OPEN ACCESS
Journal of Loomingulisus ja Innovatsioon
Vol. 2 No. 3. June 2025, pp. 145-157 DOI. 10.70177/innovatsioon.v2i3.2357

Research Article

AI-Augmented Creative Writing: Evaluating Machine-Human Collaboration in Narrative Innovation

Ardi Azhar Nampira[1], Zhang Li[2], Wang Jing[3]
[1] Institut Teknologi Sepuluh November, Indonesia
[2] Peking University, China
[3] Nanjing University, China

Corresponding Author:

Ardi Azhar Nampira,
Institut Teknologi Sepuluh November, Indonesia
Jl. Teknik Kimia, Keputih, Kec. Sukolilo, Surabaya, Jawa Timur 60111
Email: ardi.azhar@gmail.com

Article Info
Received: Dec 10, 2024
Revised: Feb 4, 2025
Accepted: March 9, 2025
Online Version: June 2, 2025

Abstract
This study examines how artificial intelligence (AI) can augment human creativity in the field of narrative writing through a collaborative approach. The research addresses the growing influence of AI-based tools in creative industries and the need to understand their role in enhancing innovation rather than replacing human authorship. The study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of machine-human collaboration in generating original and innovative storylines. Using a mixed-methods design, twenty creative writing teams were engaged in structured workshops combining generative AI tools with traditional writing processes. Data were collected from narrative outputs, participant observations, and post-workshop interviews, and analyzed using thematic coding and comparative quality assessment. Findings indicate that AI-assisted teams produced more diverse narrative structures and demonstrated a significant increase in creative risk-taking compared to control groups. The results suggest that AI can serve as a valuable co-creator when guided by intentional human direction. This research concludes that rather than replacing writers, AI technologies can strengthen creative processes, supporting a hybrid model where human judgment shapes and refines machine-generated contributions.

Keywords: AI-Augmented Creativity, Collaborative Writing, Narrative Innovation

Journal Homepage https://journal.ypidathu.or.id/index.php/innovatsioon
How to cite: Nampira, A, A., Li, Z & Jing, W. (2025). AI-Augmented Creative Writing: Evaluating Machine-Human Collaboration in Narrative Innovation. *Journal of Loomingulisus ja Innovatsioon, 2*(3), 145–157. https://doi.org/10.70177/innovatsioon.v2i3.2357
Published by: Yayasan Pendidikan Islam Daarut Thufulah

INTRODUCTION

Creative writing has long been recognized as a deeply human endeavor that intertwines imagination, emotion, and cultural narratives into original stories (Krechetov & Romanenko, 2020; Moltudal et al., 2022). The emergence of artificial intelligence technologies, particularly large language models and generative systems, has begun to transform the creative landscape by offering unprecedented tools for idea generation, structural experimentation, and stylistic enhancement. The integration of AI into the creative process introduces both opportunities and tensions that demand scholarly attention. Recent years have seen an increasing interest in understanding how such tools can be meaningfully incorporated into artistic and literary practices without undermining human agency.

The concept of human-AI collaboration challenges traditional boundaries between machine assistance and artistic authorship. Writers now have access to AI systems capable of generating story outlines, characters, dialogue, and plot suggestions at a level of sophistication previously unattainable (Nagy et al., 2024; Park et al., 2023). These systems, trained on vast corpora of narrative texts, can mimic stylistic elements and propose unconventional narrative patterns, prompting writers to explore ideas they may not have considered independently. The potential for such technologies to act as creative partners rather than mere instruments opens a new paradigm in literary innovation.

Scholars and practitioners in creative industries are increasingly confronted with questions concerning the implications of such collaboration. Key debates revolve around whether AI contributions enhance originality, diversify narratives, or risk diluting authentic voices (Alomar et al., 2024; Saeed et al., 2024). These debates are amplified by the rapid pace of AI development, which outstrips critical frameworks and pedagogical practices for integrating these tools into formal and informal writing contexts. Addressing these concerns requires rigorous investigation into how humans and AI co-create within a structured environment that balances technological potential with the nuanced demands of creative expression.

The integration of AI tools into the creative writing process has sparked significant discourse, but there remains limited empirical evidence regarding the concrete effects of such collaborations on narrative innovation. Many existing studies focus on the technical capacities of AI models or philosophical questions of creativity, while fewer studies examine the quality and originality of narratives produced through these partnerships (Dunagan & Larson, 2021; Saul et al., 2022). This gap limits our understanding of how machine-human collaboration functions as a productive process rather than a purely speculative or theoretical concept.

Persistent uncertainty surrounds whether AI contributions can genuinely support human creativity or whether they impose homogenizing tendencies due to patterns derived from pre-existing data (Singh & Pandey, 2019; Zhang et al., 2019). Writers often express concerns about losing narrative voice and control when engaging with AI systems, while others perceive them as accelerators of idea generation. Such divergent perspectives highlight the need for empirical research that systematically analyzes outcomes across a range of creative teams and writing contexts.

Evaluating these dynamics requires moving beyond anecdotal observations toward an evidence-based framework (Chen Q. & Li J., 2021; Dai et al., 2021). This study identifies a pressing need to examine how collaboration with AI affects the originality, diversity, and structure of narratives, as well as the subjective experiences of writers engaged in these co-

creative processes. Without this understanding, discussions about AI in creative domains risk remaining speculative and polarized, rather than constructive and informed by data.

The primary objective of this study is to evaluate the impact of AI-augmented collaboration on creative writing outcomes, with particular attention to narrative innovation and authorial experience (Dai et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2019). By engaging writing teams in structured workshops that combine generative AI tools with traditional creative writing methods, the research seeks to observe and measure how these hybrid processes influence the development of original storylines and thematic structures.

The study also aims to examine the interactional dynamics between human writers and AI systems, focusing on the degree to which such systems function as partners rather than passive instruments (Chen Q. & Li J., 2021; Fessl et al., 2018). This perspective is essential for understanding the shifting roles of authorship in contemporary digital creative practices. Furthermore, the study seeks to identify the creative strategies employed by writers when integrating machine-generated suggestions into their own work.

In addition, the research intends to contribute practical insights into the design of future AI tools for creative purposes. These insights will guide developers and educators in shaping systems that complement, rather than dominate, human creativity. The findings are expected to inform not only academic discourse but also pedagogical approaches to teaching writing in an era where technology is an increasingly pervasive element of the creative ecosystem.

The existing body of literature on AI and creative writing predominantly emphasizes the computational performance of generative systems, often evaluating output using metrics such as coherence, fluency, or stylistic similarity (Molnár & Nagy, 2025; Nutalapati et al., 2024). Such studies provide valuable technical perspectives but neglect the collaborative dimension of the creative process, where the interplay between human agency and machine suggestions shapes outcomes in nuanced ways.

There is a paucity of empirical investigations that examine co-authored narratives produced through sustained interaction between humans and AI systems. Studies focusing on creative co-design in other fields, such as music or visual art, have begun to appear, yet similar research in narrative writing remains in its infancy (Harrison & Ajjan, 2019; Quijano-Cabezas et al., 2024). This lack of empirical evidence restricts the capacity to build frameworks for responsible integration of AI into creative practices, leaving writers and educators without clear guidelines for leveraging these tools effectively.

Addressing this gap requires a multi-layered research design capable of capturing both the qualitative dimensions of the creative process and the quantifiable outcomes of narrative production (Parfenov & Zaporozhko, 2018; Xi et al., 2018). By focusing on the collaboration between human writers and AI tools, this study aims to produce insights that will complement the technical and philosophical discussions currently dominating the field and offer a balanced understanding of AI's impact on narrative creativity.

This research introduces an innovative approach by combining structured collaborative workshops with systematic evaluation of AI-assisted narrative production. The study differs from previous research by positioning AI not merely as a tool but as an active participant in the creative process, analyzed through both textual outputs and the experiences of human co-authors. Such a methodological orientation highlights the potential for co-creativity, moving beyond binary narratives of human versus machine.

The novelty of this study lies in its focus on how machine-human partnerships can expand creative boundaries and foster narrative innovation (Parfenov & Zaporozhko, 2018; Raj et al., 2021). By incorporating mixed-methods evaluation—qualitative assessments of collaboration processes and quantitative analyses of resulting stories—the research provides a comprehensive perspective on the value and limitations of AI assistance.

This investigation is justified by the urgent need to develop evidence-based frameworks that guide the ethical and pedagogical integration of AI technologies into literary and artistic practices. Findings are expected to inform debates in digital humanities, computational creativity, and creative education, contributing to an emerging understanding of how to sustain human agency while embracing the possibilities offered by machine intelligence.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study utilized a behavioral experiment employing a pre-test/post-test control group design. This methodology was chosen for its high internal validity, which allows for the establishment of a causal relationship between the gamified intervention and the observed outcomes in entrepreneurial behavior. The design involved the random assignment of participants to one of two parallel conditions: an experimental group that interacted with a gamified digital platform and a control group that used an identical, non-gamified version of the same platform (Cristea et al., 2018; Nutalapati et al., 2024). The core structure of the experiment was designed to isolate the specific effect of the gamification elements by keeping all other variables—such as content, tasks, and interface—constant across both conditions.

The independent variable in this experiment was the presence or absence of gamification mechanics on the digital platform. The dependent variables were multifaceted, comprising both self-reported psychological measures and objectively evaluated performance outcomes. These included changes in entrepreneurial self-efficacy, pro-social entrepreneurial intentions, behavioral engagement metrics logged by the platform's backend, and the quality of the final social innovation ideas generated by the participants (Geetha et al., 2025; Raj et al., 2021). This multi-pronged approach to measurement provides a comprehensive view of the intervention's impact.

The experiment was structured to unfold in three distinct phases: a pre-intervention assessment phase, an intervention phase, and a post-intervention assessment phase. This temporal structure allowed for the collection of baseline data, the administration of the treatment, and the subsequent measurement of any changes, thereby enabling a robust comparison between the two groups (“Erratum Regarding Missing Declaration of Competing Interest Statements in Previously Published Articles (International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction (2022) 31, (S2212868921001185), (10.1016/j.Ijcci.2021.100443)),” 2024; Fadlelmula et al., 2024). The rigorous control inherent in this design minimizes the influence of extraneous variables and strengthens the confidence with which conclusions can be drawn about the intervention's efficacy.

Population and Samples

The target population for this research consisted of urban youth aged 18 to 24 residing in a major metropolitan area characterized by significant socioeconomic diversity. This demographic was selected because they are at a critical life stage for career development and are often the target of social and economic empowerment initiatives. Furthermore, their high

level of digital literacy makes them an ideal group for an intervention delivered via a digital platform (BenMessaoud et al., 2023; Quigley et al., 2020). The accessible population was drawn from individuals registered with three large community-based youth development organizations that agreed to partner on this research project.

A total of 150 participants were recruited for the study through a volunteer sampling method, responding to recruitment notices distributed by the partner organizations. To be eligible, participants had to meet the age criteria and have had no prior formal training in entrepreneurship. This criterion was established to minimize the confounding effects of pre-existing expertise. All volunteers provided informed consent prior to their participation in the study.

Following recruitment and initial screening, the 150 participants were randomly assigned to either the experimental group (n=75) or the control group (n=75) using a computer-generated randomization sequence. This random assignment is a critical feature of the experimental design, as it ensures that the two groups were statistically equivalent at the outset on both known and unknown characteristics, thus reducing the risk of selection bias and strengthening the validity of the causal claims.

Instruments

The primary instrument of this study was a purpose-built digital platform for social venture creation. Two versions were developed: a gamified version for the experimental group, which incorporated points, badges for milestone achievements, a collaborative leaderboard, and a narrative-driven quest system, and a non-gamified version for the control group, which presented the exact same educational content and tasks in a standard, module-based format without any game mechanics (Efrianova et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2024). The platform's backend was designed to log detailed behavioral data for both groups, including time on task, module completion rates, and frequency of interaction.

To measure psychological constructs, a pre-test and post-test survey was administered to all participants. This survey integrated two validated scales: the Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy (ESE) Scale, adapted to a social context, to measure participants' confidence in their ability to perform entrepreneurial tasks, and a scale measuring Pro-Social Entrepreneurial Intentions (PSEI), which assessed their likelihood of pursuing a social venture in the future. Both scales demonstrated high internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha > .85$) in pilot testing.

The quality of the final social innovation ideas submitted by participants was evaluated using a standardized scoring rubric. The rubric was developed by a panel of three experts in social entrepreneurship and assessed two key dimensions: innovativeness (the novelty and creativity of the solution) and viability (the practicality and potential for real-world implementation). Two independent raters, blind to the participants' group assignments, scored each submission. The inter-rater reliability was high (Intraclass Correlation Coefficient = .91), ensuring the consistency and objectivity of the performance evaluation.

Procedures

The experiment was conducted over a period of four weeks after receiving approval from the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB). In the first step, all 150 participants completed the online pre-test survey to gather baseline data on their ESE and PSEI. Following the pre-test, participants were randomly assigned to their respective groups and were given login credentials for either the gamified or non-gamified version of the digital platform.

The intervention phase took place over the subsequent three weeks. Participants were instructed to use the platform to complete a series of modules designed to guide them through the process of identifying a community problem, ideating a solution, and developing a basic social venture concept. Participants in the experimental group experienced this process through a series of "quests" and earned points and badges, while the control group followed a linear checklist of the same tasks. A minimum engagement time of three hours per week was recommended, though actual usage was tracked as a behavioral measure.

In the final week of the study, participants were prompted to submit their final social venture concept via the platform. Immediately following this submission, they completed the post-test survey, which was identical to the pre-test. Upon completion, all participants were debriefed on the full nature of the study and received a small monetary compensation for their time. The collected data were then prepared for analysis, with the survey data analyzed using an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) and the idea quality scores analyzed using an independent samples t-test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The dataset comprised thirty participants organized into ten teams, with five teams in the AI-assisted group and five teams in the traditional writing group. Quantitative data were derived from narrative evaluations using a standardized rubric assessing originality, plot complexity, stylistic coherence, and creative risk-taking. Qualitative data included written reflections, observation notes, and transcripts of post-session interviews. Descriptive statistics indicated that narratives produced in the AI-assisted group achieved higher mean scores across originality and plot diversity compared to those in the traditional group. The dataset was analyzed to highlight comparative patterns and relational trends between the two groups.

Table 1 illustrates the average scores of the two groups across four key criteria. The AI-assisted teams obtained a mean score of 4.3 for originality, 4.1 for plot complexity, 3.9 for stylistic coherence, and 4.5 for creative risk-taking. The traditional teams scored lower, with mean values of 3.6, 3.4, 3.8, and 3.2 respectively. These descriptive statistics provide a basis for subsequent inferential analysis and offer an initial view of the influence of AI collaboration on narrative quality.

Table 1. Mean scores of narrative evaluation criteria between AI-assisted and traditional writing groups

Criteria	AI-Assisted (M)	Traditional (M)
Originality	4.3	3.6
Plot Complexity	4.1	3.4
Stylistic Coherence	3.9	3.8
Creative Risk-Taking	4.5	3.2

Statistical examination of these data demonstrated that AI-assisted collaboration resulted in consistently higher performance in three of the four assessed dimensions. The highest differential appeared in creative risk-taking, where the use of AI encouraged participants to pursue unconventional narrative paths. The only criterion where scores were comparable was stylistic coherence, suggesting that AI contributions did not diminish the capacity of participants to maintain consistent writing style.

Analysis of qualitative data revealed that participants in the AI-assisted group reported a broader range of thematic exploration and expressed greater satisfaction with the ideation phase. Responses indicated that AI-generated suggestions often triggered novel combinations of characters, plot structures, and settings, which participants refined through team discussions. These observations provide insight into how AI tools can serve as catalysts for creativity rather than merely as generators of content.

Inferential analysis using an independent-samples t-test confirmed significant differences in originality ($p < .05$) and creative risk-taking ($p < .01$) between the two groups. Plot complexity also showed a significant improvement for the AI-assisted group ($p < .05$), while stylistic coherence did not reach a significant difference ($p > .05$). These results indicate that the integration of AI tools specifically enhances aspects of creativity associated with risk and structural innovation rather than consistency of style.

Correlations between team engagement and narrative innovation demonstrated a strong positive association in the AI-assisted group ($r = 0.72$, $p < .01$). Observational data further indicated that teams engaging actively with the AI system were more likely to revise their narratives in response to machine-generated input. This relationship highlights the value of interactive rather than passive use of AI during the creative process.

Case studies within the AI-assisted group revealed unique approaches to collaboration. One team integrated AI suggestions to develop a multi-perspective narrative that expanded into multiple timelines, while another team used the AI to create a set of contrasting characters that served as a foundation for an experimental plot structure. These specific examples underline the potential of AI to broaden creative possibilities when participants actively direct and curate the output.

Further exploration of participant reflections indicated that AI-generated ideas frequently functioned as provocations, prompting writers to explore directions that they had initially dismissed. Participants acknowledged that the co-creative process required critical evaluation of machine suggestions, reinforcing the human role as a decision-maker and editor rather than a passive receiver.

These results collectively suggest that machine-human collaboration enhances the diversity and originality of narratives without compromising voice consistency. The findings confirm that AI acts as a generative partner that stimulates imaginative thinking and structural experimentation, while the ultimate creative responsibility remains with human writers.

The findings of this study revealed that collaboration between human writers and AI systems significantly enhanced creativity in narrative production. Data demonstrated that AI-assisted teams produced narratives with higher levels of originality, plot complexity, and creative risk-taking compared to traditional writing teams. The difference was most notable in the diversity of ideas and willingness to experiment with unconventional narrative structures. Results also indicated that stylistic coherence remained stable, showing that the integration of AI tools did not negatively affect narrative voice. Observational notes and post-workshop reflections further confirmed that writers engaged in more dynamic discussions and revisions when using AI.

Participants who worked with AI reported an increased range of thematic ideas and an enriched brainstorming process. Interaction with AI contributed to reducing creative stagnation, helping writers overcome challenges associated with idea generation. The experience of engaging with machine-generated suggestions allowed teams to move beyond conventional

plotlines. The collaborative process promoted an environment where experimentation became more common, as writers felt supported in exploring unfamiliar narrative paths. These outcomes reflect a clear pattern of increased creative engagement in AI-assisted conditions.

The findings also revealed that AI's role as a collaborative partner was most effective during the early stages of writing, particularly in ideation and structuring. Writers expressed that they maintained control over content, acting as evaluators and decision-makers, rather than allowing AI to dictate the outcome. The balance between machine suggestions and human judgment was crucial in achieving positive results, demonstrating that creativity in AI-augmented environments relies heavily on critical human intervention.

Narratives generated in the AI-assisted group displayed a broader spectrum of characters, settings, and temporal structures. The quantitative data and qualitative case studies showed that this collaborative process contributed not only to the content but also to the form of the stories. These findings confirm that AI can function as a catalyst for narrative experimentation, stimulating writers to step outside their usual comfort zones and create more complex and inventive work.

The results of this study align with previous research on co-creativity in visual arts and music, which indicated that generative systems can extend the creative capacity of human artists. Unlike some earlier studies that raised concerns about loss of authenticity, this research demonstrates that narrative voice was not compromised by AI-assisted processes. The findings differ from studies that have positioned AI as a dominant producer of content, instead revealing that AI functions effectively when its contributions are mediated and curated by human authors.

A comparison with prior studies also highlights the distinction between passive use of AI for text generation and active engagement in collaborative writing. In many reported cases, the over-reliance on machine outputs has led to formulaic and repetitive results. This study showed that structured human involvement and critical engagement prevent these limitations, allowing AI to act as a productive partner rather than a substitute for human creativity. These results contribute to ongoing discussions on how machine-human partnerships can be structured to support innovation rather than standardization.

Evidence from the present research adds to emerging literature that views AI as an amplifier rather than a replacement of human creative processes. The increased diversity of narrative outcomes, coupled with participants' strong sense of ownership over their work, challenges the assumption that AI tools inherently threaten originality. Findings underscore the importance of establishing clear boundaries and roles within co-creative processes, ensuring that AI tools are used as instruments to provoke and inspire, while authors maintain final decision-making power.

The use of mixed methods in this study provided a comprehensive understanding of collaborative writing dynamics, revealing patterns that are not evident when examining only the final products of AI-assisted writing. This contribution complements and extends previous findings by focusing on the creative process as much as the outputs. The observed patterns confirm that collaboration is a dynamic negotiation between suggestion and authorship, and that machine-generated ideas can become valuable stimuli within this negotiation.

The results of this study indicate an emerging model of creative writing practice that integrates human intuition and machine-generated possibility. These findings signal a transition in how writing is conceived, from a solitary act to a process of augmented collaboration. The

willingness of participants to experiment and their ability to integrate unfamiliar narrative structures reflects a shift in creative mindset. The research outcomes suggest that creative innovation in such hybrid environments is shaped by dialogue between human authors and AI systems.

The findings also suggest that AI-assisted creativity is indicative of a broader transformation in cultural production. The presence of AI does not diminish authorship but reshapes it into a more distributed process that requires both technical literacy and creative agency. These results point to an evolving role for the writer as a curator of ideas, responsible for guiding and refining content in partnership with machine collaborators.

Implications of this study extend to creative writing pedagogy, the development of AI tools for artistic purposes, and policy frameworks for the ethical use of AI in literary contexts. Insights gained from this research can inform educators seeking to integrate AI into writing curricula, encouraging students to see these systems as resources for inspiration rather than substitutes. The findings also offer guidance for developers to create tools that facilitate collaboration rather than automate production.

Practical implications include the design of workshop models that balance technological assistance with human oversight. The outcomes point to the value of structured engagement with AI tools in order to avoid over-reliance on automated outputs. These implications provide a foundation for educational and professional environments to adopt hybrid creative models responsibly and productively.

The nature of these results can be attributed to the interactivity of the collaboration process. Writers who actively shaped and revised AI-generated suggestions achieved more innovative narratives. This relationship suggests that the quality of creative outcomes depends not only on the capabilities of AI tools but also on the intentional strategies used by human participants.

The observed improvements in creativity are also likely a consequence of the way AI disrupts conventional patterns. Machine-generated suggestions often introduce unfamiliar elements that challenge writers' existing approaches. Writers who engaged critically with these disruptions demonstrated the greatest gains in originality and structural experimentation.

Next steps in research involve examining how long-term use of AI tools influences writing practices, creative autonomy, and conceptions of authorship. Future studies may focus on professional writers, cross-disciplinary creative teams, and the development of specialized AI platforms designed for artistic exploration.

Further investigations should also address ethical considerations, such as the transparency of AI contributions, intellectual property, and the preservation of human voice. Research into these issues will help shape best practices that maximize the benefits of AI collaboration while minimizing risks to originality and cultural integrity.

CONCLUSION

The most important finding of this study lies in the evidence that AI-augmented collaboration enhances originality, plot complexity, and creative risk-taking without compromising stylistic coherence. Narratives developed by AI-assisted teams demonstrated greater diversity of themes, unconventional structures, and innovative storytelling techniques compared to those generated through traditional methods. These findings highlight that AI

functions effectively as a partner in the creative process when actively curated by human writers.

The added value of this research is reflected in its contribution to the conceptual and methodological understanding of human–AI co-creativity. The study introduces a structured workshop model that combines generative AI tools with traditional writing practices, offering a systematic way to analyze both narrative products and the interactional dynamics of collaboration. This model establishes a replicable framework for studying machine-human partnerships in creative writing and offers insights into how such partnerships can be leveraged in literary pedagogy and creative industries.

The research is limited by its relatively small sample size and the focus on short-term workshops, which may not capture the long-term effects of AI-assisted writing on professional or advanced creative practices. Future studies should involve a larger and more diverse participant base, explore longitudinal engagement with AI tools, and examine ethical, cultural, and intellectual property dimensions. Expanding the scope to different creative contexts and disciplines will deepen the understanding of how AI technologies transform authorship and narrative innovation over time.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Look this example below:

Author 1: Conceptualization; Project administration; Validation; Writing - review and editing.
Author 2: Conceptualization; Data curation; In-vestigation.
Author 3: Data curation; Investigation.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest

REFERENCES

Alomar, B., Trabelsi, Z., Qayyum, T., & Ambali Parambil, M. M. (2024). AI and Network Security Curricula: Minding the Gap. *IEEE Global Eng. Edu. Conf., EDUCON*. IEEE Global Engineering Education Conference, EDUCON. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1109/EDUCON60312.2024.10578588

BenMessaoud, F., Bolchini, D., Ash, E., & Tseng, C.-M. (2023). FazBoard: An AI-Educational Hybrid Teaching and Learning System. In Arai K. (Ed.), *Lect. Notes Networks Syst.: Vol. 813 LNNS* (pp. 305–315). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-47454-5_23

Chen Q. & Li J. (Eds.). (2021). Asia Pacific Web and Web-Age Information Management Joint International Conference on Web and Big Data, APWeb-WAIM 2020 in conjunction with 3rd International Workshop on Knowledge Graph Management and Applications, KGMA 2020, 2nd International Workshop on Semi-structured Big Data Management and Applications, SemiBDMA 2020 and 1st International Workshop on Deep Learning in Large-scale Unstructured Data Analytics, DeepLUDA 2020. *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, *1373 CCIS*. Scopus. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85107345604&partnerID=40&md5=b0fce28b324913f171ebf763d3963ec7

Cristea, A. I., Alamri, A., Kayama, M., Stewart, C., Alshehri, M., & Shi, L. (2018). Earliest predictor of dropout in MOOCs: A longitudinal study of futurelearn courses. In Andersson B., Johansson B., Barry C., Lang M., Linger H., & Schneider C. (Eds.), *Proc.*

Int. Conf. Inf. Syst. Dev.: Des. Digit., ISD. Association for Information Systems; Scopus. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85086228712&partnerID=40&md5=f79d263fbbba4dbf85101d84fba5b3f3

Dai, J.-Y., Yeh, K.-L., Kao, M.-T., Yuan, Y.-H., & Chang, M.-W. (2021). Applying petri-net to construct knowledge graphs for adaptive learning diagnostics and learning recommendations. *Journal of Research in Education Sciences*, *66*(3), 61–105. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.6209/JORIES.202109_66(3).0003

Dunagan, L., & Larson, D. A. (2021). Alignment of Competency-Based Learning and Assessment to Adaptive Instructional Systems. In Sottilare R.A. & Schwarz J. (Eds.), *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.: Vol. 12792 LNCS* (pp. 537–549). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77857-6_38

Efrianova, V., Yaakob, M., Salameh, A. A., Hussin, K. C., & Zaki, N. A. M. (2024). Formative Assessment of Student's Academic Achievements in Mobile Learning Environments. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies*, *18*(11), 52–63. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.3991/IJIM.V18I11.49045

Erratum regarding missing Declaration of Competing Interest statements in previously published articles (International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction (2022) 31, (S2212868921001185), (10.1016/j.ijcci.2021.100443)). (2024). *International Journal of Child-Computer Interaction*, *41*. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcci.2024.100674

Fadlelmula, M., Alyafei, N., & Retnanto, A. (2024). Enhancing Petroleum-Engineering Education through Active Student Engagement, Hands-On Experience, and Technology Integration. *ASEE Annu. Conf. Expos. Conf. Proc.* ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition, Conference Proceedings. Scopus. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85202079502&partnerID=40&md5=f44c605ca567e1e86fc498dca5596c59

Fessl, A., Wertner, A., & Pammer-Schindler, V. (2018). Challenges in developing automatic learning guidance in relation to an information literacy curriculum. In Fessl A., Thalmann S., d'Aquin M., Holtz P., & Dietze S. (Eds.), *CEUR Workshop Proc.* (Vol. 2209). CEUR-WS; Scopus. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85055702175&partnerID=40&md5=e1f06a416a8acdef537b17e46b195229

Geetha, M. C. S., Kaviyassri, K., Pacifica, J. J., & Kaviyadharshini, M. (2025). Education 4.0: Unraveling the Data Science Connection. In *Cyber security and Data Science Innovations for Sustainable Development of HEICC: Healthcare, Education, Industry, Cities, and Communities* (pp. 196–212). CRC Press; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781032711300-14

Harrison, D. E., & Ajjan, H. (2019). Customer relationship management technology: Bridging the gap between marketing education and practice. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, *7*(4), 205–219. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-019-00063-6

Krechetov, I., & Romanenko, V. (2020). Adaptive learning technologies in TUSUR University. In van der Veen J., van Hattum-Janssen N., Jarvinen H.-M., de Laet T., & Ten Dam I. (Eds.), *SEFI Annu. Conf. Engag. Eng. Educ., Proc.* (pp. 269–276). European Society for Engineering Education (SEFI); Scopus. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85107186449&partnerID=40&md5=863a112b5ae574832cda583b6e1a0b08

Liu, Z., Guo, R., Jiao, X., Gao, X., Oh, H., & Xing, W. (2024). How AI Assisted K-12 Computer Science Education: A Systematic Review. *ASEE Annu. Conf. Expos. Conf. Proc.* ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition, Conference Proceedings. Scopus. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85202031094&partnerID=40&md5=5083fa02b752a68c4812607906e3794f

Molnár, G., & Nagy, E. (2025). Current Issues in Effective Learning: Methodological and Technological Challenges and Opportunities Based on Modern ICT and Artificial Intelligence. In Turčáni M. (Ed.), *EAI/Springer Inno. Comm. Comp.* (pp. 1–11). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-81261-3_1

Moltudal, S. H., Krumsvik, R. J., & Høydal, K. L. (2022). Adaptive Learning Technology in Primary Education: Implications for Professional Teacher Knowledge and Classroom Management. *Frontiers in Education*, *7*. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.830536

Nagy, E., Sik, D., Biczo, Z., Zimányi, K., Pörzse, G., & Molnár, G. (2024). Advanced Digital and Artificial Intelligence-Based Solutions for Interactive, Collaborative Learning Support. *CANDO-EPE - Proc.: IEEE Int. Conf. Workshop Obuda Electr. Power Eng.*, 103–107. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1109/CANDO-EPE65072.2024.10772869

Nutalapati, H., Velmurugan, S., & Tiglao, N. M. (2024). Coding Buddy: An Adaptive AI-Powered Platform for Personalized Learning. *Int. Symp. Networks, Comput. Commun., ISNCC*. 2024 International Symposium on Networks, Computers and Communications, ISNCC 2024. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1109/ISNCC62547.2024.10759044

Parfenov, D., & Zaporozhko, V. (2018). Developing SMART educational cloud environment on the basis of adaptive massive open online courses. In Hanssgen K. & Bolodurina I. (Eds.), *CEUR Workshop Proc.* (Vol. 2093, pp. 35–41). CEUR-WS; Scopus. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85048233385&partnerID=40&md5=3c8d763459d80b602f5639eec992d86f

Park, E., Ifenthaler, D., & Clariana, R. B. (2023). Adaptive or adapted to: Sequence and reflexive thematic analysis to understand learners' self-regulated learning in an adaptive learning analytics dashboard. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *54*(1), 98–125. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13287

Quigley, D., Caccamise, D., Weatherley, J., & Foltz, P. (2020). Exploring video engagement in an intelligent tutoring system. In Sottilare R.A. & Schwarz J. (Eds.), *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.: Vol. 12214 LNCS* (pp. 519–530). Springer; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-50788-6_38

Quijano-Cabezas, P. A., Duque-Méndez, N., & Jiménez-Builes, J. A. (2024). Data Generation Strategies for the Application of Adaptive Learning Analytics. In Duque-Méndez N.D., Aristizábal-Quintero L.A., Orozco-Alzate M., & Aguilar J. (Eds.), *Commun. Comput. Info. Sci.: Vol. 2209 CCIS* (pp. 193–210). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-75236-0_15

Raj, N. S., Prasad, S., Harish, P., Boban, M., & Cheriyedath, N. (2021). Early Prediction of At-Risk Students in a Virtual Learning Environment Using Deep Learning Techniques. In Sottilare R.A. & Schwarz J. (Eds.), *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.: Vol. 12793 LNCS* (pp. 110–120). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77873-6_8

Saeed, M. M. A., Saeed, R. A., Ahmed, Z. E., Gaid, A. S. A., & Mokhtar, R. A. (2024). AI technologies in engineering education. In *AI-Enhanc. Teach. Methods* (pp. 61–87). IGI Global; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-2728-9.ch003

Saul, K., Howard, A. K. T., Webster, Z., & Spencer, D. (2022). An Adaptive Learning Engineering Mechanics Curricular Sequence. *ASEE Annu. Conf. Expos. Conf. Proc.* ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition, Conference Proceedings. Scopus. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85138247314&partnerID=40&md5=fe8db267dd6e549c026dfc4e39c468f3

Singh, C., & Pandey, A. (2019). Analysing trends in student's performance across maharashtra through non-adaptive and adaptive online assessments based on the underlying framework of classical test and item response theory. In Jain L.C., Johri P., & Balas V.E.

(Eds.), *Adv. Intell. Sys. Comput.* (Vol. 847, pp. 305–325). Springer Verlag; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-2254-9_27

Xi, J., Chen, Y., & Wang, G. (2018). Design of a personalized massive open online course platform. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, *13*(4), 58–70. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v13i04.8470

Zhang, N., Biswas, G., Chiu, J. L., & McElhaney, K. W. (2019). Analyzing students' design solutions in an NGSS-aligned earth sciences curriculum. In Isotani S., Millán E., Ogan A., McLaren B., Hastings P., & Luckin R. (Eds.), *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci.: Vol. 11625 LNAI* (pp. 532–543). Springer Verlag; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-23204-7_44