

Serendipity by Design: Evaluating the Impact of Cross-domain Mappings on Human and LLM Creativity

Qiawen Ella Liu¹, Marina Dubova^{2*}, Henry Conklin^{1*}, Takumi Harada^{1,3}, & Thomas L. Griffiths¹

¹Princeton University

²Santa Fe Institute

³Toyota Motor North America, Inc., Plano, Texas

*Equal contribution

Abstract

Are large language models (LLMs) creative in the same way humans are, and can the same interventions increase creativity in both? We evaluate a promising but largely untested intervention for creativity: forcing creators to draw an analogy from a random, remote source domain (“cross-domain mapping”). Human participants and LLMs generated novel features for ten daily products (e.g., backpack, TV) under two prompts: (i) cross-domain mapping, which required translating a property from a randomly assigned source (e.g., octopus, cactus, GPS), and (ii) user-need, which required proposing innovations targeting unmet user needs. We show that humans reliably benefit from randomly assigned cross-domain mappings, while LLMs, on average, generate more original ideas than humans and do not show a statistically significant effect of cross-domain mappings. However, in both systems, the impact of cross-domain mapping increases when the inspiration source becomes more semantically distant from the target. Our results highlight both the role of remote association in creative ideation and systematic differences in how humans and LLMs respond to the same intervention for creativity.

Keywords: Creativity; Analogy; Cross-domain mapping; Large Language Model

Introduction

Coming back from a hike in 1941, Swiss engineer George de Mestral noticed burrs stuck stubbornly to his dog’s fur. Upon close examination of these burrs with a microscope, he found numerous tiny hooks catching on loops – a structure that inspired his invention of Velcro, the fastener now securing everything from toddlers’ shoes to spacesuits (Stephens, 2007). Similar cross-domain transfers appear throughout the history of invention: Early aircraft were inspired by the structure of bird wings (Lilienthal, 1889), and neonatal incubators was inspired by the temperature-regulation techniques from poultry brooders (Budin, 1907). In each case, invention comes not from nothing but from mapping existing concepts across domains.

Drawing inspiration from remote domains may appear more like a game of chance than a systematic method for inducing creativity, depending on the serendipitous combination of a specific hike with a specific dog at a specific place. In the general case, what makes a cross-domain mapping successful and can it be engineered as a reliable intervention for creativity? The answer may depend critically on who we want to be creative. Humans are notoriously prone to fixation: once a problem is framed in a familiar way, people tend to reuse

known solutions within a single domain rather than scanning for distant alternatives across domains (Basalla, 1988; German & Barrett, 2005; Jansson & Smith, 1991). Even when people try to overcome fixation by actively considering alternative domains, they can still be constrained by knowledge fragmentation (Simon, 1955), characterized by the classic ‘unknown unknown’ problem (Firestein, 2012). Large language models (LLMs), by contrast, are trained on massive, cross-disciplinary corpora that might allow them to generate remote associations without the same cognitive bottlenecks. While a central theme of human creativity research is developing scalable methods that help innovators overcome both fixation and unknown unknowns, it remains an open question whether interventions designed for humans will prove effective for systems with fundamentally different capacity for storing, retrieving, and recombining knowledge.

Here, we test cross-domain mapping as a practical intervention for idea generation by both humans and LLMs. We prompt humans and LLMs to generate novel product ideas either by explicitly drawing inspiration from a distant source domain or by proposing incremental improvements based on existing user needs. Human raters then assess the ideas along four dimensions: originality (our focal dimension), feasibility, usefulness, and overall investment worthiness. We ask whether cross-domain mapping reliably boosts originality of ideas, whether its effects differ between humans and LLMs, and what kinds of cross-domain mappings are generative in both systems.

We show that cross-domain mapping significantly boosts the originality of ideas for humans and not LLMs, but LLMs produce more original ideas than humans on average. We also show that a random cross-domain mapping is not guaranteed to inspire creative ideas; rather, ideas are seen as more original when the inspiration is drawn from a more distant domain. Overall, our results suggests that mechanisms that enhance human creativity may play a different (in our case, diminished) role in systems whose cognitive architectures differ radically from our own.

Background

Creativity as the ability to bridge remote associations

Creativity researchers have long recognized that creative ideas often arise by linking concepts that are *weakly associated*, traversing longer distances in semantic space or recombining elements drawn from distinct semantic domains (Kenett,

2018; Koestler, 1964; Mednick, 1962; Youn et al., 2015). In these associative accounts of creativity, generating novel ideas depends on how semantic memory is organized. Semantic retrieval is not uniform, but organized into *associative hierarchies*, such that individuals with steep hierarchies prioritize dominant, conventional associates, whereas those with flatter hierarchies more readily connect distant associates (Mednick, 1962). Consistent with this view, highly creative individuals tend to navigate semantic space more expansively, retrieving more distant associates (Beaty et al., 2021; Gray et al., 2019; Kenett et al., 2014), shifting flexibly across semantic subcategories (Zhang et al., 2023), and producing larger associative leaps both with and without explicit goals (see Beaty and Kenett, 2023, for a review).

Despite broad agreement that creativity benefits from bridging remote associations, interventions that systematically induce such connections remain relatively rare (Linsey et al., 2010; Zhan et al., 2023). While some interventions are effective at inducing creative ideas in certain contexts (e.g., Zhan et al., 2023), these usually focus on a few targets and inspirations, offering little coverage of the vast combinatorial space of potential mappings. We use cross-domain mapping as a systematic intervention to “flatten” the associative hierarchy, forcing creators to leap beyond a target domain’s well-trodden semantic neighborhood. Since the space of potentially useful inspirations is vast, we create a broad set of cross-domain mappings by randomly selecting pairs of source domains. In doing so we hope to intentionally recreate the kind of serendipity that has been shown to be so important in the history of discovery (James, 1880; Souriau, 1881).

Analogy as the mechanism for transferring relational structure across domains Structure-Mapping Theory (Gentner, 1983) formalises the cognitive mechanism underlying cross-domain inspiration. An analogy can support systematic inference, by aligning relational structure between a source and a target – importing a coherent system of relations that makes previously overlooked aspects of the target problem visible (Gentner, 1983; Holyoak & Thagard, 1995). In particular, aligning with and projecting from the source structure can highlight implicit limitations in the target (constraints) as well as suggest new possibilities for intervention (affordances). For example, by mapping the *circulatory system* onto *urban traffic flow*, a planner might notice the need for one-way “valves” to prevent backflow, or see an opportunity to build lots of small neighborhood routes that deliver traffic deep into side streets, the way capillaries carry blood into tissue. In the current study, we design our cross-domain mapping approach to explicitly instantiate such an analogical structure-mapping process in humans and LLMs (see below, Eliciting Novel Ideas from Humans and LLMs).

LLMs as creative systems that can generate cross-domain associations at scale Across creative writing, design, and hypothesis generation tasks, LLMs reliably produce large numbers of novel ideas and often emulate or outperform human participants (Bellemare-Pepin et al., 2026; Cropley, 2023;

Koivisto & Grassini, 2023; Si et al., 2024). While the most creative humans still outperform current models in the diversity of the ideas they produce (Koivisto & Grassini, 2023; Meincke et al., 2025; Wenger & Kenett, 2025), evidence nevertheless suggests contemporary LLMs have substantial creative capacity.

Trained on massive, cross-disciplinary corpora, LLMs can detect structural parallels across seemingly unrelated fields and generate cross-domain mappings at scale – something that may drive their creative ability. Recent evidence shows that LLMs can perform analogical reasoning that rivals human performance (Ding et al., 2023; Webb et al., 2023) and flexibly recombine knowledge to generate novel solutions (Gu et al., 2024; Mehrotra et al., 2024), perhaps reflecting the fact that they are less affected by the cognitive bottlenecks that often constrain human analogical reasoning (e.g., limited knowledge access, steep associative hierarchies, and fixation). It is thus natural to ask whether cross-domain mapping might benefit humans and LLMs to the same degree.

Eliciting Novel Ideas from Humans and LLMs

Human idea generation

Participants. We recruited online English-speaking adults from Prolific, retaining a final sample of $N = 140$ participants after screening¹ (56 male, 83 female, 1 non-binary). Participants’ mean age was 43.24 years ($SD = 13$, range = 21-77).

Target Products. We selected ten everyday consumer products spanning diverse categories: *smartphone*, *TV* (electronics), *sofa*, *desk* (furniture), *car* (vehicle), *refrigerator* (appliances), *backpack* (accessories), *yoga mat* (sports equipment), *chef’s knife* (kitchen tools), and *sneakers* (clothing).

Inspiration Sources. We also selected 26 inspiration sources across various domains: animals (octopus, chameleon), plants (bamboo, cactus), natural systems (coral reef, beehive), technological systems (hydroelectric dam, GPS navigation), physical phenomena (water cycle, tornado formation), abstract concepts (storytelling), social/organizational systems (symphony orchestra, hospital, government), and food (pickle, sandwich). Specifically, the ten target products could also serve as inspiration sources, provided they were not paired with themselves.

Design and Procedure. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two conditions and completed 10 design challenges, generating one novel feature for each product. In the *Cross-Domain Mapping* condition, each target product (e.g., *toothbrush*) was paired with a randomly sampled inspiration source (e.g., *mattress*). Participants first described a property of the source (e.g., *toothbrush bristles reach tiny spaces*) and then proposed a product feature that translated that property to the target (*a mattress layer of ultrafine bristles that gently brushes away dead skin while you sleep*). Each of the 100

¹We manually reviewed all responses for AI-like phrasing and atypical response consistency, and cross-referencing with AI-detection software.

target–source pairs was completed by 7 participants, yielding 700 human-generated cross-domain ideas. In the *User-Need* condition, participants saw the same target products (e.g., mattress) without a source; instead, they identified an unmet user need (e.g., *partners disturb each other by moving during sleep*) and proposed an innovative solution (e.g., *separate mattress zones that absorb motion and automatically adjust firmness*). Each product was received by 70 participants, yielding 700 human-generated user-need ideas).

LLM idea generation

We generated product ideas using seven LLMs (o3, gpt-4o, claude-sonnet-4, deepseek-v3, llama-3.3-70b, Qwen2.5-72B, gemini-2.5-pro) under conditions that mirrored the human tasks. In the *Cross-Domain Mapping* condition, each model was prompted with the same 100 target–source combinations used in the human study and instructed to generate a single novel feature by translating a specific property of the source domain to the target product (temperature = 1 where applicable). This procedure yielded 700 LLM-generated cross-domain ideas. In the *User-Need* condition, each of the seven models was prompted to identify unmet user needs and propose a corresponding design feature for each of the ten target products. The prompt was repeated for 10 independent generations per target (10 targets \times 10 iterations), yielding 700 LLM-generated user-need ideas.

Rephrasing and Format Normalization To control for superficial differences in style, framing, and length between ideas generated by humans and LLMs, we normalize each idea by asking the same LLM (o3) to rephrase the original content into a short (1–2 sentence), reader-friendly product description. Rephrased outputs omit both the cross-domain analogy framing and explicit user-need framing, focusing only on what the product is and does.²

Evaluating Ideas

Participants. We recruited $N = 1002$ online English-speaking adults from Prolific (459 male, 528 female, 11 non-binary, 4 preferred not to say). Participants’ mean age was 41.9 years ($SD = 12.9$, range = 20–80). This study was preregistered at Open Science Framework (link).

Material. We split all rephrased human- and LLM-generated ideas ($n = 2800$) into 100 lists, each containing approximately 30 ideas sampled evenly across generation source (human vs. LLM), condition (cross-domain vs. user-need), and target product. Each idea was rated by approximately 10 independent participants. Each list also included four catch trials to

²For example, the idea “A cactus has spines that collect moisture from the air and tissue that stores water. Like a cactus, this backpack uses micro-spines to condense moisture as you walk and channels it into an internal reservoir, providing water and cooling during long trips.” is rephrased as “This backpack collects moisture from the air as you move and channels it into an internal reservoir. The collected water can be used for hydration and provides gentle cooling during extended use.”

assess attention and understanding of the rating scales. 108 (about 10%) participants who failed more than 50% of these checks were excluded.

Procedure. Participants were instructed to imagine themselves as judges evaluating startup pitches on a show like *Shark Tank*. They rate each idea on four dimensions using 5-point Likert scales with clearly labeled endpoints, with the order of these ratings randomized between participants: *Originality*: the extent to which the idea was novel or unexpected. *Feasibility*: the degree to which the idea could plausibly be implemented with current technology. *Usefulness*: the extent to which the idea would provide meaningful real-world benefits to users. *Investment Worthiness*: an overall judgment of whether the idea was strong enough to merit investment. Participants were instructed to rely on their intuitive judgments and to evaluate each idea independently. Ideas were presented in randomized order within each list.

Results

Originality, Feasibility, Usefulness, and Investment Worthiness Across ideas, originality shows a strong trade-off with feasibility ($r = -0.74$, $p < .001$, as shown in Figure 1), but weakly and negatively correlated with usefulness ($r = -0.08$, $p < .001$). More original ideas are only modestly more likely to be judged as worth investing in ($r = 0.23$, $p < .001$). In contrast, investment worthiness is driven primarily by perceived usefulness ($r = 0.71$, $p < .001$), far more than by originality or feasibility ($r = .11$, $p < .001$). The same qualitative relationships hold when considering human-generated ideas or LLM-generated ideas alone.

Meaningful differences in originality between humans and LLMs, and among LLMs We assessed originality using a linear mixed-effects model predicting originality ratings from each source of ideas, with random intercepts for participants (since each participant rated multiple ideas) and ideas (since each idea was rated by multiple participants). Across both conditions, LLMs generated ideas were rated as more original than human generations (see Figure 2). Although cross-domain prompting increased originality for humans relative to the user-need condition (see below), human ideas in the cross-domain mapping condition were still rated as less original than LLM-generated ideas overall ($M = 2.93$, 95% CI [2.87, 2.99]). Most LLMs were rated as statistically significantly more original than humans after correction for multiple comparisons (Holm-adjusted $p < .01$), with the exception of Llama-3.3-70b, which did not reliably outperform humans ($M = 3.02$, 95% CI = [2.87, 3.17]). Among LLMs, originality ratings varied reliably: o3 and Claude-Sonnet-4 achieved the highest ratings ($M = 3.83$, 95% CI = [3.68, 3.98] and $M = 3.76$, 95% CI = [3.61, 3.91], respectively), significantly exceeding humans and other LLMs (all Holm-adjusted $p < .001$), though they did not differ reliably from each other.




Figure 1: Cross-domain mapping increases originality for humans but yields weaker benefits for LLMs. Ideas (points) are presented along originality (vertical axis) and feasibility (horizontal axis), with density contours showing distributions for human (green) and LLM (orange) outputs. Cross-domain prompting (left) produces more highly original human ideas relative to the user-need prompt (right).

A similar pattern held in the user-need condition. Human ideas again showed the lowest originality ratings ($M = 2.57$, 95% CI [2.50, 2.63]), and all LLMs were rated as more original than humans (all Holm-adjusted $p < .001$). However, unlike in the cross-domain mapping condition, differences among LLMs were smaller. Descriptively, o3 and Claude Sonnet 4 continued to receive the highest originality ratings; however, its advantage was statistically significant only relative to Llama-3.3-70b and Qwen2.5-72B (all Holm-adjusted $p < .001$), and not relative to gpt-4o, gemini-2.5-pro, or deepseek-v3 after correction.

Cross-domain mappings increase originality for humans, but not for LLMs We examined whether cross-domain prompting increases originality by fitting a linear mixed-effects model predicting originality ratings from idea source (human vs. LLM), condition (cross-domain mapping vs. user need), and their interaction, with random intercepts for participants and ideas. Aggregating across ideas, cross-domain mapping led to significantly higher originality ratings overall ($b = 0.36$, $SE = 0.04$, $t = 9.05$, $p < .001$). However, the augmentation effect of cross-domain mapping was primarily driven by human responses, as we also found a significant interaction between condition and idea source ($b = 0.48$, $SE = 0.06$, $t = 8.42$, $p < .001$). Specifically, for humans, cross-domain prompts reliably increased originality relative

to the user-need condition, whereas LLM originality showed little evidence of a comparable benefit (see also Figure 1).

The augmentation effect of cross-domain mappings for humans is even more pronounced in the upper tail of the originality distribution. When we focus on the top 10% original ideas of each idea pool (human/LLMs) ($n = 96$), human ideas are even slightly *more original* than LLM ideas ($b = -0.07$, $SE = 0.03$, $t = -2.19$, $p = .031$). For example, when asked to map *tornado formation* onto a novel feature of smartphones, one human envisioned a phone that generates airflow strong enough to blow a person away (Figure 1, upper left corner); another imagined a smartphone which “contains powerful internal fans that, when you press a button after misplacing it, spin to create a cyclone that guides the phone back to you.” Inspired by *GPS navigation*, someone proposed a shoe that “shows your GPS route in bright colors, uses a light-up arrow on the top to point the way, and displays street names, road signs, and lights around the shoe.” These human ideas were rated as the most original across all ideas (4.88-4.89 out of 5).

What combinations tend to yield more original ideas? Not all target–inspiration combinations are equally effective at producing original ideas. Some pairings consistently yielded higher originality ratings across both humans and LLMs (see




Figure 2: Originality ratings by model and condition. Distributions show originality ratings for ideas generated by different models under each prompting conditions. Diamonds indicate estimated marginal means, with error bars showing 95% confidence intervals. Box plots show medians and quartiles, with individual data points overlaid.

Figure 3 (c) and (d)). For instance, combining *octopus* with *car* produced original ideas from both sources (e.g., human: “This car moves on eight tentacle-like appendages instead of wheels, letting it drive, climb, sink, and float”; o3: “like octopus, this car deploys a flexible skin embedded with micro-vacuum pads that [...] create temporary adhesion, allowing self-parking on steep walls”). In contrast, pairing *sneaker* with *sofa* resulted in mundane ideas that merely transplanted cushioning features (e.g., human: “This sneaker has extremely cushioned, plush soles designed specifically for comfort”; Qwen2.5-72B: “this sneaker uses a multi-layered cushioning system ...”). The correlation between average originality ratings for the same combinations produced by humans versus LLMs was significantly positive ($r = 0.44, p < .001$, see also Figure 3 (a)), suggesting that certain combinations are inherently more conducive to original thinking.

To understand more systematically what kind of target–inspiration combinations tend to yield more original ideas, we quantified the semantic distance between each pair using general knowledge associated with the corresponding concepts in Wikipedia. For each concept, we retrieved up to 50 sentences from its Wikipedia page X and embedded these sentences using a pretrained sentence-transformer model θ (all-mpnet-base-v2). We use the dimensionality reduction technique from Conklin (2025), which takes the embeddings $Z = \theta(X)$ and computes a soft quantization \hat{Z} for each token by computing the cosine similarity between each embedding and n uniformly distributed points on the surface of the unit sphere S and normalising. The result is a categorical distribution \hat{Z} over the discrete points in S that describes the model’s representation space:

$$P(\hat{Z}) \propto \sum_{1 \times n} \text{softmax} \left(\frac{Z}{|Z|} \cdot \frac{S}{|S|} \right) \quad (1)$$

By conditioning these estimates $P(\hat{Z}|X = x)$, we get a distribution for each concept x describing how it is represented in the model’s embedding space. Semantic distance between a target i and its inspiration j was computed as the Jensen–Shannon divergence between their distributions $D_{KL}(P(\hat{Z}|\text{concept}_i)||P(\hat{Z}|\text{concept}_j))$ at each layer, then aggregated. Across ideas, combinations that paired more semantically distant concepts tended to receive higher originality ratings (human $\beta = .1, t = 2.721, p < .01$; LLMs $\beta = .18, t = 4.81, p < .001$) (see Figure 3 (b)).

Discussion

Creativity is often associated with sudden and serendipitous cross-domain inspirations. The central question motivating this work was whether such cross-domain mappings can be induced at scale, and whether cross-domain mappings affect creative insights differently for humans and LLMs. We found (1) LLMs generated ideas that were perceived as more original on average, regardless of whether cross-domain mappings were explicitly prompted; (2) on average, cross-domain mapping prompts increased the perceived originality of human ideas but not LLM ideas; and (3) across both systems, greater semantic distance between target and inspiration domains predicted higher perceived originality.

Semantic distance as a driver of originality We found a cross-domain mapping intervention increased originality for people but not for LLMs. One interpretation is that without an explicit invitation to map across domains, human participants may remain anchored to incremental improvements that the product already affords.

Our results also show that semantic distance between targets and inspirations matters for both humans and LLMs. Within LLM-generated ideas, originality increased as the semantic distance between the target and inspiration domains grew. Thus, we interpret the human–LLM asymmetry to cross-domain intervention as more of a difference in sensitivity to prompting than an indication of whether cross-domain mappings can be generative in the general case. One possibility is that LLMs already draw on broad associations even under a user-need framing, leaving less room for improvement when given an explicit cross-domain mapping. Another related possibility is that prompting effects for LLMs depend on distance – explicit mapping prompts may matter only when the target–source pairing is highly remote (e.g., car and octopus, backpack and cactus). Testing the conditions where cross-domain mapping becomes an effective intervention for LLMs would require experiments that systematically manipulate semantic distance across a wide range of conceptual space and assess whether and when such prompts increase originality relative to another prompt framing such as user need.

Originality, feasibility, and usefulness There was a strong negative relationship between originality and feasibility, and almost no relationship between originality and usefulness. At




Figure 3: Originality varies by cross-domain combinations and semantic distance: (a) originality ratings for human vs LLM ideas given the same target-source combinations are significantly correlated. (b) Mean originality ratings plotted against Wikipedia-based semantic distance between source and target concepts by source (human vs LLM). (c–d) Means of originality for each target concept (rows) and inspiration/source domain (columns), displayed separately for LLMs (c) and humans (d); numbers denote average originality and colors encode magnitude.

face value, this might suggest that pushing ideas toward high originality necessarily produces impractical ideas with unclear utility. However, judgments of feasibility and usefulness are necessarily made relative to a currently imaginable problem/solution space (Shtulman, 2023). Ideas that sit outside that space may look both impossible and pointless, not necessarily because they violate principles of physics or markets, but because the mechanisms by which they could be realized are not yet representable. Many historically transformative ideas initially suffered from this problem. For example, early skepticism about AI-generated arts often rested on the assumption that a creative machine would entail a human-like robot arms manipulating brushes (McCorduck, 1991), rather than statistical models operating over latent representations—an implementation path that was not merely unlikely, but effectively *unthinkable* at the time. Once a workable path appears, judgments of feasibility can shift rapidly; and until adoption, usefulness is necessarily speculative.

Limitations and future directions First, our current analysis focused on quantitative outcomes (e.g., originality rating), but humans and LLMs may also differ qualitatively in the cross-domain mappings they draw. Preliminary qualita-

tive inspection suggests that humans and LLMs often draw on different properties of the same source domain. Human ideas seem to frequently prioritize salient perceptual or sensorimotor features. For example, inspired by pickles, many human participants proposed a car with “pickle-green paint with grooves and bumps,” or inspired by cacti, a backpack with thorny textures to deter theft. In contrast, LLM cross-domain mappings more often align and project mechanisms or functions across domains: the same example of a pickle-inspired car leads to a self-healing, anti-corrosion mechanism (micro-brine capsules that seal scratches), while the cactus becomes a water-harvesting system (micro-spine condensation fins channeling moisture into a drinkable reservoir). It’s unlikely that LLMs don’t know pickles are typically green and dimpled while cacti are spiky, but they differ from humans in what is treated as generative during analogical transfer. Our next step is to systematically code idea content—e.g., perceptual vs. functional/mechanistic features, and test what kind of mappings LLMs and humans tend to draw.

In addition, our design captures one-shot idea generation, whereas real-world creativity is inherently iterative: ideas are criticized, combined, revised, and gradually made workable. Future work should therefore study iterative workflows

which could instantiate explicit mechanisms that humans naturally use in creative practice—e.g., reflection and adversarial critique that could be implemented either within models (self-critique and refinement loops), in multi-agent or cultural-evolution paradigms, or in human–AI collaborations.

Acknowledgments

We thank Toyota Motor North America, Inc. for their support of this research. We also thank Pavel Chvykov, Matthew Henderson, and the Diverse Intelligence Summer Institute for many thoughtful discussions that inspired this work.

References

- Basalla, G. (1988). *The evolution of technology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Beaty, R. E., & Kenett, Y. N. (2023). Associative thinking at the core of creativity. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 27(7), 671–683. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2023.04.004>
- Beaty, R. E., Zeitlen, D. C., Baker, B. S., & Kenett, Y. N. (2021). Forward flow and creative thought: Assessing associative cognition and its role in divergent thinking. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 41, 100859.
- Bellemare-Pepin, A., Lespinasse, F., Thölke, P., Harel, Y., Mathewson, K., Olson, J. A., Bengio, Y., & Jerbi, K. (2026). Divergent creativity in humans and large language models. *Scientific Reports*, 16(1), 1279.
- Budin, P. (1907). *The nursling: The feeding and hygiene of premature & full-term infants*. Caxton Publishing Company.
- Conklin, H. C. (2025). *Information structure in mappings: An approach to learning, representation and generalisation* [Doctoral dissertation, The University of Edinburgh].
- Cropley, D. (2023). Is artificial intelligence more creative than humans?: ChatGPT and the divergent association task. *Learning Letters*, 2, 13–13.
- Ding, Z., Srinivasan, A., MacNeil, S., & Chan, J. (2023). Fluid transformers and creative analogies: Exploring large language models' capacity for augmenting cross-domain analogical creativity. *Proceedings of the 15th Conference on Creativity and Cognition*, 489–505.
- Firestein, S. (2012). *Ignorance: How it drives science*. Oxford University Press.
- Gentner, D. (1983). Structure-mapping: A theoretical framework for analogy. *Cognitive science*, 7(2), 155–170.
- German, T. P., & Barrett, H. C. (2005). Functional fixedness in a technologically sparse culture. *Psychological Science*, 16(1), 1–5.
- Gray, K., Anderson, S., Chen, E. E., Kelly, J. M., Christian, M. S., Patrick, J., Huang, L., Kenett, Y. N., & Lewis, K. (2019). “Forward flow”: A new measure to quantify free thought and predict creativity. *American Psychologist*, 74, 539–554.
- Gu, T., Wang, J., Zhang, Z., & Li, H. (2024). Llms can realize combinatorial creativity: Generating creative ideas via LLMs for scientific research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.14141*.
- Holyoak, K. J., & Thagard, P. (1995). *Mental leaps: Analogy in creative thought*. MIT Press.
- James, W. (1880). Great men, great thoughts, and the environment. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 46, 441–459.
- Jansson, D. G., & Smith, S. M. (1991). Design fixation. *Design Studies*, 12(1), 3–11.
- Kenett, Y. N. (2018). Going the extra creative mile: The role of semantic distance in creativity—theory, research, and measurement. *The Cambridge handbook of the neuroscience of creativity*, 3, 233–48.
- Kenett, Y. N., Anaki, D., & Faust, M. (2014). Investigating the structure of semantic networks in low and high creative persons. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 8, 407.
- Koestler, A. (1964). *The act of creation*. Hutchinson.
- Koivisto, M., & Grassini, S. (2023). Best humans still outperform artificial intelligence in a creative divergent thinking task. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1), 13601.
- Lilienthal, O. (1889). *Birdflight as the basis of aviation*. Longmans, Green; Co.
- Linsey, J. S., Tseng, I., Fu, K., Cagan, J., Wood, K. L., & Schunn, C. (2010). A study of design fixation, its mitigation and perception in engineering design faculty. *Journal of Mechanical Design*, 132(4), 041003.
- McCorduck, P. (1991). *Aaron's code: Meta-art, artificial intelligence, and the work of harold cohen*. Macmillan.
- Mednick, S. A. (1962). The associative basis of the creative process. *Psychological Review*, 69, 220–232.
- Mehrotra, P., Parab, A., & Gulwani, S. (2024). Enhancing creativity in large language models through associative thinking strategies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.06715*.
- Meincke, L., Nave, G., & Terwiesch, C. (2025). ChatGPT decreases idea diversity in brainstorming. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 9, 1107–1109.
- Shtulman, A. (2023). *Learning to imagine: The science of discovering new possibilities*. Harvard University Press.
- Si, C., Yang, D., & Hashimoto, T. (2024). Can LLMs generate novel research ideas? a large-scale human study with 100+ nlp researchers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.04109*.
- Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 69(1), 99–118.
- Souriau, P. (1881). *Théorie de l'invention*. Hachette.
- Stephens, T. (2007, January 4). *How a swiss invention hooked the world*. SWI swissinfo.ch. <https://www.swissinfo.ch/eng/how-a-swiss-invention-hooked-the-world/>
- Webb, T., Holyoak, K. J., & Lu, H. (2023). Emergent analogical reasoning in large language models. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 7(9), 1526–1541.
- Wenger, E., & Kenett, Y. (2025). We're different, we're the same: Creative homogeneity across LLMs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.19361*.
- Youn, H., Strumsky, D., Bettencourt, L., & Lobo, J. (2015). Invention as a combinatorial process: Evidence from us patents. *Journal of the Royal Society interface*, 12(106).
- Zhan, Z., Yao, X., & Li, T. (2023). Effects of association interventions on students' creative thinking, aptitude, empathy,

and design scheme in a steam course: Considering remote and close association. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, 33(5), 1773–1795.

Zhang, J., Zhuang, K., Sun, J., Liu, C., Fan, L., Wang, X., Gu, J., & Qiu, J. (2023). Retrieval flexibility links to creativity: Evidence from computational linguistic measure. *Cerebral Cortex*, 33(8), 4964–4976.