



encompasses fixed-scope content curation tasks, atomic creative tasks, and complex and interdependent tasks (refer to Figure 1).

### 2.1 Fixed-scope Content Curation Tasks

Substantial research demonstrates that Large Language Models (LLMs) adeptly manage defined content curation tasks such as text summarization [16], content refinement [19], and code explanation [24]. These tasks involve reiterating existing knowledge succinctly and coherently without generating novel insights. GPT and similar LLMs have shown proficiency in these tasks, often without the necessity for human intervention. Clark et al. revealed that text generated by GPT-3 was linguistically advanced to the extent that distinguishing it from human-written text became challenging for evaluators [7]. This calls for well-structured frameworks to dissect human and machine errors and ascertain authorship [13]. Such evidence underscores the potential for reducing human involvement in content curation tasks due to the superior quality of machine-generated text.

### 2.2 Atomic Creative Tasks


The second category comprises atomic creative tasks that necessitate generating novel and valuable outputs [3, 27]. These include tasks such as crafting analogous design concepts [18, 31], design problems [20–22], slogans [8], and tweetorials [15]. LLMs like GPT can foster novel connections or "creative leaps" due to their extensive knowledge base [4]. However, real creativity often requires domain-specific and nuanced knowledge that might be absent in LLM training data. Hence, to ensure quality, LLM outputs for these tasks must be guided, selected, or edited by humans through precise human-AI interactions.

### 2.3 Complex and Interdependent Tasks

Beyond the atomic creative tasks are complex and interdependent tasks such as active search [25, 26], neurocognitive disorder test [10], collaborative design work [23], and storytelling in text [28, 30] and images [29]. These tasks demand not only domain expertise but also capabilities for planning, reasoning, ideating, and maintaining context over extended periods to create coherent and innovative content. Researchers have developed tools like Promptify [2] and PromptPaint [6] for text-to-image generation, Spellburst [1] for exploratory creative coding, and XCreation [29] for cross-modal storytelling to facilitate these intricate interactions.

## 3 PRELIMINARY STUDIES AND RESULTS

Our research comprises three studies, each examining human-AI interactions across tasks varying in creativity and complexity. The initial study delves into fixed-scope content curation tasks, utilizing news headline generation as the investigative lens. The first study examines fixed-scope content curation tasks, employing news headline generation as the medium for exploration. The second study transitions to probing atomic creative tasks, with a focus on analogy generation to uncover underlying creative processes. Lastly, the third study escalates in complexity, exploring the complex and interdependent tasks associated with data visualization.



**Figure 2: Study 1 on fixed-scope content curation tasks - interface for human-AI news headline co-creation for *guidance + selection + post-editing* condition: (A) news reading panel, (B) perspectives (keywords) selection panel (multiple keywords can be selected), (C) headline selection panel with post-editing capability, and (D) difficulty rating slider.**

These three studies collectively offer a comprehensive understanding of human-AI interaction across a spectrum of task creativity and complexity.


### 3.1 Study 1 on Fixed-Scope Content Curation Tasks: News Headline Generation

This research investigates human-AI interactions within fixed-scope content curation tasks, specifically focusing on the generation of news headlines [11]. A between-subjects experiment was conducted involving 40 participants tasked with creating news headlines using either traditional manual methods or one of three LLM-enhanced systems: (1) *selection*, (2) *guidance + selection*, and (3) *guidance + selection + post-editing*.

- **Selection:** The LLM generates three headlines for each news article (*generate headlines*), and the user selects the most appropriate one;
- **Guidance + Selection:** The LLM extracts several potential perspectives (keywords) from each news article (*extract perspectives*), the user chooses one or more perspectives to emphasize in the headline, the LLM then generates three headlines for each news article based on the selected perspectives (*generate headlines w/ perspectives*), and finally, the user selects the best one;
- **Guidance + Selection + Post-editing:** This is similar to *Guidance + Selection*, but the user can further edit the selected headline (post-editing).

An example of the interface supporting *guidance + selection + post-editing* is presented in Figure 2. Subsequently, the outputs produced via the five interaction types—manual, AI-only, and the three AI-assisted conditions—were evaluated by a cohort of 20 experts.

The results of the study indicate that LLMs (GPT-3 *text-davinci-002* model), on average, are capable of generating headlines of a high quality independently. However, they are not without flaws, necessitating human oversight to correct inaccuracies. The study found that the *guidance + selection* modality was particularly effective, facilitating the efficient generation of superior headlines



**Figure 3: Study 2 on atomic creative tasks - our learning prompts based on Duncker and Lees' radiation problem [14] for generating cross-domain analogies.**

compared to more labor-intensive methods such as extensive post-editing or entirely manual composition. Interestingly, the research also observed that across all conditions, there was a similar level of perceived trust and control reported by participants.

### 3.2 Study 2 on Atomic Creative Tasks: Cross-Domain Analogy Generation

Transitioning from fixed-scope content curation tasks, the second study delves into atomic creative tasks, focusing on cross-domain analogy generation. In this context, classical analogous problems curated or crafted by humans, such as Duncker and Lees' radiation problem [14], are employed to *guide* Large Language Models (LLMs) as examples in generating analogies (see Figure 3). Our study indicates the necessity for human evaluators to *select*, *rate*, and *post-edit* these AI-generated analogies to address potential biases and ensure ethical and legal compliance.

In our recent exploratory experiments assessing LLMs' efficacy in atomic creative tasks, we tasked participants with reformulating the original problem using 120 analogous problems generated by GPT-3 *text-davinci-002* model [12]. The results were encouraging: the AI-generated analogies were predominantly perceived as useful, with a median helpfulness rating of 4 out of 5, and they instigated substantial changes in problem formulation in about 80% of cases. However, up to 25% of the outputs were rated as potentially harmful, chiefly due to unsettling content that did not necessarily fall under bias or toxicity. These insights highlight the potential of LLMs to enhance atomic creative tasks and simultaneously draw attention to the necessity for human intervention in the form of selection, rating, and post-editing.

### 3.3 Study 3 on Complex and Interdependent Tasks: Data Visualization

This study aims to explore human-AI interactions within the context of complex and interdependent tasks, with an emphasis on data visualization. Exploratory data analysis typically involves searching for insights that extend beyond linear and sequential thinking. While tools like Jupyter Notebook offer substantial analytical capabilities, they often do not fully support the exploratory nature

required for complex data analysis and corresponding human-AI interactions. To address these limitations, we introduced a "design-like" intelligent canvas. This tool integrates generative AI into the data analysis process and enhances human-AI collaboration by enabling interactive editing, which facilitates rapid prototyping, iteration, and the efficient management of comparative visualizations (refer to Figure 4). A user study involving 10 participants with in-depth interview was conducted to evaluate the interface's facilitation of human-AI interaction in tackling complex and interdependent tasks.

## 4 IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Our upcoming research aims to explore further into the intricacies of human-AI interactions, particularly focusing on complex and interdependent tasks that exhibit a high potential for interaction. This research builds upon the findings from Study 3, which investigated the preliminary stages of data visualization prototyping facilitated by Generative AI. These initial attempts often led to an unstructured, "messy" output, as demonstrated by the outcomes of Study 3. Moreover, our objective extends beyond achieving a neatly organized set of data visualizations. Data analysis aims to uncover new insights, such as explanations for discrepancies observed when comparing visualizations. While the interpretation of these visualizations traditionally falls within the expertise of human data analysts, the advent of generative AI and its multi-modal understanding capabilities, including image captioning, presents an opportunity for AI to aid in interpreting and structuring visualizations. Thus, our research question is: **How can we harness multi-modal understanding of generative AI for real-time data visualization management?** To answer this question, we plan to conduct a formative study focusing on how experienced data analysts interpret and organize data visualizations as Knudsen et al. [17]. This formative study will be followed by the development of a mixed-initiative user interface designed for real-time data visualization management, and a user study to evaluate the performance of the system.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Tyler Angert, Miroslav Suzara, Jenny Han, Christopher Pondoc, and Hariharan Subramonyam. 2023. Spellburst: A Node-based Interface for Exploratory Creative Coding with Natural Language Prompts. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. ACM, San Francisco CA USA, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3586183.3606719>
- [2] Stephen Brade, Bryan Wang, Mauricio Sousa, Sageev Oore, and Toví Grossman. 2023. Promptify: Text-to-Image Generation through Interactive Prompt Exploration with Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. ACM, San Francisco CA USA, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3586183.3606725>
- [3] Joel Chan, Zijian Ding, Eesh Kamrah, and Mark Fuge. 2024. Formulating or Fixating: Effects of Examples on Problem Solving Vary as a Function of Example Presentation Interface Design. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2401.11022> arXiv:2401.11022 [cs].
- [4] Joel Chan, Pao Siangliulue, Denisa Qori McDonald, Ruixue Liu, Reza Moradinezhad, Safa Aman, Erin T. Solovey, Krzysztof Z. Gajos, and Steven P. Dow. 2017. Semantically Far Inspirations Considered Harmful?: Accounting for Cognitive States in Collaborative Ideation. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGCHI Conference on Creativity and Cognition (C&C '17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 93–105. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3059454.3059455>
- [5] Ruijia Cheng, Alison Smith-Renner, Ke Zhang, Joel Tetreault, and Alejandro Jaimes-Larrarte. 2022. Mapping the Design Space of Human-AI Interaction in Text Summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language*



**Figure 4: Study 3 on complex and interdependent tasks - data analysis results in design-like canvas environment: results (left) and study setting (right).**

Technologies. Association for Computational Linguistics, Seattle, United States, 431–455. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.naacl-main.33>

[6] John Joon Young Chung and Eytan Adar. 2023. PromptPaint: Steering Text-to-Image Generation Through Paint Medium-like Interactions. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. ACM, San Francisco CA USA, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3586183.3606777>

[7] Elizabeth Clark, Tal August, Sofia Serrano, Nikita Haduong, Suchin Gururangan, and Noah A. Smith. 2021. All That’s ‘Human’ Is Not Gold: Evaluating Human Evaluation of Generated Text. *arXiv:2107.00061 [cs]* (July 2021). <http://arxiv.org/abs/2107.00061> 00008 arXiv: 2107.00061.

[8] Elizabeth Clark, Anne Spencer Ross, Chenhao Tan, Yangfeng Ji, and Noah A. Smith. 2018. Creative Writing with a Machine in the Loop: Case Studies on Slogans and Stories. In *23rd International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*. ACM, Tokyo Japan, 329–340. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3172944.3172983>

[9] Zijian Ding and Joel Chan. 2023. Mapping the Design Space of Interactions in Human-AI Text Co-creation Tasks. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.06430> arXiv:2303.06430 [cs].

[10] Zijian Ding, Jiawen Kang, Tinky Oi Ting Ho, Ka Ho Wong, Helene H Fung, Helen Meng, and Xiaojuan Ma. 2022. TalkTive: A Conversational Agent Using Backchannels to Engage Older Adults in Neurocognitive Disorders Screening. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, New Orleans LA USA, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3502005>

[11] Zijian Ding, Alison Smith-Renner, Wenjuan Zhang, Joel R. Tetreault, and Alejandro Jaimes. 2023. Harnessing the Power of LLMs: Evaluating Human-AI Text Co-Creation through the Lens of News Headline Generation. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2310.10706> arXiv:2310.10706 [cs].

[12] Zijian Ding, Arvind Srinivasan, Stephen MacNeil, and Joel Chan. 2023. Fluid Transformers and Creative Analogies: Exploring Large Language Models’ Capacity for Augmenting Cross-Domain Analogical Creativity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12832* (2023).

[13] Yao Dou, Maxwell Forbes, Rik Koncel-Kedziorski, Noah Smith, and Yejin Choi. 2022. Is GPT-3 Text Indistinguishable from Human Text? Scarecrow: A Framework for Scrutinizing Machine Text. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Dublin, Ireland, 7250–7274. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.501>

[14] Karl Duncker. 1945. On problem-solving. *Psychological Monographs* 58, 5 (1945), i–113. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0093599>

[15] Katy Ilonka Gero, Vivian Liu, and Lydia Chilton. 2022. Sparks: Inspiration for Science Writing using Language Models. In *Designing Interactive Systems Conference*. ACM, Virtual Event Australia, 1002–1019. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3532106.3533533>

[16] Tanya Goyal, Junyi Jessy Li, and Greg Durrett. 2022. News Summarization and Evaluation in the Era of GPT-3. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2209.12356> arXiv:2209.12356 [cs].

[17] Søren Knudsen, Mikkel Rønne Jakobsen, and Kasper Hornbæk. 2012. An exploratory study of how abundant display space may support data analysis. In *Proceedings of the 7th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction: Making Sense Through Design*. ACM, Copenhagen Denmark, 558–567. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2399016.2399102>

[18] Mina Lee, Megha Srivastava, Amelia Hardy, John Thickstun, Esin Durmus, Ashwin Paranjape, Ines Gerard-Ursin, Xiang Lisa Li, Faisal Ladhak, Frieda Rong, Rose E. Wang, Minae Kwon, Joon Sung Park, Hancheng Cao, Tony Lee, Rishi Bommasani, Michael Bernstein, and Percy Liang. 2022. Evaluating Human-Language Model Interaction. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2212.09746> arXiv:2212.09746 [cs] version: 2.

[19] Zhicheng Lin. 2023. *Why and how to embrace AI such as ChatGPT in your academic life*. preprint. PsyArXiv. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/sdx3j>

[20] Stephen MacNeil, Zijian Ding, Ashley Boone, Anthony Bryce Grubbs, and Steven P. Dow. 2021. Finding Place in a Design Space: Challenges for Supporting Community Design Efforts at Scale. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 5, CSCW1 (April 2021), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3449246>

[21] Stephen MacNeil, Zijian Ding, Kexin Quan, Ziheng Huang, Kenneth Chen, and Steven P. Dow. 2021. ProbMap: Automatically constructing design galleries through feature extraction and semantic clustering. In *The Adjunct Publication of the 34th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. ACM, Virtual Event USA, 134–136. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3474349.3480203>

[22] Stephen MacNeil, Zijian Ding, Kexin Quan, Thomas j Parashos, Yajie Sun, and Steven P. Dow. 2021. Framing Creative Work: Helping Novices Frame Better Problems through Interactive Scaffolding. In *Creativity and Cognition (C&C ’21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3450741.3465261>

[23] Stephen MacNeil, Ziheng Huang, Kenneth Chen, Zijian Ding, Alex Yu, Kendall Nakai, and Steven P. Dow. 2023. Freeform Templates: Combining Freeform Curation with Structured Templates. In *Creativity and Cognition*. 478–488. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3591196.3593337> arXiv:2305.00937 [cs].

[24] Stephen MacNeil, Andrew Tran, Dan Mogil, Seth Bernstein, Erin Ross, and Ziheng Huang. 2022. Generating Diverse Code Explanations using the GPT-3 Large Language Model. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on International Computing Education Research - Volume 2*. ACM, Lugano and Virtual Event Switzerland, 37–39. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3501709.3544280>

[25] Srishti Palani, Zijian Ding, Stephen MacNeil, and Steven P. Dow. 2021. The “Active Search” Hypothesis: How Search Strategies Relate to Creative Learning. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval*. ACM, Canberra ACT Australia, 325–329. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3406522.3446046>

[26] Srishti Palani, Zijian Ding, Austin Nguyen, Andrew Chuang, Stephen MacNeil, and Steven P. Dow. 2021. CoNotate: Suggesting Queries Based on Notes Promotes Knowledge Discovery. In *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI ’21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445618>

[27] R. Keith Sawyer. 2012. *Explaining creativity: the science of human innovation* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press, New York.

[28] Nikhil Singh, Guillermo Bernal, Daria Savchenko, and Elena L. Glassman. 2022. Where to Hide a Stolen Elephant: Leaps in Creative Writing with Multimodal Machine Intelligence. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction* (Feb. 2022), 3511599. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3511599>

[29] Zihan Yan, Chunxu Yang, Qihao Liang, and Xiang ‘Anthony’ Chen. 2023. XCreation: A Graph-based Crossmodal Generative Creativity Support Tool. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. ACM, San Francisco CA USA, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3586183.3606826>

[30] Ann Yuan, Andy Coenen, Emily Reif, and Daphne Ippolito. 2022. Wordcraft: Story Writing With Large Language Models. In *27th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*. ACM, Helsinki Finland, 841–852. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3490099.3511105>

[31] Q. Zhu and J. Luo. 2022. Generative Pre-Trained Transformer for Design Concept Generation: An Exploration. *Proceedings of the Design Society 2* (May 2022), 1825–1834. <https://doi.org/10.1017/pds.2022.185> Publisher: Cambridge University Press.