
Divergent-Convergent Thinking in Large Language Models for Creative Problem Generation

Manh Hung Nguyen
 MPI-SWS, Germany
 manguyen@mpi-sws.org

Adish Singla
 MPI-SWS, Germany
 adishs@mpi-sws.org

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) have significant potential for generating educational questions and problems, enabling educators to create large-scale learning materials. However, LLMs are fundamentally limited by the “Artificial Hivemind” effect, where they generate similar responses within the same model and produce homogeneous outputs across different models. As a consequence, students may be exposed to overly similar and repetitive LLM-generated problems, which harms diversity of thought. Drawing inspiration from Wallas’s theory of creativity and Guilford’s framework of divergent-convergent thinking, we propose CREATIVEDC, a two-phase prompting method that explicitly scaffolds the LLM’s reasoning into distinct phases. By decoupling creative exploration from constraint satisfaction, our method enables LLMs to explore a broader space of ideas before committing to a final problem. We evaluate CREATIVEDC for creative problem generation using a comprehensive set of metrics that capture diversity, novelty, and utility. The results show that CREATIVEDC achieves significantly higher diversity and novelty compared to baselines while maintaining high utility. Moreover, scaling analysis shows that CREATIVEDC generates a larger effective number of distinct problems as more are sampled, increasing at a faster rate than baseline methods.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities across a wide range of domains, and their applications are becoming increasingly widespread. In education, LLMs have shown particular promise for generating questions and problems, such as topic-specific questions [1, 2], problems at varying difficulty levels [3, 4, 5], mathematically valid problems [2], and high-quality programming problems [6]. While LLMs support educators by enabling scalable problem creation, a fundamental limitation threatens their effectiveness in this domain. Prior work has shown that LLMs exhibit the “Artificial Hivemind” effect [7], which is characterized by repetition within a single model and homogeneity across different models. As a result, students may be exposed to LLM-generated problems that are overly similar and repetitive, which can harm the collective diversity of thought and creativity.

Existing work has proposed several methods to mitigate this homogeneity of LLM outputs. A naive method is to use a high decoding temperature, which increases surface-level diversity but does not improve originality and can even reduce creativity [8]. Other methods use external information such as persona simulation to steer models toward different perspectives [9] or contextualized prompting to add thematic constraints that guide generation [6]. More advanced methods include fine-tuning with creativity signals to explicitly optimize for novelty and diversity [10] or multi-LLM discussion frameworks that enhance creativity through role-play and debate among multiple agents [8]. However, a limitation shared by these methods is that they do not fundamentally change the underlying reasoning process. When prompted directly for creative outputs, LLMs often immediately attempt to satisfy all constraints, leading to premature convergence that prunes creative exploration.




Figure 1: Creative Problem Generation with CREATIVEDC. The input is a context containing a theme of interest and a programming concept for practicing. Our method instruct an LLM to apply a two-stage thinking process before generating a creative problem. **(1) Divergent thinking phase:** exploring diverse and novel ideas related to the theme. **(2) Convergent thinking phase:** narrowing down to one idea and align it with the constraints (required programming concept) in the given context. The output creative problem consists of a description, a test suite and a sample solution.

Our approach, drawing inspiration from Wallas’s classical theory of creativity [11] and Guilford’s divergent-convergent thinking [12], addresses this limitation by explicitly scaffolding the LLM’s reasoning into two distinct phases. In the *divergent thinking phase*, the model explores the creative space freely by generating wildly different, unconventional ideas without the cognitive burden of satisfying task constraints. In the *convergent thinking phase*, the model selects promising ideas and refines them to meet all requirements. By decoupling exploration from constraint satisfaction, our approach enables the LLM to traverse a broader ideation space before committing to a final answer. While prior work has applied divergent-convergent frameworks to classification tasks [13], creative problem-solving [14], and human-AI co-creation interfaces [15], our work provides a novel contribution by applying this framework to scaffold automated creative problem generation.

Our contributions are as follows:

1. We propose CREATIVEDC, a two-phase prompting method that scaffolds divergent and convergent thinking in the LLM’s reasoning process for creative problem generation.
2. We instantiate this paradigm for creative programming problem generation in our experiments. Then, we evaluate our method using a comprehensive set of metrics that capture diversity and novelty, both lexically and semantically, as well as utility.
3. We show that CREATIVEDC achieves significantly greater diversity and novelty than baseline methods, while maintaining high utility across diverse input contexts. Moreover, CREATIVEDC generates a larger effective number of distinct problems than the baselines.

2 Problem Setup

In this section, we formally define the *creative problem generation* in Sec. 2.1, describe the metrics for evaluating the creativity of generated problems in Sec. 2.2, and state our objective in Sec. 2.3.

2.1 Creative Problem Generation

Given a *context* \mathcal{C} that specifies the requirements for problem generation, the goal is to generate a problem \mathcal{P} that satisfies the constraints specified in \mathcal{C} while being creative. We represent a generated problem \mathcal{P} as a tuple $\mathcal{P} = (\mathcal{P}_{\text{desc}}, \mathcal{P}_{\text{eval}}, \mathcal{P}_{\text{sol}})$ consisting of three components: (1) $\mathcal{P}_{\text{desc}}$ is a natural-language description of the problem; (2) $\mathcal{P}_{\text{eval}}$ is a guideline for evaluating the correctness of any answers to the problem; and (3) \mathcal{P}_{sol} is a reference solution that solves the problem. Figure 1 illustrates an example input context and a corresponding generated problem. We are interested in evaluating the creativity of a large set of K problems generated for the same context \mathcal{C} , defined as $\mathcal{S}_K(\mathcal{C}) = \{\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots, \mathcal{P}_K\}$. We will evaluate the creativity of this set of problems in our experiments.

2.2 Metrics for Evaluating Creativity

Creativity is inherently multi-dimensional [16, 17], and recent work has emphasized the importance of simultaneously assessing diversity/novelty and utility (quality), highlighting trade-offs between these often competing objectives [18, 19]. Following these multi-dimensional evaluation approaches, we evaluate creativity across three complementary dimensions: *diversity*, *novelty*, and *utility*.

Diversity. Diversity measures the variation among the K problems in \mathcal{S} . We evaluate diversity using both lexical and semantic metrics.

Lexical Diversity. We measure lexical diversity as the ratio of unique n -grams to the total number of n -grams across the set. A higher score indicates richer wording with less repetition. Let $\text{ngrams}_n(\mathcal{P})$ denote the multiset of n -grams extracted from problem \mathcal{P} . Lexical diversity is defined as: $\text{LexDiv}_n(\mathcal{S}) = |\bigcup_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{S}} \text{ngrams}_n(\mathcal{P})| / \sum_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{S}} |\text{ngrams}_n(\mathcal{P})|$.

Semantic Diversity. To capture diversity beyond surface lexical overlap, we evaluate the semantic diversity of the set \mathcal{S} as the average pairwise cosine distance between problem embeddings. A higher score indicates greater semantic variety among the K problems. Let $\mathbf{e}(\mathcal{P}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the embedding of problem \mathcal{P} . Semantic diversity is defined as: $\text{SemDiv}(\mathcal{S}) = 1 / \binom{K}{2} \sum_{i < j} d_{\text{cos}}(\mathbf{e}(\mathcal{P}_i), \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{P}_j))$.

Novelty. While diversity measures variation within the set \mathcal{S} , novelty captures how distinct the problems in \mathcal{S} are from an external reference corpus \mathcal{R} . Prior work typically computes novelty against large-scale web corpora [20], which are vast but semantically sparse, and finding a close match for a specific creative output is unlikely unless it is near-plagiarism. We adopt a more challenging evaluation setting. For each generation method, we construct \mathcal{R} from the pool of problems generated by all *other* methods on the same context \mathcal{C} . This creates a semantically dense reference corpus where all problems share the same themes, programming concepts, and similar LLM-generation patterns. This setting provides a conservative lower bound on real-world novelty, as achieving high novelty against such a closely matched reference is considerably harder than against generic web text.

Lexical Novelty. We measure the proportion of n -grams in a generated problem that do not appear in the reference corpus. For a problem $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{S}$ and reference corpus \mathcal{R} , the lexical novelty is:

$\text{LexNov}_n(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}) = |\text{ngrams}_n(\mathcal{P}) \setminus \bigcup_{\mathcal{P}' \in \mathcal{R}} \text{ngrams}_n(\mathcal{P}')| / |\text{ngrams}_n(\mathcal{P})|$. A higher score indicates more distinctive phrasing relative to other methods’ outputs. We report this metric averaged across all problems in \mathcal{S} .

Semantic Novelty. To capture novelty beyond surface level, we compute the minimum cosine distance between a problem embedding and the embeddings of all problems in the reference corpus: $\text{SemNov}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}) = \min_{\mathcal{P}' \in \mathcal{R}} d_{\text{cos}}(\mathbf{e}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbf{e}(\mathcal{P}'))$. This measures how far each problem lies from its nearest semantic neighbor in the reference set. Higher values indicate more semantically novel outputs. We report the average over all problems in \mathcal{S} .

Utility. Utility measures the quality of each generated problem $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{S}$ with respect to the given context \mathcal{C} . We evaluate utility along three binary dimensions: (1) *Validity*: the problem is solvable and the test suite must be correct and complete; (2) *Context Relevance*: the problem is related to the theme specified in \mathcal{C} and requires the given programming concepts to solve; and (3) *Comprehensibility*: the description $\mathcal{P}_{\text{desc}}$ provides sufficient information to solve the problem. The utility of a problem is defined as the product of these three binary indicators: $\text{Utility}(\mathcal{P}) = \mathbf{1}[\text{Validity}] \times \mathbf{1}[\text{Context Relevance}] \times \mathbf{1}[\text{Comprehensibility}]$, which equals 1 only when all three criteria are satisfied, and 0 otherwise. We evaluate utility using an LLM-as-a-judge approach by using a strong LLM to assess context relevance and comprehensibility, and generates a solution program that we execute against $\mathcal{P}_{\text{eval}}$ to verify validity, following prior work [21, 7, 6, 19]. We define the utility of a set \mathcal{S} as the percentage of problems in \mathcal{S} that achieve utility 1: $\text{Utility}(\mathcal{S}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{1}[\text{Utility}(\mathcal{P}) = 1] \times 100$.

2.3 Objective

Our objective is to design a method that, given a context \mathcal{C} , generates a set of problems $\mathcal{S}_K(\mathcal{C})$ that maximizes *diversity* and *novelty* while maintaining high *utility*. This objective is challenging because diversity and novelty often conflict with utility constraints [19].

3 Our Proposed Method: CREATIVEDC

3.1 Motivation

Standard LLM prompting tends to produce homogeneous outputs because models converge on statistically “average” responses that satisfy the given constraints [7]. This behavior contrasts with human creative processes, which naturally alternate between exploration and refinement. Wallas’s classical theory of creativity [11] describes a staged process consisting of preparation, incubation, illumination, and verification, with early stages involve broad exploration before converging on a solution. Similarly, Guilford [12] distinguished between *divergent thinking*, which generates multiple possibilities and explores the problem space, and *convergent thinking*, which evaluates and selects among alternatives to produce a single solution. When prompted directly for creative outputs, LLMs lack explicit scaffolding for divergent exploration; they immediately attempt to satisfy all constraints, leading to outputs that cluster around common patterns. Our approach, CREATIVEDC, addresses this limitation by explicitly structuring the LLM’s reasoning into distinct divergent and convergent phases.

3.2 Two-phase Thinking Process

CREATIVEDC decomposes the problem generation task into two reasoning phases: a divergent thinking phase that explores the creative space freely, followed by a convergent thinking phase that refines selected ideas into valid problems. Figure 1 illustrates this pipeline with an example, and Table 2 shows the prompt template used by our method. The output includes both the reasoning traces (divergent and convergent thinking) and the final problem components ($\mathcal{P}_{\text{desc}}$, $\mathcal{P}_{\text{eval}}$, and \mathcal{P}_{sol}).

Divergent Thinking. In the divergent thinking phase, the LLM explores the thematic space of the given context without the cognitive burden of satisfying programming constraints. Given a context \mathcal{C} containing a theme and programming concepts, the model is instructed to focus *only* on the theme and generate wildly different and underexplored elements, objects, scenarios, or situations. The prompt explicitly encourages unusual, surprising, unconventional, and diverse ideas while temporarily ignoring the required programming concepts. This design choice is motivated by the observation that

premature constraint satisfaction limits creative exploration. By removing these constraints during ideation, the model can traverse a broader semantic space and discover novel directions that would otherwise be pruned early.

Convergent Thinking. In the convergent thinking phase, the LLM selects one idea from the divergent phase and connects it with the required programming concepts to create a valid problem. The model is instructed to verify that the resulting problem satisfies all constraints specified in the context. Importantly, the process is designed to be internally iterative. If the selected idea cannot be successfully connected with the programming concepts, the model is encouraged to go back to select another idea and try again. This iterative refinement ensures that the final output maintains high utility (validity, context relevance, comprehensiveness) while preserving the creative seed discovered during divergent exploration.

3.3 Persona Simulation Augmentation

To further enhance the diversity of generated problems, we augment CREATIVEDC with persona simulation. Prior work has shown that simulating different personas can help LLMs generate more diverse outputs by adopting varied perspectives [9]. In our approach, we prepend a persona simulation instruction to the beginning of the prompt. The persona is uniformly sampled from the Persona Hub dataset [9], which contains diverse synthetic personas with different backgrounds, expertise, and viewpoints. This persona augmentation encourages the model to explore the creative space through the lens of the simulated persona, potentially exploring ideas that the model would not generate under its default behavior. In our experiments in Section 4, we conduct an experiment to evaluate the effect of persona augmentation by applying the same persona simulation to all evaluated methods. The full persona simulation instruction and examples are provided in Table 4 in Appendix A.

4 Evaluation

4.1 Dataset

We evaluate the effectiveness of different methods in generating creative programming problems. We use contexts (themes and concepts) used for generating contextualized programming problems from prior work [6, 22, 23, 24]. To enable evaluation with large values of K , we use 4 themes (“Cooking”, “Science Fiction”, “Superheroes”, “Board Games”) and 5 concepts (“Variables”, “Selection Statements”, “Loops”, “Lists”, “Strings”). By combining each theme with each concept, we obtain 20 unique contexts. For each context, we generate $K = 100$ problems using each method in Section 4.2. Following prior work [6], we use a generation consistency check (whether \mathcal{P}_{sol} passes the test suite $\mathcal{P}_{\text{eval}}$) to discard inconsistent problems and continue generating problems until we obtain $K = 100$ problems.

4.2 Methods and Models Evaluated

Methods. We compare our method CREATIVEDC against two baselines: BASE and CoT [25]. Table 3 shows the prompts used by each method. The BASE method uses the prompt adapted from [6], which was designed to contextualize programming problems. The CoT adds a “Think step by step” instruction to the BASE prompt. Our method adds an instruction to apply a divergent-convergent thinking process at the beginning of the prompt. In our experiments, we also evaluate the effect of adding persona information to the prompt. When persona is included, we prepend an instruction to simulate a particular persona at the beginning of the prompt for all methods. Full prompts of all methods and the persona simulation instruction are provided in the Appendix A.

Models. We use an open-source model, Qwen3-235B-A22B-Instruct-2507 [26], a state-of-the-art mixture-of-experts model as our generation model. We set the temperature to 1.0 and keep all other default parameters. For metrics requiring semantic distance (SemDiv, SemNov, and Vendi score), we use Qwen/Qwen3-Embedding-0.6B [27] as the embedding model. For utility evaluation, we use Gemini 2.5 Flash-Lite [28] as the judge model with greedy decoding (i.e. temperature = 0.0).

Table 1: Diversity, Novelty, and Utility (mean \pm SE across contexts; $K = 100$). In both settings without and with persona simulation, CREATIVEDC significantly outperforms all baselines on all lexical and semantic diversity and novelty metrics (all $p < 0.01$, Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test), while maintaining utility comparable to the baselines ($p > 0.01$). Highest scores are bolded.

Method	Diversity		Novelty		Utility (%)
	LexDiv	SemDiv	LexNov	SemNov	
<i>wo/ Persona</i>					
BASE	0.74 ± 0.01	0.46 ± 0.01	0.62 ± 0.01	0.20 ± 0.01	92.95 ± 0.83
CoT	0.75 ± 0.01	0.46 ± 0.01	0.66 ± 0.02	0.18 ± 0.01	91.35 ± 1.24
CREATIVEDC	0.81 ± 0.00	0.54 ± 0.01	0.73 ± 0.01	0.30 ± 0.01	90.85 ± 0.88
<i>w/ Persona</i>					
BASE	0.81 ± 0.01	0.49 ± 0.01	0.66 ± 0.01	0.22 ± 0.01	91.80 ± 1.14
CoT	0.82 ± 0.01	0.52 ± 0.01	0.67 ± 0.01	0.23 ± 0.01	89.70 ± 1.02
CREATIVEDC	0.84 ± 0.00	0.56 ± 0.01	0.75 ± 0.01	0.31 ± 0.01	89.65 ± 1.12




Figure 2: Semantic Diversity and Semantic Novelty distributions. Kernel density estimates show per-problem scores for each method. In the without persona setting, CREATIVEDC achieves 16.7% higher semantic diversity and 63.5% higher semantic novelty than CoT (all $p < 0.001$, Mann-Whitney U test). With persona simulation, CREATIVEDC maintains substantial advantages (8.5% diversity, 32.9% novelty over CoT). CREATIVEDC also exhibits lower variance, indicating more consistent performance.

4.3 Results

How does CREATIVEDC perform compared to baseline methods? Table 1 shows the diversity, novelty, and utility scores for all methods. We report both the mean and the standard error of the mean, aggregated over all contexts. Without persona simulation, CREATIVEDC significantly outperforms all baselines on all lexical and semantic diversity and novelty metrics (all $p < 0.01$, Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test). Notably, for semantic novelty, CREATIVEDC outperforms BASE by 51.5% and CoT by 63.5%. This demonstrates that CREATIVEDC is effective not only at using more diverse and novel phrases to generate creative problems, but also at exploring a richer semantic space. Importantly, there is no statistically significant reduction in task utility compared to the baselines ($p > 0.01$). When persona simulation is added, all methods improve in diversity and novelty, but there is a slight trade-off in utility. Nevertheless, CREATIVEDC offers significant advantages in diversity and novelty while maintaining utility comparable to the baselines. Figure 2 visualizes the distribution of per-problem scores using kernel density estimation (KDE) with Gaussian kernels, where each method’s distribution is independently normalized. CREATIVEDC not only achieves higher mean scores but also exhibits lower variance, indicating consistently high diversity and novelty across different problem instances.

Does CREATIVEDC generate more effective problems than baselines? We report the Vendi Score [29], which can be interpreted as the effective number of distinct problems in a set. Specifically, given K problem embeddings, we construct a similarity matrix $\mathbf{K} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$, where \mathbf{K}_{ij} is the cosine similarity between $\mathbf{e}(\mathcal{P}_i)$ and $\mathbf{e}(\mathcal{P}_j)$. The Vendi Score is then computed as:




Figure 3: Effective number of distinct problems when varying the number of problems K . For each method, we show the Vendi score [29] computed on all problems (dashed lines) and on problems with utility score of 1 only (solid lines). The shaded bands represent the standard error of the mean Vendi score across different contexts. In the without persona setting, CREATIVE DC outperforms CoT by 24.0% at $K = 10$ and 72.0% at $K = 100$, achieving faster growth in the effective number of distinct problems compared to CoT. With persona simulation, CREATIVE DC maintains its diversity advantage, demonstrating effective diversity at scale.




Figure 4: Performance of CREATIVE DC across contexts. Everyday theme such as “Cooking” achieves highest utility but lowest diversity and novelty, while more creative themes enable higher diversity and novelty. Simpler programming concepts (e.g., Variables) allows generating more novel problems.

$\text{Vendi}(\mathcal{S}) = \exp\left(-\sum_{i=1}^K \lambda_i \log \lambda_i\right)$, where $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K$ are the eigenvalues of \mathbf{K}/K . The Vendi Score ranges from 1 (all items identical) to K (all items maximally dissimilar). We show the Vendi score as a function of K for each method in Figure 3. As the number of problems K increases from 10 to 100, the Vendi score also increases for all methods, indicating that each method generates new and “unique” problems as more are sampled. However, CREATIVE DC consistently achieves substantially higher Vendi scores than all baselines for all values of K . Without persona simulation, CREATIVE DC achieves 24.0% higher Vendi score than CoT at $K = 10$, and this advantage grows to 72.0% at $K = 100$. This widening gap reflects the faster scaling of CREATIVE DC compared to CoT. Adding persona simulation modestly increases the Vendi scores of all methods, but CREATIVE DC continues to outperform the baselines in both settings.

How does CREATIVE DC perform across different contexts? To understand the performance of CREATIVE DC across different contexts, we show the Utility, SemDiv, and SemNov scores of CREATIVE DC in Figure 4. Overall, CREATIVE DC performs well across all contexts, though we observe systematic patterns in how different themes and programming concepts affect performance. We find a trade-off between utility and creativity. The “Cooking” theme achieves the highest utility score but the lowest semantic diversity and novelty, suggesting that familiar themes facilitate high-quality problem

generation but constrain creative exploration. In contrast, more creative themes such as “Science Fiction” and “Superheroes” enable higher diversity and novelty, indicating that inherently creative themes provide more room for exploration. Regarding programming concepts, simpler concepts such as “Variables” and “Selection Statements” achieve higher novelty than more complex concepts such as “Loops” and “Lists”, suggesting that simpler concepts provide more freedom for creative problem generation.

5 Related Work

LLMs for Problem Generation. Recent studies have used LLMs to generate problems across various domains. This includes generating topic-specific educational questions [1, 2], producing questions at different difficulty levels [3, 4, 5], creating mathematically valid problems from equations [2], and improving the overall quality of generated questions [30]. Another line of research has focused on specific domains, such as programming, by using LLMs to generate high-quality programming tasks [6] and developing effective distractors for multiple-choice programming questions [31]. However, most of this work focuses on generating standard questions and problems and often does not consider the creative aspects of problem generation, which is the main focus of our work.

Diversity Collapse and Low Creativity of LLMs. LLMs exhibit an “Artificial Hivemind” effect, characterized by intra-model repetition and inter-model homogeneity [7]. Moreover, Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) alignment amplifies this convergence toward statistically average responses, reducing creativity [20] and producing lower-entropy distributions [32]. Existing work also find that LLMs lack novelty and surprise [10], with seemingly creative outputs largely attributable to recombining human-written web text [20]. One of the reasons for this lack of creativity is “functional fixedness,” a cognitive bias that limits unconventional thinking. This has been demonstrated in creative problem-solving benchmarks where LLMs fail to use familiar objects innovatively [14], suggesting explicit scaffolding is needed to overcome conventional thinking.

Approaches to Enhance LLM Creativity. A number of methods have been proposed to promote creativity in LLM outputs. Simply increasing the decoding temperature may result in more varied responses on the surface, but does not necessarily increase originality and, in some cases, can reduce creativity [8]. Fine-tuning models with creativity-oriented preference signals is promising but requires costly and large-scale human preference datasets [10]. Multi-LLM discussion frameworks attempt to boost creativity by organizing dialogue and debate among multiple models, but these setups come with considerable computational costs [8]. Persona simulation can guide the model to generate more diverse outputs by simulating different viewpoints [9], but this technique does not fundamentally change the core reasoning process of the model. Unlike these approaches, our method directly scaffolds the LLM’s reasoning process through a two-phase prompting strategy at inference time.

6 Concluding Discussion

We introduced CREATIVEDC, a two-phase prompting method that scaffolds divergent-convergent thinking for creative problem generation. By explicitly decoupling exploration from constraint satisfaction, our method enables LLMs to traverse a broader semantic space before committing to a specific answer, addressing the limitation of premature constraint satisfaction that causes homogeneity in generative AI outputs. Our evaluation demonstrates that CREATIVEDC achieves substantial improvements in diversity and novelty while maintaining high utility. The results validate the effectiveness of applying established theories of human creativity and divergent-convergent thinking framework to guide LLM reasoning for improving creativity at inference time.

We discuss limitations of our work and suggest directions for future research. First, we evaluated CREATIVEDC on a single state-of-the-art LLM (Qwen3-235B); future work should validate the approach across different model architectures and sizes to understand its generalizability. Second, while we used automated metrics for utility, diversity, and novelty, a human study would provide valuable insights into the perceived creativity and practical utility of generated problems. Finally, our evaluation focused on programming problem generation; extending CREATIVEDC to other creative domains (e.g., story writing, poetry, design) would demonstrate its broader applicability.

References

- [1] Ziqing Li, Mutlu Cukurova, and Sahan Bulathwela. A Novel Approach to Scalable and Automatic Topic-Controlled Question Generation in Education. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference, LAK 2025, Dublin, Ireland, March 3-7, 2025*, 2025.
- [2] Zichao Wang, Andrew S. Lan, and Richard G. Baraniuk. Math Word Problem Generation with Mathematical Consistency and Problem Context Constraints. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2021, Virtual Event / Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 7-11 November, 2021*, 2021.
- [3] Ying Jiao, Kumar Shridhar, Peng Cui, Wangchunshu Zhou, and Mrinmaya Sachan. Automatic Educational Question Generation with Difficulty Level Controls. In *Artificial Intelligence in Education - 24th International Conference, AIED 2023, Tokyo, Japan, July 3-7, 2023, Proceedings*, 2023.
- [4] Yongan Yu, Alexandre Krantz, and Nikki G. Lobczowski. From Recall to Reasoning: Automated Question Generation for Deeper Math Learning Through Large Language Models. In *Artificial Intelligence in Education - 26th International Conference, AIED 2025, Palermo, Italy, July 22-26, 2025, Proceedings, Part V*, 2025.
- [5] Sabina Elkins, Ekaterina Kochmar, Jackie C. K. Cheung, and Iulian Serban. How Teachers Can Use Large Language Models and Bloom's Taxonomy to Create Educational Quizzes. In *Thirty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2024, Thirty-Sixth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2024, Fourteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2024, February 20-27, 2024, Vancouver, Canada*, 2024.
- [6] Manh Hung Nguyen, Victor-Alexandru Padurean, Alkis Gotovos, Sebastian Tschiatschek, and Adish Singla. Synthesizing high-quality programming tasks with llm-based expert and student agents. In *Artificial Intelligence in Education - 26th International Conference, AIED 2025, Palermo, Italy, July 22-26, 2025, Proceedings, Part I*, 2025.
- [7] Liwei Jiang, Yuanjun Chai, Margaret Li, Mickel Liu, Raymond Fok, Nouha Dziri, Yulia Tsvetkov, Maarten Sap, Alon Albalak, and Yejin Choi. Artificial Hivemind: The Open-Ended Homogeneity of Language Models (and Beyond). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2025.
- [8] Li-Chun Lu, Shou-Jen Chen, Tsung-Min Pai, Chan-Hung Yu, Hung-Yi Lee, and Shao-Hua Sun. Llm discussion: Enhancing the creativity of large language models via discussion framework and role-play. In *Conference on Language Modeling*, 2024.
- [9] Xin Chan, Xiaoyang Wang, Dian Yu, Haitao Mi, and Dong Yu. Scaling synthetic data creation with 1,000,000,000 personas. *CoRR*, abs/2406.20094, 2024.
- [10] Mete Ismayilzada, Antonio Laverghetta Jr., Simone A. Luchini, Reet Patel, Antoine Bosselut, Lonneke Van Der Plas, and Roger E. Beaty. Creative Preference Optimization. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2025*, 2025.
- [11] Graham Wallas. *The Art of Thought*. 1926.
- [12] Joy Paul Guilford. The Structure of Intellect. *Psychological Bulletin*, 53, 1956.
- [13] Tanmay Parekh, Kartik Mehta, Ninareh Mehrabi, Kai-Wei Chang, and Nanyun Peng. Di-CoRe: Enhancing Zero-shot Event Detection via Divergent-Convergent LLM Reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2025.
- [14] Yufei Tian, Abhilasha Ravichander, Lianhui Qin, Ronan Le Bras, Raja Marjeh, Nanyun Peng, Yejin Choi, Thomas L. Griffiths, and Faeze Brahman. MacGyver: Are Large Language Models Creative Problem Solvers? In Kevin Duh, Helena Gómez-Adorno, and Steven Bethard, editors, *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, NAACL 2024, Mexico City, Mexico, June 16-21, 2024, 2024.

- [15] Chao Wen, Tung Phung, Pronita Mehrotra, Sumit Gulwani, Tomohiro Nagashima, and Adish Singla. Exploration vs. Fixation: Scaffolding Divergent and Convergent Thinking for Human-AI Co-Creation with Generative Models. *CoRR*, abs/2512.18388, 2025.
- [16] Mark A. Runco and Garrett J. Jaeger. The standard definition of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 24, 2012.
- [17] Margaret A. Boden. *The Creative Mind - Myths and Mechanisms* (2. ed.). 2003.
- [18] Alexander Shypula, Shuo Li, Botong Zhang, Vishakh Padmakumar, Kayo Yin, and Osbert Bastani. Evaluating the Diversity and Quality of LLM Generated Content. In *Conference on Language Modeling (COLM)*, 2025.
- [19] Vishakh Padmakumar, Chen Yueh-Han, Jane Pan, Valerie Chen, and He He. Measuring LLM Novelty As The Frontier Of Original And High-Quality Output. *CoRR*, abs/2504.09389, 2025.
- [20] Ximing Lu, Melanie Sclar, Skyler Hallinan, Niloofar Mireshghallah, Jiacheng Liu, Seungju Han, Allyson Ettinger, Liwei Jiang, Khyathi Raghavi Chandu, Nouha Dziri, and Yejin Choi. AI as Humanity’s Salieri: Quantifying Linguistic Creativity of Language Models via Systematic Attribution of Machine Text against Web Text. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2025, Singapore, April 24-28, 2025*, 2025.
- [21] Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric P. Xing, Hao Zhang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Judging LLM-as-a-Judge with MT-Bench and Chatbot Arena. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*, 2023.
- [22] Andre Del Carpio Gutierrez, Paul Denny, and Andrew Luxton-Reilly. Evaluating Automatically Generated Contextualised Programming Exercises. In *Proceedings of the Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education (SIGCSE)*, 2024.
- [23] Evanfiya Logacheva, Arto Hellas, James Prather, Sami Sarsa, and Juho Leinonen. Evaluating Contextually Personalized Programming Exercises Created with Generative AI. In *Proceedings of the Conference on International Computing Education Research (ICER)*, 2024.
- [24] Sami Sarsa, Paul Denny, Arto Hellas, and Juho Leinonen. Automatic Generation of Programming Exercises and Code Explanations Using Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the Conference on International Computing Education Research (ICER)*, 2022.
- [25] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V. Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- [26] An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengan Huang, Chenxu Lv, Chujie Zheng, Dayiheng Liu, Fan Zhou, Fei Huang, Feng Hu, Hao Ge, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jian Yang, Jiaxi Yang, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keqin Bao, Kexin Yang, Le Yu, Lianghao Deng, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Mingze Li, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Qin Zhu, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Shixuan Liu, Shuang Luo, Tianhao Li, Tianyi Tang, Wenbiao Yin, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Wang, Xinyu Zhang, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Su, Yichang Zhang, Yinger Zhang, Yu Wan, Yuqiong Liu, Zekun Wang, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, Zhipeng Zhou, and Zihan Qiu. Qwen3 Technical Report. *CoRR*, abs/2505.09388, 2025.
- [27] Yanzhao Zhang, Mingxin Li, Dingkun Long, Xin Zhang, Huan Lin, Baosong Yang, Pengjun Xie, An Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Junyang Lin, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen3 Embedding: Advancing Text Embedding and Reranking Through Foundation Models. *CoRR*, abs/2506.05176, 2025.
- [28] Gemini Team. Gemini 2.5: Pushing the Frontier with Advanced Reasoning, Multimodality, Long Context, and Next Generation Agentic Capabilities. *CoRR*, abs/2507.06261, 2025.

- [29] Dan Friedman and Adji Bousso Dieng. The Vendi Score: A Diversity Evaluation Metric for Machine Learning. *Trans. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 2023.
- [30] Sahan Bulathwela, Hamze Muse, and Emine Yilmaz. Scalable Educational Question Generation with Pre-trained Language Models. In *Artificial Intelligence in Education - 24th International Conference, AIED 2023, Tokyo, Japan, July 3-7, 2023, Proceedings*, 2023.
- [31] Mohammad Hassany, Peter Brusilovsky, Jaromír Savelka, Arun Balajee Lekshmi Narayanan, Kamil Akhuseyinoglu, Arav Agarwal, and Rully Agus Hendrawan. Generating Effective Distractors for Introductory Programming Challenges: LLMs vs Humans. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Learning Analytics and Knowledge Conference, LAK 2025, Dublin, Ireland, March 3-7, 2025*, 2025.
- [32] Yiming Zhang, Harshita Diddee, Susan Holm, Hanchen Liu, Xinyue Liu, Vinay Samuel, Barry Wang, and Daphne Ippolito. Noveltybench: Evaluating language models for humanlike diversity. In *Conference on Language Modeling*, 2025.

A Full Prompts

Table 2: CREATIVEDC method prompt. {placeholder} is replaced with the actual theme and concept for each context.

Method	Prompt
CREATIVEDC	<p><i>Apply the following thinking process to generate a problem.</i></p> <p><i>Divergent thinking phase: Think about only the given theme and list down wildly different and underexplored elements, objects, scenarios, or situations that are relevant. Ignore the required programming concepts in this phase. Push for unusual, surprising, unconventional, and diverse ideas. Explore the creative space related to the theme as much as possible.</i></p> <p><i>Convergent thinking phase: From your brainstormed ideas, select one and connect it with the required programming concepts to create a creative programming problem. Make sure the problem does not require any other programming concepts other than the given programming concepts. If it does not work, feel free to go back to select another idea and try again.</i></p> <p># Task Instruction</p> <p>Given a theme of {theme}, create a Python programming problem that requires only {concept} to solve. The problem should include a problem description, a test suite, and a solution program. Below are the requirements for the problem:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The problem must be clearly relevant to the given theme of {theme} and the theme is explicitly used throughout. It requires only {concept} to solve the problem. - The problem description must be sensible and sound natural. It must provide comprehensive information required to solve the problem and pass the test suite (e.g., how the program will be tested, function signatures). Do not use type hints. Do not mention the required programming concepts in the problem description. - The test suite must consist of at least 5 comprehensive test cases written in the Pytest framework format. The testsuite must be correct and covers both base and corner cases. If the test suite involves handling files and I/O, the related files should be created using ‘setup_module()’ and removed using ‘teardown_module()’ functions in the Pytest framework. Everything from the solution program will be imported manually; do not import anything else except ‘pytest’ and ‘os’. Do not use multiple assert statements in a single test case. - The solution program must use only {concept}. Do not include any comments, usage examples, or tests in the solution program. The solution program must pass the test suite. <p># Output Format</p> <p>Output a JSON object with the following keys: ‘divergent_thinking’, ‘convergent_thinking’, ‘description’, ‘test_suite’, and ‘solution’.</p>

Table 3: Baseline method prompts. {placeholder} is replaced with the actual theme and concept for each context.

Method	Prompt
BASE	<p># Task Instruction</p> <p>Given a theme of {theme}, create a Python programming problem that requires only {concept} to solve. The problem should include a problem description, a test suite, and a solution program. Below are the requirements for the problem:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The problem must be clearly relevant to the given theme of {theme} and the theme is explicitly used throughout. It requires only {concept} to solve the problem. - The problem description must be sensible and sound natural. It must provide comprehensive information required to solve the problem and pass the test suite (e.g., how the program will be tested, function signatures). Do not use type hints. Do not mention the required programming concepts in the problem description. - The test suite must consist of at least 5 comprehensive test cases written in the Pytest framework format. The testsuite must be correct and covers both base and corner cases. If the test suite involves handling files and I/O, the related files should be created using ‘setup_module()’ and removed using ‘teardown_module()’ functions in the Pytest framework. Everything from the solution program will be imported manually; do not import anything else except ‘pytest’ and ‘os’. Do not use multiple assert statements in a single test case. - The solution program must use only {concept}. Do not include any comments, usage examples, or tests in the solution program. The solution program must pass the test suite. <p># Output Format</p> <p>Output a JSON object with the following keys: ‘description’, ‘test_suite’, and ‘solution’.</p>
CoT	<p><i>Think step by step to generate a problem.</i></p> <p># Task Instruction</p> <p>Given a theme of {theme}, create a Python programming problem that requires only {concept} to solve. The problem should include a problem description, a test suite, and a solution program. Below are the requirements for the problem:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The problem must be clearly relevant to the given theme of {theme} and the theme is explicitly used throughout. It requires only {concept} to solve the problem. - The problem description must be sensible and sound natural. It must provide comprehensive information required to solve the problem and pass the test suite (e.g., how the program will be tested, function signatures). Do not use type hints. Do not mention the required programming concepts in the problem description. - The test suite must consist of at least 5 comprehensive test cases written in the Pytest framework format. The testsuite must be correct and covers both base and corner cases. If the test suite involves handling files and I/O, the related files should be created using ‘setup_module()’ and removed using ‘teardown_module()’ functions in the Pytest framework. Everything from the solution program will be imported manually; do not import anything else except ‘pytest’ and ‘os’. Do not use multiple assert statements in a single test case. - The solution program must use only {concept}. Do not include any comments, usage examples, or tests in the solution program. The solution program must pass the test suite. <p># Output Format</p> <p>Output a JSON object with the following keys: ‘chain_of_thought’, ‘description’, ‘test_suite’, and ‘solution’.</p>

Table 4: Persona simulation instruction and examples. {persona} is replaced with a persona description uniformly sampled from the Persona Hub dataset [9].

Instruction Template: Play the role of {persona}. Use the persona’s personality, perspective, and language.

Example of persona: A scientist who is interested in the field of aging research and the potential benefits of injecting young blood into the elderly to improve health and delay aging. They are also interested in the study of human genetics and the identification of natural gene-disrupting mutations.

Divergent thinking output by the simulated persona: Superheroes often represent ideals, but what if their powers are unstable? I’m thinking about the idea of ‘power decay’—what if superheroes gradually lose their abilities over time, like biological aging? Could we track that? Or what if their powers are inherited through rare genetic mutations—like natural gene disruptions that confer flight or regeneration? What if we could identify these mutations by studying populations? Or perhaps there’s a ‘gene registry’ of superheroes based on mutation profiles. Another idea: maybe young superheroes have more potent abilities, and injecting plasma from them could rejuvenate older heroes’ powers—like parabiosis in aging research. Or consider a world where hero status is assigned not by deeds, but by genetic screening at birth. Maybe there’s a hidden list of ‘silent mutants’—people with disrupted genes that haven’t activated yet. Or what if superhero teams maintain a list of power thresholds, and when a member falls below it, they’re retired? What if exposure to cosmic rays causes random gene disruptions, and we need to track who developed powers after a meteor shower? Or a database of sidekicks whose powers are unstable due to incomplete gene expression? Or a list of heroes who’ve lost their powers after turning 30—like a ‘genetic expiration date’. Or maybe some heroes can only activate powers in specific environmental conditions, and we need to map those. Or consider inherited resistance to certain villains—like a family immune to mind control due to a disrupted receptor gene. Or a longitudinal study tracking mutation stability across generations of superhero families. What if a lab maintains a list of CRISPR-edited infants who were supposed to get powers but didn’t—‘failed activations’? Or a blacklist of people falsely identified as mutants due to sequencing errors? So many angles—gene expression over time, inheritance patterns, environmental triggers, false positives, power thresholds, intergenerational studies, mutation registries, rejuvenation attempts.

Convergent thinking output by the simulated persona: From the idea of tracking superhero power levels over time and identifying when they fall below a functional threshold—like aging or decay—I can build a programming problem. The core idea is: a superhero team maintains a list of current members’ power levels. Due to aging or unknown factors, power levels decline. The team has a minimum threshold for active duty. The task is to identify which heroes have fallen below the threshold and must be retired. This fits perfectly with Lists—input is a list of power levels, output is a list of indices (positions) where the power level is too low. It’s simple, uses only Lists, ties into aging research metaphorically, and connects to genetic stability—mutations that once conferred powers may degrade or silence over time. The problem is natural, relevant to superheroes, and requires only list traversal and comparison—achievable with basic list operations.

Problem description generated by the simulated persona: In a world where superheroes rely on genetically encoded abilities, their power levels can diminish over time due to natural aging or unstable gene expression. The Global Hero Registry maintains a list of current active heroes’ power levels, measured on a standardized scale. A hero must maintain a power level of at least 50 to remain on active duty. You are tasked with writing a function called ‘identify_retirees’ that takes a list of integers representing the power levels of heroes in the order they were registered. The function should return a list of indices (positions in the original list) where the hero’s power level is below 50. These heroes must be recommended for retirement. The function should return the indices in ascending order. Assume the list of power levels is non-empty and contains only integers.
