lot more to lose.

SEQUENCE FOUR – First Culmination/Midpoint

We reach the midpoint of the story where we see rising action. Our character faces a higher obstacle and the story builds to the first culmination, which might seem like a resolution of the story. If the story is a tragedy and our hero dies, then the midpoint could be a low point for our character. If, however, our hero wins in the end, then they win in some way here.

SEQUENCE FIVE – Subplot & Rising Action

Introduce a strong SUBPLOT to the story (e.g. a character you briefly introduced earlier starts to matter more to the story here).

SEQUENCE SIX – Main Culmination/End of Act Two

Build up the story in preparation for the main culmination. This sequence will feature the highest obstacle and the lowest moment of the story for the character (if the story ends in a tragedy, this could be the highest moment instead). We see the new tension that will carry us through the final act of the story.

Note: Since most midpoints and endings are paralleled, the PLOT POINT at the end of this sequence is usually at the polar opposite of those points. So if our hero wins at the midpoint and at the end, then she usually has her lowest point here.

SEQUENCE SEVEN – Resolution

We bring the story to its conclusion. Our protagonist may not get what he wants but he gets what he needs. Consider adding a twist that is surprising yet inevitable. Clarity and resolution are important for a good ending.

B.3 Survey

B.3.1 Initial Survey on Day 1

Experiment Day 1 - Initial Survey

Please complete the initial survey to provide baseline data prior to starting the experiment. Rest assured that your responses to this survey will not impact your score in any manner, so we encourage you to answer honestly.

Q1. Name, ID, and Group

Q2. Rate your comfort with the English language.

- Native communicator (speaking and writing in English since early childhood)
- Not-native but fluent in English
- Not fluent in English

Q3. Rate your level of experience with creative writing.

- Some professional or academic experience in creative writing
- No professional experience but ample creative writing experience in school, college, and beyond
- Limited exposure to creative writing

Q4. Rate your creative writing ability relative to your peers.

- Above average
- Average
- Below Average

Q5. Please write down your 'DAT creativity test' score here.

B.3.2 DAT Score Survey

The Divergent Association Task (DAT) was conducted through the website <https://www.datcreativity.com/>. Participants were provided with consent information on the site before proceeding to write 10 different words that were mostly unrelated to each other. The test typically takes 2 to 4 minutes to complete. After completing the task, participants were asked to record their DAT score on the initial survey on Day 1. We informed participants that they could take the test only once and instructed them to report the score from their first attempt.



[Home](#) [Take the test](#) [About](#) [FAQ](#) [Team](#)

The Divergent Association Task measures verbal creativity in under 4 minutes

It involves thinking of 10 unrelated words. People who are more creative tend to think of words with greater “distances” between them, showing more divergent thinking.

Take the test (2 to 4 minutes)

We recommend that you [take the test](#) before you [learn more about it](#). You can also read a [CNN article](#) on the task or read our [open-access manuscript](#) in *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.



Instructions

Please enter 10 words that are as **different** from each other as possible, in all meanings and uses of the words.

Rules

1. Only **single words** in English.
2. Only **nouns** (e.g., things, objects, concepts).
3. **No proper nouns** (e.g., no specific people or places).
4. **No specialised vocabulary** (e.g., no technical terms).
5. Think of the words **on your own** (e.g., do not just look at objects in your surroundings).

Consent

Contribute your anonymous responses to our research?

- Yes
- No

▼ Study details

In this 4-minute survey, you will be asked to complete a creativity task and report your age, gender, and country. Participating is voluntary, there are no foreseeable risks, and your responses remain anonymous. The study will help researchers understand creativity across the world.

For study questions, [contact Dr. Jay Olson](#). For questions about your rights as a research participant, contact the Research Oversight and Compliance Office—Human Research Ethics Program at ethics.review@utoronto.ca.

— Dr. Jay Olson and Dr. Loren Martin
University of Toronto Mississauga

Enter words

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.

Demographics (optional)

Age:

Sex:

Country:

Bonus question (optional)

One hears about “morning types” and “evening types.” Which one of these types do you consider yourself to be?

- Definitely a morning type
- Rather more a morning type than an evening type
- Rather more an evening type than a morning type
- Definitely an evening type

Submit

B.3.3 Exit Survey on Day 1

Q1. Name, ID, and Group

Q2. Enter the **Number of Minutes to Complete the Full Assignment**, including brainstorming, outlining, writing, and editing.

Q3. Enter the Number of Minutes Spent on **Brainstorming**.

Q4. Enter the Number of Minutes Spent on **Outlining**.

Q5. Enter the Number of Minutes Spent on **Writing**.

Q6. Enter the Number of Minutes Spent on **Editing**.

Q7. How would you rate your **overall satisfaction** with the writing process?

Extremely dissatisfied (1)	Moderately dissatisfied (2)	Slightly dissatisfied (3)	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (4)	Slightly satisfied (5)	Moderately satisfied (6)	Extremely satisfied (7)
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------

Q8. Did the writing process allow for **flexibility** to achieve what you wanted?

Extremely disagree (1)	Moderately disagree (2)	Slightly disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Slightly agree (5)	Moderately agree (6)	Extremely agree (7)
------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------

Q9. Do you feel confident that you will be able to **achieve your writing goals** with this process?

Extremely disagree (1)	Moderately disagree (2)	Slightly disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Slightly agree (5)	Moderately agree (6)	Extremely agree (7)
------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------

Q10. Did the writing process help to achieve what you wanted? Would you **use the same writing process again** in the future?

No Yes

Q11. [If answer was No]: What would you change?

B.3.4 Exit Survey on Day 2

Q1. Name, ID, and Group

Q2. Enter the **Number of Minutes to Complete the Full Assignment**, including brainstorming, outlining, writing, and editing.

Q3. Enter the Number of Minutes Spent on **Brainstorming**.

Q4. Enter the Number of Minutes Spent on **Outlining**.

Q5. Enter the Number of Minutes Spent on **Writing**.

Q6. Enter the Number of Minutes Spent on **Editing**.

Q7. How would you rate your **overall satisfaction** with the writing process?

Extremely dissatisfied (1)	Moderately dissatisfied (2)	Slightly dissatisfied (3)	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (4)	Slightly satisfied (5)	Moderately satisfied (6)	Extremely satisfied (7)
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	---	------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------

Q8. Did the writing process allow for **flexibility** to achieve what you wanted?

Extremely disagree (1)	Moderately disagree (2)	Slightly disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Slightly agree (5)	Moderately agree (6)	Extremely agree (7)
------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------

Q9. Do you feel confident that you will be able to **achieve your writing goals** with this process?

Extremely disagree (1)	Moderately disagree (2)	Slightly disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Slightly agree (5)	Moderately agree (6)	Extremely agree (7)
------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------

Q10. Did the writing process help to achieve what you wanted? Would you **use the same writing process again** in the future?

No

Yes

Q11. [If answer was No]: What would you change?

Q12. How satisfied are you with the **AI's help** in your writing, including the **quality of its suggestions** and how much it **boosted your productivity**?

Extremely dissatisfied (1)	Moderately dissatisfied (2)	Slightly dissatisfied (3)	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (4)	Slightly satisfied (5)	Moderately satisfied (6)	Extremely satisfied (7)
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	---	------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------

Q13. How satisfied were you with the **AI-human collaboration experience** you were asked to follow?

Extremely dissatisfied (1)	Moderately dissatisfied (2)	Slightly dissatisfied (3)	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (4)	Slightly satisfied (5)	Moderately satisfied (6)	Extremely satisfied (7)
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	---	------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------

Q14. Please specify ChatGPT's contribution to generating the story, using a scale from 0% to 100% (where 0% indicates you contributed 100%, 100% indicates ChatGPT contributed 100%, and 50% indicates an equal contribution from both).

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Contribution of ChatGPT (0 to 100%)



B.4 Evaluation

Q1. Name, ID, and Group

Q2. Please enter the **File Name** (e.g., 747B9xv8XAViqblr.docx) of the paper you are reviewing.

Q3. **[Originality]** Is the story **original and creative**? For example, does the story use novel themes, original plot/setting, unusual story structure, unusual ending, and surprising and unexpected style and emotional tone?

Extremely uncreative (1)	Moderately uncreative (2)	Slightly uncreative (3)	Neither creative nor uncreative (4)	Slightly creative (5)	Moderately creative (6)	Extremely creative (7)
-----------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------	--	--------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------

Q4. **[Interestingness]** Does the story provide an **interesting and immersive experience** for readers, **engaging** them deeply? For example, does the story use literary devices to convey vivid images and scenes to engage readers?

Extremely uninteresting (1)	Moderately uninteresting (2)	Slightly uninteresting (3)	Neither interesting nor uninteresting (4)	Slightly interesting (5)	Moderately interesting (6)	Extremely interesting (7)
--------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	--	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------

Q5. **[Writing Quality]** Is the language **clear, comprehensible, and easy to understand**? In addition, is the text free of errors in grammar, punctuation, and spelling?

Extremely poor writing quality (1)	Moderately poor writing quality (2)	Slightly poor writing quality (3)	Neither good nor poor writing quality (4)	Slightly good writing quality (5)	Moderately good writing quality (6)	Extremely good writing quality (7)
---------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------

Q6. **[Coherence]** Is the story **well-structured and organized**?

Extremely poor coherence (1)	Moderately poor coherence (2)	Slightly poor coherence (3)	Neither good nor poor coherence (4)	Slightly good coherence (5)	Moderately good coherence (6)	Extremely good coherence (7)
---------------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------

Q7. **[Overall Quality]** What is your **overall assessment** of the story? For example, does the story effectively convey its main ideas in a manner that is creative, interesting, well-written, and coherent?

Extremely bad (1)	Moderately bad (2)	Slightly bad (3)	Neither good nor bad (4)	Slightly good (5)	Moderately good (6)	Extremely good (7)
----------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

C Supplementary Text

C.1 Reflective Feedback Analysis

We analyze the qualitative feedback from our participants to gain deeper insights into their experiences with AI-assisted writing. Participants provided brief feedback on which aspects of their AI-assisted writing worked well and which aspects they found challenging or would like to change. Written feedback was collected from 197 participants. To formally analyze this qualitative data, we extracted key topics from the 197 essays and quantified the frequency of comments associated with each topic. Following the method outlined by Ludan *et al.* (28), we used LLMs to identify ten positive and ten negative topics across the entire comment set. Each participant's comment was then classified into these topics using GPT-4 as the LLM. Comments could be assigned to none, one, or multiple topics based on their content.

Differences among Treatment Groups Our qualitative feedback data confirms that participants in the Human Creativity and Copilot groups experienced higher levels of satisfaction and produced higher-quality stories compared to those in the Human Confirmation group.

Students in the Human Confirmation group were primarily tasked with confirming AI-generated outputs, which severely limited their involvement in the creative process. This lack of engagement was a source of frustration and disconnection for many participants. For instance, one student mentioned feeling "super removed from the content of the story," which led to a final product they were "far from proud of." This disengagement contributed to a reduced sense of ownership over the final story, as students felt disconnected from the creative aspects that typically foster a stronger connection to the work. Moreover, students in this group often struggled with the AI's narrative direction. They reported that AI outputs frequently "diverged" from their creative vision, making it challenging to produce a coherent and satisfying narrative. One student expressed, "I struggled to redirect the storyline without giving it ideas/examples/nudges," underscoring how the AI's limitations in nuanced storytelling left the narrative feeling "generic" and unaligned with their vision. The AI's inability to handle subtle details and stylistic elements resulted in stories that felt "flat" and lacked depth. Consequently, the combination of reduced sense of ownership, difficulty in narrative control, and AI's creative limitations led to lower satisfaction and perceived quality in the Human Confirmation group.

In contrast, students in the Human Creativity group experienced a greater sense of creative control, which enabled them to maintain a stronger connection to the story. As one student noted, being responsible for the story's ideation and outlining allowed them to "keep the story aligned with my vision from the start," leading to a more satisfying experience. However, while students appreciated the creative control, they also encountered challenges with AI's execution. The need for frequent adjustments and prompts to achieve the desired narrative highlighted the limitations of AI in fully realizing the students' creative intentions. For instance, one student noted, "I couldn't get the AI story to be exactly the way I wanted it. It just didn't have my voice, and I had a hard time infusing my voice into its system," demonstrating the challenge of making the AI's output match their creative vision. Despite these challenges, the active involvement in the creative process led to a greater sense of ownership and a more positive perception of the final product. This suggests that the balance of human creativity and AI support in this group was effective in enhancing both satisfaction and story quality.

Similarly, the Copilot group, which facilitated a partnership between human and AI throughout all stages of the writing process, also reported high levels of satisfaction and story quality. Students in this group benefited from a collaborative approach where they could either initiate

tasks or use AI for feedback and refinement. One student described the experience as a "true partnership," where the AI was used to enhance rather than replace their creative input. This iterative and collaborative approach allowed students to continuously improve the narrative, leading to polished and well-rounded stories. The flexibility to involve AI at any stage of the process, coupled with the ability to retain creative control, resulted in a strong sense of ownership and satisfaction with the final product. For example, one student noted, "The iterative process of suggesting tweaks for each paragraph and then asking ChatGPT to rewrite it was particularly insightful," which underscored the effective partnership in refining the story.

The qualitative feedback suggests that AI should be leveraged as a supportive tool that enhances, rather than replaces, human creativity. Both the Human Creativity and Copilot models show that when AI and humans collaborate effectively, the creative process can be "productive" and "fulfilling."

Opportunities in Writing with AI Table S.1 highlights the opportunities provided by LLM support for story writing. Participants identified ten key benefits of AI in writing, grouped into three main areas. First, *Efficiency and Workflow Enhancement* emerged as a significant benefit, with participants noting AI's ability to maintain structure, reduce writing time, and improve planning. Second, *Creativity and Idea Generation* were greatly enhanced, as AI produced diverse and imaginative storylines, aiding in ideation and iterative refinement. Finally, *Language and Structural Support* was another crucial advantage, with AI delivering improvements in grammar, maintaining coherent structures, and assisting with research and fact-checking to improve overall writing quality.

Challenges in Writing with AI Table S.2 outlines the challenges associated with LLM support for story writing. Our analysis revealed ten key challenges associated with using LLMs in story writing, clustered into three main categories. First, *Authenticity and Emotional Depth* posed significant issues, with many users feeling that the AI's responses lacked a human touch, emotional depth, and authenticity, resulting in narratives that felt too formal and impersonal. *Technical and Logical Consistency* was another problem, with AI struggling to follow complex instructions and maintain a consistent narrative voice. Finally, *Creativity and Critical Thinking* limitations were evident, with the AI struggling to generate truly novel ideas, relying on clichés, and struggling with humor or irony. These challenges highlight the need for human oversight in AI-assisted writing to ensure depth and originality.

C.2 Other Tables and Figures

Difference-in-Differences Results for Total Completion Time Table S.3 presents the difference-in-differences test results for total completion time. Regarding the group effect, there is no significant difference in completion time among groups. For the day effect, AI assistance significantly decreased completion time on Day 2 compared to Day 1, when participants wrote stories without AI assistance. For the interaction term, there was no evidence that the change in completion time from Day 1 to Day 2 differed significantly between groups.

Differences in Additional Quality Measures Table S.4 presents the regression results comparing group differences in originality, interestingness, writing quality, and coherence of stories written with AI assistance. For all measures except originality, the Human Confirmation condition—representing an exclusion of human involvement in creative roles—yields lower scores compared to conditions where humans are actively engaged in creative roles (i.e., Human Creativity and Copilot conditions). Furthermore, assigning creative tasks to humans while delegating writing and editing tasks to AI (i.e., Human Creativity condition) results in higher

scores for interestingness, writing quality, and coherence compared to a fully collaborative approach throughout the entire process (i.e., Copilot condition). However, these differences achieve statistical significance only for coherence ($P < 0.05$).

Influence of Additional Quality Metrics on Overall Quality Table S.5 presents the regression results showing how additional quality metrics—such as originality, interestingness, writing quality, and coherence—influence overall quality. The results indicate that the interestingness of the story has the greatest impact on overall quality, followed by coherence, originality, and writing quality.

Main Findings Regarding Performance Tables S.6 to S.9 present two sets of regression results highlighting our main findings on completion time and overall story quality. The primary regression model accounts for individual characteristics, including DAT score, creative writing experience, creative writing ability, and English language proficiency. To evaluate the robustness of these findings, we also test whether the results remain consistent when these fixed effects are excluded. The results across the tables indicate that our findings are robust, holding true regardless of whether these fixed effects are included.

Main Findings Regarding Satisfaction Tables S.10 to S.12 present regression results for our main findings on participant satisfaction. Table S.10 illustrates how participant satisfaction with the writing process changes from Day 1 (writing without AI) to Day 2 (writing with AI) across treatments. Tables S.11 and S.12 detail how satisfaction metrics for the writing process and AI assistance vary among treatments when writing with AI on Day 2.

D Supplementary Tables

Table S.1: Opportunities in LLM Support for Story Writing

	Topics (# of Comments)	Example
1	Efficiency and Time-Saving (72)	"ChatGPT is fast at writing and better at maintaining structure than I am. It was able to follow my outline very closely and write something that had a clear beginning, conflict, and ending. When I wrote on my own, I ran out of time due to poor planning."
2	Idea Generation and Creativity Boost (68)	"AI helped the most with ideation and outline. ChatGPT came up with ten completely different (science) fictions with twisted plots beyond the scope of everyday events."
3	Structure and Outline Assistance (51)	"By using ChatGPT to help with the outline, I was able to quickly create a structured narrative framework that guided the rest of my writing process."
4	Grammar and Language Improvement (39)	"I noticed that the syntax and word choice for Day 2 were far more diverse and interesting than my own writing on Day 1."
5	Overcoming Writer's Block (29)	"When writing my first story without AI help, I hit some writer's blocks where ideas stopped coming for a bit. This stalled my progress. With AI helping on the second story, I flowed better as I didn't get stuck like before. Having the AI bounce ideas made it easier to just keep writing. I felt less alone when creating, less likely to bog down or lose steam."
6	Diverse Perspective and Ideas (28)	"AI can generate a list of ideas quickly, aiding in the brainstorming process. The iterative process with AI helps refine the writing to meet specific preferences."
7	Faster Iteration and Refinement (25)	"Unsurprisingly, writing the first draft of the story with ChatGPT was much faster compared to the Day 1 assignment (10 minutes with ChatGPT vs. 64 minutes on Day 1!)."
8	Enhanced Vocabulary and Description (22)	"ChatGPT provided vivid descriptions and enhanced the imagery in my story that I wouldn't have been able to come up with on my own."
9	Assistance with Research and Factual Accuracy (18)	"AI's vast knowledge base was useful for fact-checking and adding authenticity to story elements."
10	Flexibility in Story Adaptation (15)	"I wanted to shift the focus of the story from one character to another midway through the narrative. ChatGPT quickly adapted by reorienting the plot and providing additional backstory for the new main character, seamlessly integrating the change into the story."

Table S.2: Challenges in LLM Support for Story Writing

	Topics (# of Comments)	Example
1	Lack of Human Touch, Emotional Depth, and Authenticity (58)	"The AI's responses sometimes felt too formal and lacked the emotional depth that human storytelling often encapsulates."
2	Difficulty in Matching Personal Writing Style (45)	"AI's writing didn't sound like me at all; it was hard to achieve a specific writing style despite testing out various descriptions."
3	Difficulty in Following Complex Instructions (43)	"I gave ChatGPT detailed instructions to weave two plotlines together with alternating perspectives, but the AI struggled to maintain the structure. It either focused too much on one plotline or lost the thread of the other, leading to an unbalanced narrative."
4	Difficulty with Specific Editing needs (37)	"Editing with ChatGPT was incredibly frustrating. If I prompted ChatGPT to make the story longer, the result was complex and flowery language that was unnatural to read. I also could not get ChatGPT to edit specific paragraphs or remove certain sentences."
5	Overreliance on Clichés and Predictable Content (29)	"ChatGPT's writing is rather predictable. Even with additional prompting, it was pretty easy to identify which stories were written by ChatGPT."
6	Struggle with Nuanced and Context-Specific Writing (26)	"The need for human oversight was evident; while AIs are powerful, they cannot fully grasp subjective or highly contextualized aspects."
7	Difficulty Maintaining Consistent Narrative Voice (24)	"I found that when I asked ChatGPT to continue the story from where I left off, the narrative voice often shifted noticeably. The tone and style would change, making the continuation feel disjointed from the earlier parts I had written."
8	Inability to Generate Truly Novel Ideas (22)	"Basically, quite good at creating a wide variety within one genre but not actual novel ideas"
9	Lack of Critical Thinking and Logical Flow (20)	"ChatGPT sometimes generated plot points that didn't make logical sense in the context of the story. For instance, it introduced a sudden character motivation that contradicted earlier events, which disrupted the story's logical flow."
10	Difficulty with Subtle Humor or Irony (15)	"When I tried to incorporate irony into the dialogue, ChatGPT often missed the mark. It would either take the statement too literally or rephrase it in a way that lost the ironic twist, making the humor fall flat."

Table S.3: Difference-in-Differences Results for Total Completion Time

Variables	Total Completion Time
Constant	54.7543*** (12.882)
Human Creativity	-1.3765 (3.545)
Copilot	-3.9105 (3.586)
Day	-26.4200*** (3.678)
Day × Human Creativity	0.1834 (5.031)
Day × Copilot	3.2993 (5.115)
DAT	0.3245** (0.147)
Writing Experience	0.5364 (1.778)
Writing Ability	-2.5071 (1.690)
English Proficiency	-2.3031 (2.486)

Note: The Human Confirmation group is set as the baseline. Additionally, Day 1 is coded as 0 and Day 2 as 1. The regression analysis is conducted at the participant-level.

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table S.4: Differences in Additional Quality Metrics Among Groups on Day 2 (Writing with AI)

Groups	Originality	Interestingness	Writing Quality	Coherence
T1 (Human Confirmation) vs. T2 (Human Creativity)	-0.0409 (0.103)	0.3031*** (0.112)	0.2850*** (0.097)	0.4599*** (0.102)
T1 (Human Confirmation) vs. T3 (Copilot)	0.0535 (0.102)	0.2614** (0.111)	0.1857* (0.097)	0.2285** (0.101)
T2 (Human Creativity) vs. T3 (Copilot)	0.0945 (0.101)	-0.0417 (0.110)	-0.0992 (0.096)	-0.2314** (0.100)

Note: The values indicate the difference in quality metric scores, specifically reflecting the score of the latter group compared to the former group (baseline), after controlling individual characteristics, DAT, writing experience, writing ability, and English proficiency. The regression analysis is conducted at the evaluation-level.

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table S.5: Influence of Additional Quality Metrics on Overall Quality

Metrics	Overall Quality
Constant	-0.5600*** (0.064)
Originality	0.2027*** (0.012)
Interestingness	0.4231*** (0.012)
Writing Quality	0.1671**** (0.012)
Coherence	0.2944*** (0.012)

Note: Overall quality is the dependent variable, and additional quality metrics are the independent variables. The regression analysis is conducted at the evaluation-level.

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table S.6: Inequality in Completion Time on Day 2 (Writing with AI)

Variables	Human Confirmation		Human Creativity		Copilot	
	Constant	21.2859** (8.737)	21.6476 (30.632)	41.5586*** (6.199)	61.0138*** (19.617)	0.9793 (9.940)
Day 1 Completion Time	0.3176** (0.123)	0.3222** (0.135)	0.0426 (0.085)	-0.0049 (0.087)	0.6589*** (0.143)	0.7012*** (0.153)
DAT		0.1489 (0.371)		-0.1340 (0.202)		-0.1038 (0.458)
Writing Experience		1.9699 (4.641)		-6.4829** (2.785)		-2.4580 (3.619)
Writing Ability		0.5075 (4.047)		5.9990** (2.883)		0.4708 (4.047)
English Proficiency		-6.1062 (5.189)		-2.4920 (5.069)		5.9989 (5.260)

Note: The dependent variable is total completion time on Day 2, with the Human Confirmation group set as the baseline. The slope represents the relationship between completion times across days: a slope of 1 indicates that Day 1 and Day 2 times are perfectly correlated, whereas a slope of 0 suggests that AI intervention equalized completion time regardless of Day 1 time. The regression analysis is conducted at the participant-level.

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table S.7: Overall Quality

Variables	Day 1 (Without AI)		Day 2 (With AI)	
	Constant	4.9200*** (0.068)	3.5160*** (0.499)	4.7670*** (0.074)
T2: Human Creativity	-0.0170 (0.096)	0.0061 (0.098)	0.2780*** (0.103)	0.3376*** (0.106)
T3: Copilot	-0.1518 (0.098)	-0.1443 (0.105)	0.2628** (0.104)	0.3158*** (0.105)
DAT		0.0146** (0.006)		0.0007 (0.006)
Writing Experience		-0.1594** (0.066)		-0.0805 (0.071)
Writing Ability		0.1140 (0.070)		-0.0205 (0.074)
English Proficiency		0.0866 (0.097)		-0.0831 (0.101)

Note: Overall quality is the dependent variable, and the Human Confirmation group is set as the baseline. The regression analysis is conducted at the evaluation-level.

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table S.8: Inequality in Overall Quality on Day 2 (Writing with AI)

Variables	Human Confirmation		Human Creativity		Copilot	
Constant	4.5196*** (0.570)	3.6482*** (1.321)	4.0526*** (0.438)	5.3392*** (0.781)	4.1926*** (0.454)	4.9040*** (1.171)
Day 1 Overall Quality	0.0497 (0.114)	0.0864 (0.114)	0.2016** (0.088)	0.2442** (0.093)	0.1774* (0.094)	0.2069** (0.095)
DAT		0.0112 (0.014)		-0.0054 (0.008)		-0.0059 (0.014)
Writing Experience		-0.1429 (0.155)		0.0746 (0.103)		-0.1106 (0.124)
Writing Ability		-0.1974 (0.151)		-0.1255 (0.108)		0.2695** (0.133)
English Proficiency		0.1158 (0.183)		-0.3284* (0.184)		-0.2545 (0.173)

Note: The dependent variable is overall story quality on Day 2, with the Human Confirmation group set as the baseline. The slope represents the relationship between overall quality across days: a slope of 1 indicates perfect correlation between Day 1 and Day 2 quality, whereas a slope of 0 suggests that AI intervention equalized story quality regardless of Day 1 quality. The regression analysis is conducted at the participant-level.

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table S.9: Inequality in Overall Quality by DAT Score

Variables	Day 1 (Without AI)		Day 2 (With AI)	
	Constant	3.6088*** (0.460)	3.5091*** (0.496)	5.0645*** (0.491)
DAT	0.0153*** (0.006)	0.0139** (0.006)	-0.0015 (0.006)	-0.0005 (0.006)
Writing Experience		-0.1673** (0.066)		-0.0762 (0.071)
Writing Ability		0.1144 (0.070)		-0.0049 (0.075)
English Proficiency		0.0961 (0.096)		-0.0469 (0.101)

Note: Overall quality is the dependent variable. The regression analysis is conducted at the evaluation-level.

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table S.10: Comparison of Process Satisfaction Scores Between Day 1 and Day 2

Groups	Day 1 (without AI) vs. Day 2 (with AI)			
	Process Satisfaction	Flexibility	Process Effectiveness	Intent to Reuse Process
Human Confirmation	-0.0507 (0.248)	-0.7975** (0.242)	-0.0715 (0.266)	-0.1320* (0.074)
Human Creativity	0.8584*** (0.215)	-0.0050 (0.213)	0.8491*** (0.225)	0.1510** (0.065)
Copilot	0.4154* (0.228)	0.0484 (0.221)	0.8548*** (0.216)	0.1484** (0.067)

Note: The values represent the differences in satisfaction metric scores, comparing Day 2 (writing with AI) to Day 1 (writing without AI), after controlling for individual characteristics, DAT, writing experience, writing ability, and English proficiency. A positive value indicates an increase in satisfaction on Day 2 compared to Day 1. The regression analysis was conducted at the participant level.

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table S.11: Process Satisfaction Among Groups on Day 2 (Writing with AI)

Groups	Process Satisfaction	Flexibility	Process Effectiveness	Intent to Reuse Process
T1 (Human Confirmation) vs. T2 (Human Creativity)	0.6766*** (0.250)	0.7848*** (0.252)	0.8023*** (0.249)	0.1957*** (0.067)
T1 (Human Confirmation) vs. T3 (Copilot)	0.5793** (0.251)	0.8692*** (0.253)	1.0316*** (0.251)	0.2159*** (0.067)
T2 (Human Creativity) vs. T3 (Copilot)	-0.0972 (0.247)	0.0845 (0.248)	0.2293 (0.246)	0.0202 (0.066)

Note: The values represent the differences in satisfaction metric scores, comparing the latter group to the former group (baseline), after controlling for individual characteristics, DAT, writing experience, writing ability, and English proficiency. A positive value indicates that the latter group had a higher satisfaction score than the former group. The regression analysis was conducted at the participant level.

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table S.12: Satisfaction with AI Assistance Across Groups on Day 2 (Writing with AI)

Groups	Effectiveness of AI	Satisfaction of AI	Contribution of AI
T1 (Human Confirmation) vs. T2 (Human Creativity)	0.4987** (0.225)	0.7336*** (0.251)	-20.5582*** (2.381)
T1 (Human Confirmation) vs. T3 (Copilot)	0.5087** (0.226)	1.0134*** (0.253)	-13.5237*** (2.368)
T2 (Human Creativity) vs. T3 (Copilot)	0.0100 (0.222)	0.2798 (0.248)	7.0345*** (2.337)

Note: The values reflect the differences in satisfaction with AI assistance scores, comparing the latter group to the former group (baseline), after controlling for individual characteristics, DAT, writing experience, writing ability, and English proficiency. A positive value indicates that the latter group reported higher satisfaction scores than the former group. The regression analysis was performed at the participant level.

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$