

Creativity and task perception [★]Daniela Grieco ^{a,*}, Patrick Llerena ^b, Anne-Gaëlle Maltese ^c^a Università degli Studi di Milano, Italy^b University of Strasbourg, University of Lorraine, CNRS, BETA,^c UMR 8019 - CLERSE - Centre Lillois d'Etudes et de Recherche Sociologiques et Economiques, University of Lille, CNRS, F-59000, Lille, France

ARTICLE INFO

JEL classification:

C91

D91

O31

Keywords:

Creativity

Open task

Closed task

Perception

Constraints

Self-selection

ABSTRACT

This paper explores how individuals perceive open versus closed tasks in creative contexts and how this perception influences their choice between tasks. The experiment has a 2x2 design, where we give the possibility (or not) to choose between tasks, and vary the incentive scheme (flat payment vs. performance-based incentives). We find that subjects perceive a task as more open the lower the goal clarity and the more they feel free to explore. Additionally, we show that the likelihood of choosing an open task increases with the perceived freedom to explore, while it decreases with goal clarity, particularly when incentives in place. The effects of self-selection on creative performance are then investigated.

1. Introduction

Participation and performance in any task are significantly influenced by how tasks are perceived by individuals, since perception shapes motivation, engagement, and strategies employed to tackle challenges. Exploring how task perception affects creative performance is pivotal in understanding human cognitive processes and decision-making in the complex phenomenon of creativity. One key dimension of differentiation between tasks is their openness, which means the extent of constraints imposed on problem-solving.

In the general sense, constraints are perceived as limitations or barriers that “*decrease the number of options available by precluding some responses to a task*” (Tromp and Sternberg, 2024). Although creativity is often seen as the ultimate expression of freedom, it is not possible for ideas to emerge without constraints. In fact, “*What makes a person or product creative is the flair of originality constrained by usefulness, and the benefit of usefulness constrained by originality*” (Kaufman and Sternberg, 2010). This attention paid to constraints is even more important as it shapes the way researchers classified creative tasks.

The paper presents a laboratory experiment with a 2x2 between-subject design, where we give participants the possibility (or not) to choose between tasks, and vary the incentive scheme (flat payment vs. performance-based incentives). As the first research

[★] We acknowledge the financial support from the University of Strasbourg and the Department of Law C. Beccaria, University of Milano. P. Llerena also thanks the Chaire of Management de la Créativité hosted by the Fondation Université de Strasbourg. The experiment has been pre-registered on AsPredicted on February 23, 2025 (pre-registration #214265, available at the following link: <https://aspredicted.org/ghfr-6w35.pdf>). The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Strasbourg on February 14, 2025 (Unistra/CER/2025-10). The experimental sessions have been run at the Laboratory for Experimental Economics of Strasbourg (LEES) on February 25–27, 2025. The authors also extend their thanks to Kene Boun My for his support in organizing and managing the experimental sessions.

^{*} Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: daniela.grieco@unimi.it (D. Grieco), pllerena@unistra.fr (P. Llerena), anne-gaëlle.maltese@univ-lille.fr (A.-G. Maltese).

question, this study examines task openness to assess how the constraints in open versus closed tasks are perceived by the participants. The hypothesis we test is whether subjects perceive the openness of the task as shaped by two key dimensions that emerge in the literature: goal clarity and freedom of explore. Although in studies on creativity, the classifications of tasks considered closed versus open tend to be not questioned, subjects can differ in how they perceive the task. To the best of our knowledge, these aspects have never been explicitly examined so far. In fact, it is plausible that the way the subjects perceive a task greatly influences their creative approach, regardless of its prior classification. For example, a task judged to be open by researchers may be perceived as more closed by some subjects due to constraints that the experimenters did not add explicitly, or may arise from the way the goal is formulated. By neglecting this subjective dimension, studies might underestimate the diversity of creative responses and oversimplify the complexity of creative processes. Consequently, our first contribution aims to examine whether the perception of the degree of openness of different tasks aligns with assumptions in the creativity literature. To test whether this alignment occurs, subjects will answer two questions aimed at measuring how clear was the goal they had to reach on each task and how free they felt to explore completing each task.

Our second contribution consists of testing the effects of allowing subjects to self-select into an open or a closed task. This choice is studied in relation to how the subjects perceive the task in terms of clarity of goals, freedom to explore, ease, and confidence in their own absolute and relative performance. The second hypothesis we test is thus related to how the openness of the task can influence the willingness of the subjects to engage in a specific task. Instead of just comparing subjects' creative performance in tasks differing in their degree of openness, as typical in the literature, we will also examine subjects' choice to complete one specific task. By deciding to engage in a closed vs. open task, subjects will reveal their preference for the type of task. Subjects might choose a task only depending on the intrinsic benefit they expect when completing it, or because they feel more comfortable in self-selecting in tasks where the constraints restrict the possible creative output, or where constraints are less tight.

Finally, we investigate whether the choice between open and closed tasks depends on the presence of incentives that reward creative performance in the task. Charness and Grieco (2019) have shown that monetary incentives are effective with closed tasks only. As third hypothesis, we test whether the preference for a task is affected by the incentive scheme (flat payment versus performance-based payment in the form of tournament), since being compensated depending on own relative performance may activate mechanisms that depend on the subject's risk or ambiguity attitude, or be related to the subject's level of confidence in own ability in completing a certain task. In this respect, people might prefer the task that is perceived easier (because of the presence of constraints, or because of the lack of constraints, depending on the subject's attitude). Furthermore, individuals might reason strategically by choosing the task they expect fewer people to select, thereby making it "less competitive".

Our results show that individuals select tasks based on personal perceptions, and performance-based incentives amplify this tendency. Although self-selection does not guarantee higher absolute performance, closed tasks, compared to open tasks, lead to greater confidence in performance estimation. However, for top performers choosing the closed task, the increased competition level cancels out the benefits of choosing a task where they excel, and thus lowers the creative scores for the most creative individuals.

In the next section, we present a review of the literature. Section 3 illustrates the experimental design. Section 4 reports our findings. Section 5 concludes with a discussion of the implications of our study.

2. Related literature

Three strands of literature are connected to our paper. First, studies that analyze how tasks are perceived and whether perception can influence creative outcome; second, papers that investigate whether self-selecting into a task affects perception and performance; third, papers that analyze the effect of incentives on task choice. Concerning the first strand, theoretical frameworks such as goal setting theory propose that the way objectives are presented, whether specific and challenging or vague and easy, affects individuals' performance and outcomes (e.g. Locke and Latham (1990)). Similarly, studies on intrinsic motivation, such as those of (Deci et al., 1985), illustrate that tasks perceived as autonomous and aligned with personal interests enhance engagement and output compared to those seen as externally controlled. These examples underscore the multifaceted impact of task perception, emphasizing its importance in shaping human behavior and performance. One key dimension influencing creative engagement is related to the way a problem is classified in problem-finding research (Getzels and Csikszentmihalyi, 1967; Csikszentmihalyi and Getzels, 1970; Dillon, 1982) and to the type of cognitive operations required. Indeed, an individual who deals with a creative task is engaged in a cognitive process. The classic distinction in the literature is between divergent thinking and convergent thinking (Guilford, 1956), where the former involves the generation of multiple ideas, while the latter results in a single logical solution. Although some authors conclude on a general positive effect of constraints on creativity (Haught-Tromp, 2017), others warn about their negative consequences on creativity (Amabile and Gryskiewicz, 1989). In their review, Acar et al. (2019) suggest the presence of an inverted U-shaped relationship between constraints and creativity, with the idea that constraints will contribute positively to creative performance once the "sweet spot" is reached, and too little or too big constraints are detrimental to it. However, this "sweet spot will differ depending on the type of constraint, the person, the creative task, and the external situational circumstances" (Tromp and Sternberg, 2024). The presence and type of constraints determine how to classify creativity tasks as "open" or "closed." Researchers often propose a continuum that varies from closed to open problems (Attanasi et al., 2021; Unsworth, 2001). This is reflected in creative tasks differing along the "openness" (or symmetrically, "closeness") dimension: in 'closed' tasks, ex ante goals are well specified, and strong constraints are imposed on subjects' responses. In a true closed problem, the method for solving the problem is known, as in the case of an equation. Closed tasks overlap with Galenson (2006)'s notion of experimental creativity, where subjects solve a problem following a tentative and incremental procedure. In the case of 'Open' tasks, no restrictions apply, and subjects are free to explore without boundaries, being required to find, invent or discover the problem itself, as in Galenson (2006)'s definition of conceptual creativity. However,

researchers who frame their results around this dichotomy rarely, if ever, challenge the validity of this classification. Subjects' actual perception of the degree of openness or closeness of a task has never been explicitly investigated. However, it is plausible that the way subjects perceive a task greatly influences their creative approach, regardless of its *a priori* classification.

In addition to not questioning how different tasks are perceived, experiments on creativity typically present subjects with one or more predetermined tasks, with no possibility for the subject to choose between tasks of different types. The second strand of literature we refer to involves studies in economics, psychology, and management and consistently indicates that allowing individuals to choose the tasks they undertake can have profound effects on their performance, motivation, and satisfaction. In economics, self-selection models suggest that when individuals are given the autonomy to select tasks, they often choose those that align with their skills and preferences, leading to increased efficiency and productivity (Lazear, 2000). Psychology research supports this by demonstrating that task choice fosters a sense of autonomy, which is a core component of intrinsic motivation according to Self-Determination Theory (Deci and Ryan, 2002). This intrinsic motivation is related to increased persistence, engagement, and creative output. In the realm of management, the concept of job crafting highlights how employees proactively modify their tasks to better suit their strengths and interests, leading to improved job satisfaction and performance (Wrzesniewski and Dutton, 2001). Collectively, these findings emphasize that the opportunity to choose tasks empowers individuals, resulting in better alignment with their capabilities and fostering a more motivated and effective approach to work. Although freedom to choose tasks can enhance motivation and alignment with personal skills, it also introduces elements of risk and uncertainty. In economics, risk-based decision making is a well-studied area, with individuals often showing varying risk preferences that influence their decisions since (Knight, 1921). On one side, allowing participants to choose a task can actually reduce uncertainty, since having to complete a certain task that is perceived as difficult could reduce confidence (Mittelstädt et al., 2025). However, When individuals select tasks, they may face uncertainty about their ability to successfully complete them or the potential rewards, leading to anxiety and decision paralysis, especially if the stakes are high. Furthermore, the choice in favor of a task can be the consequence of a biased self-evaluation (for instance due to the different information available, such as in Danz (2020)), leading to overentry in a competition and overplacement. In psychology, the concept of choice overload suggests that having too many options can be overwhelming, causing stress and reducing satisfaction with the decision (Schwartz, 2004). Management literature also highlights that, while task choice can lead to empowerment, it can simultaneously create a sense of accountability and pressure, since individuals are solely responsible for their success or failure (Eddy et al., 2013). These aspects of risk and uncertainty necessitate a careful consideration of how choice is structured and supported in organizational contexts, to ensure that the benefits of autonomy do not outweigh the potential downsides of indecision and performance anxiety. Finally, this paper contributes to a third strand of literature that relates incentives to creative outcomes and task choice. In particular, we build on Charness and Grieco (2019)'s work on creativity and incentives, which has provided a hint to understand the mixed results (Collins and Amabile, 1999; Ariely et al., 2009; Laske and Schroeder, 2017; Neckermann et al., 2014; Erat and Gneezy, 2016) on the role of monetary incentives in promoting creativity, showing that paying performance can be effective in closed tasks, while, in contrast, directly incentivizing open creativity would be ineffective or even counterproductive. Monetary incentives are effective with closed tasks only, because incentives stimulate effort, but creative performance depends on effort in closed tasks only, where the goal is clearly specified. In this respect, the paper tests whether the preference for a task is affected by the incentive scheme (Incentives vs. Flat payment), since subjects might feel more comfortable in self-selecting in tasks where the constraints restrict the possible creative output and thus the uncertainty of evaluations. Or, viceversa, constraints might be perceived as a burden that limits subjects' chances of success. Furthermore, there is evidence that confidence in own creative performance might mediate the effects of motivating variables such as monetary incentives (Bandura, 1997).

3. The experiment

The experiment has a 2x2 between-subject design, where we give the possibility (or not) to choose between tasks, and vary the incentive scheme (flat payment vs. performance-based incentives), thus obtaining four conditions. Each subject is assigned to one of the four conditions only. The subject's creative performance is evaluated twice: (1) during the experiment by peer judges (i.e. subjects in the same experimental session belonging to another group), who ranked creative answers produced within groups of five subjects, and (2) by external judges — blind to treatments and conditions, who assign a score in the range 1 ("not creative at all") – 10 ("extremely creative") to six creative answers randomly drawn from a tank containing all creative answers in each task. Instructions and questionnaires for the in-lab creativity experiment, as well as instructions for creativity assessment, are available in Appendix A and Appendix A.1, respectively.

3.1. Tasks

We follow Charness and Grieco (2019) in choosing the same closed creativity task - where subjects "combine" existing items within constraints - and the open creativity task where they are asked to develop a totally new product with no constraints. For a discussion on the comparability of the two tasks, see also Charness and Grieco (2023).

The tasks reads as follows:

Closed task

"Choose a combination of words to create an interesting story." The words supplied are: *house, zero, forgive, curve, relevance, cow, tree, planet, ring, send*. Subjects were told that they must use these words along with any other combination of words that they wished.

Open task

"If you had the talent to invent things just by thinking of them, what would you create?"

3.2. Treatments

In the experimental design, we manipulate two key features: subjects' payment (Flat Payment versus Incentives), and the possibility to choose between tasks (No Choice versus Choice).

- In the *No Choice* treatments, subjects had to complete both the creative tasks (Open and Closed), which were presented to them in randomized order.
- In the *Choice* treatments, subjects had to select only one of the two creative tasks, again presented in randomized order.
- In the *Flat Payment* treatments, subjects received a flat amount no matter their performance in the task(s).
- In the *Incentives* treatments, subjects were paid based on their performance in the creative task. In the *No Choice* condition, where they completed two tasks, one of them only was selected at random by the subject's computer and actually paid. The experimental instruction clearly specified that the two tasks had the same probability of being drawn and then paid. Subjects took part in a tournament, i.e. payment was based on the subject's position in a ranking made by five other subjects enrolled in the same experimental session, but belonging to a different group. Peers' ranking were averaged and determined subject's payment.

These two features (type of payment and possibility to choose) result in four conditions, which will be referred to as follows throughout this paper: *No Choice Flat Payment* (NCFP), *No Choice Incentives* (NCI), *Choice Flat Payment* (CFP), and *Choice Incentives* (CI).

Right after each task, subjects were asked to answer a set of questions aimed at capturing their perception of the task characteristics and their attitude towards the task. Firstly, they were asked to assess how much they liked the task, how clearly formulated was the goal to reach in the task, and how free they felt to explore in the task. Then, they were asked to self-evaluate their own performance in the task, and to self-assess their relative performance with respect to other subjects. All answers had to be given in a 1–10 scale. In the *Choice* treatment, subjects were asked to answer the two questions about task perception (about goal clarity and freedom to explore) also regarding the task they did not choose. Furthermore, they had to answer an open question asking to motivate why they selected one task instead of the other.

3.3. Questionnaires

In the questionnaire we presented at the end of the experiment, we requested demographic information and also asked subjects to answer two incentivized questions on risk and ambiguity attitude (Gneezy and Potters, 1997): each individual is endowed with 100 units (with each unit corresponding to 0.01 euro) and could invest any portion in a risky asset that had a 50 % chance of success and paid 2.5 times the amount invested if successful and nothing if unsuccessful; the individual retains whatever units were not invested. This procedure provides a measure of risk aversion for each individual: the higher the investment, the less risk averse the individual is. The question on ambiguity attitude was identical except for the fact that subjects were not told the probability that the investment would be successful (which was 50 % as in the risky asset).

The questionnaire also included questions on demographic features: gender, age, major, past involvement in creative activities, preference for creative endeavors. Since both tasks were verbal task, we asked whether subjects were native French speakers.

3.4. Creativity evaluations

As mentioned, in both the Flat Payment and in the Incentives treatments, subjects in one group evaluated and ranked the individual responses from people in another group: subjects received no specific criteria to follow but their own taste for creativity. To make comparisons across treatments, we recruited on Prolific Academics 400 external judges - blind to treatments — to evaluate on a 1–10 scale six answers drawn at random out all of the answers produced in the in-lab experiment. As with peer ranking, external raters received no indication of any specific criteria to be followed in assessing creativity. We rely on Amabile (1982) *consensual assessment technique* and do not provide judges did not receive additional instructions on how to evaluate creativity, allowing them to freely assess the creativity level of each output.

3.5. Procedures

The experiments were conducted at the LEES at the University of Strasbourg (France) from the 25th to the 27th February 2025. There were eight sessions and a total number of 320 subjects. The 320 subjects were equally distributed across the four conditions (NCFP, NCI, CFP, and CI). Among the 160 subjects who underwent into the *Choice* treatment, 83 opted to pursue the *Closed* task (37 with Flat payment and 46 with Incentives), while 77 chose the *Open* task (43 with Flat payment and 34 with Incentives). The subjects were students recruited through the ORSEE platform, with 63.32 % females and an average age of nearly 22 years. Instructions were presented to the subjects and read aloud by the experimenter. Subjects received an average payoff of 15.08 euros¹, including a 6 euros show-up fee, and sessions took on average one hour and a half. In the end, one observation was incomplete due to a technical issue and then dropped.

¹ Subjects were divided in groups of five and were evaluated by another group of five belonging to the same experimental session. The first-ranked received 15 euros, the second 12 euros, the third 9 euros, the fourth 6 euros, and the fifth 3 euros.

Table 1
Goal clarity and freedom to explore between open and closed tasks.

Variable	Condition	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Goal clarity	Open	319	8.20	2.07	1	10
	Closed	319	9.17	1.38	2	10
Freedom to explore	Open	319	8.38	2.05	1	10
	Closed	319	7.64	2.11	1	10
Test	z-statistic	p-value				
Goal clarity (Open vs. Closed)	-7.973	0.0000				
Freedom to explore (Open vs. Closed)	5.572	0.0000				

As of external judges recruited on Prolific, we ran two sessions (one for the Closed task, one for the Open task) between February 28, 2025 and March 4, 2025. The Prolific sample was pre-screened on the basis of French being the judge's first language. In the Open task session, 182 out of 200 subjects completed the experiment, with an average completion time of 5 minutes and 17 minutes. In the Open task session, 182 out of 200 subjects completed the experiment, with an average completion time of 5 minutes and 17 minutes. In the Closed task session, 197 out of 210 subjects completed the experiment, with an average completion time of 7 minutes and 17 minutes. The judges received a flat payment of about 3.60 euros. Their evaluations were collected through the administration of a Qualtrics survey via Prolific Academics.

4. Results

4.1. Tasks perception

Table 1 presents summary statistics and Wilcoxon signed-rank test results comparing *goal clarity* and *freedom to explore* as perceived by subjects between Open and Closed tasks. The results of our test for goal clarity (henceforth “clarity”) indicate significantly lower scores in the Open condition, while the tests for freedom to explore (henceforth “freedom”) suggest significantly higher perceived freedom in the Open task. We also controlled for differences in perception of clarity and freedom over each condition and found only a significant difference in freedom between the NCFP and CI conditions in the Open task ($p = 0.029$) showing that subjects facing both the presence of a performance-based payment and a choice to make (as in the CI condition) felt less free to explore than those with flat payment and no choice (diff = -0.899). This effect is smaller than expected, and we attribute the reduced sense of freedom to the increased pressure of both performing and making good choices to achieve higher payment. No other difference has been observed either for the Open or Closed task. These results provide support to our first hypothesis as subjects perceive the goal to be less clearly defined but feel freer to explore in an open task, while it is the opposite for a closed task.

In addition to these considerations about clarity and freedom, we also compared how subjects enjoyed performing the Open and Closed tasks. The level of enjoyment was high for both tasks: 7.04 vs 7.54 in a range 1–10, with no significant differences between tasks ($z = -1.501$, $p = 0.1335$, Wilcoxon signed rank test). Once we control for the condition subjects were enrolled in, we only find a significant difference in how subjects enjoyed performing the Open task between the NCFP and NCI conditions (diff = -1.182 , $p = 0.016$, Tukey's HSD test), suggesting that a performance-based payment may reduce the amusement of engaging in an Open task, in line with the literature showing a crowding out effect of the pleasure of being creative once incentives are in place (Amabile et al., 1986). All other comparisons led to non-significant differences. Fig. 1 illustrates the difference in average enjoyment between conditions, comparing subjects' self-reported levels while performing the Open vs. Closed tasks.

4.2. Task choice

To determine whether subjects had a general preference for the Open or Closed task when given the opportunity to choose between them, we conducted a binomial test. We observed a sample proportion slightly above 50 % (77 subjects choosing the Open task and 83 choosing the Closed task), but this difference was not statistically significant ($p = 0.6928$, Binomial test). This result is consistent with the level of average self-reported enjoyment that, as shown above, is similar across tasks. In addition, considering the relationship between subjects' task choice and the incentive scheme, the results show that we failed to reject the null hypothesis ($\chi^2 = 2.0279$, $p = 0.154$). This means that there is no statistically significant association between our two variables: the distribution of choice (Open vs. Closed) does not differ significantly between the two incentive treatments (Incentives vs. Flat payment).

Table 2 confirms the previous finding and presents the results of a set of Probit regressions exploring the determinants of subjects' choice in favor of a specific task. The dependent variable is the probability of choosing the Open task over the Closed task, and the observations are limited to those in the Choice treatment.² Consistently with previous results on task perception, we observe a positive effect on the choice in favor of the Open task of perceiving that task as providing more freedom to explore. On the contrary,

² Column (1) tests the role of clarity and freedom perception, while column (2) adds incentives, (3) considers the interaction between incentives and clarity/freedom perception, (4) and (5) add confidence and its interaction with incentives, (6) includes controls and (7) corrects for Multiple Hypothesis Testing.




Fig. 1. Enjoyment of task completion across conditions.

Table 2

Determinants of choice: probit regression.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Clarity	-0.301*** [0.067]	-0.301*** [0.068]	-0.182** [0.080]	-0.290*** [0.070]	-0.287*** [0.070]	-0.208** [0.084]	-0.135 [0.088]
Freedom	0.217*** [0.068]	0.223*** [0.069]	0.041 [0.090]	0.243*** [0.074]	0.243*** [0.074]	0.026 [0.099]	0.080 [0.136]
Incentive		-0.282 [0.211]	-1.464 [1.405]	-0.293 [0.213]	-0.320 [0.222]	-1.579 [1.425]	-1.436 [1.377]
Inc_clarity			-0.386** [0.160]			-0.398** [0.165]	-0.706*** [0.186]
Inc_freedom			0.526*** [0.164]			0.548*** [0.175]	0.821*** [0.247]
Confidence				-0.006 [0.051]	-0.030 [0.074]		
Inc_confidence					0.044 [0.098]		
CONTROLS	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES
MHT	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
Constant	0.708 [0.634]	0.792 [0.644]	1.304 [0.837]	0.509 [0.690]	0.496 [0.691]	1.829* [1.068]	1.771 [1.209]
Observations	160	160	160	156	156	160	156

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

Notes: Probit (standard errors in parentheses). The dependent variable is a dummy variable assuming value equal to 1 when the subject chooses the Open task, and 0 when she chooses the Closed task. Clarity is a variable assuming values between 1 and 10 and increasing in the perceived clarity of the task goals. Freedom is a variable assuming values between 1 and 10 and increasing in the perceived freedom to explore that the task allows. Incentive is a dummy variable assuming value equal to 1 when payment is performance-based, and 0 in case of flat payment. Inc_clarity is the interacted variable between Clarity and Incentive. Inc_freedom is the interacted variable between Freedom and Incentive. Confidence is a variable obtained computing the difference between the subject's estimation of her score in the task in a range 1–10, and her actual average score assigned by the External Judges in a range 1–10. Inc_confidence is the interacted variable between Confidence and Incentive. Controls include: gender, age, native language, risk attitude, ambiguity attitude, task order, how frequently the subject is engaged in creative tasks in a 1–10 scale, how much the subject enjoyed the task in a 1–10 scale. Multiple Hypothesis Testing procedure has been run using the mhtexp procedure illustrated in (List et al., 2019). The rwoif command gives very similar results.




Fig. 2. Text analysis of task choice motivations.

the probability of *not* choosing the Open task (and, instead, choosing the Closed task) is higher when subjects perceive the goal of the task as clearer (see Column 1). This result supports our second hypothesis, stating that the degree of openness of a task affects subjects' preference for the task. Incentives do not affect the choice *per se* (see Column 2), but interact with the perception of the task, reinforcing previous results (Column 3): when payment depends on performance, subjects appear to be more careful in weighting the relative advantage of each task, caring even more about freedom when choosing the Open task, and even more about clarity when choosing the Closed task. This result only partially supports our third hypothesis on the role of incentives in subjects' self-selection in a task.

4.2.1. Text analysis

To better understand the determinants of subjects' choice between the Open and Closed task, we performed a textual analysis of the content of the written answers of subjects to the question "Why did you decide not to complete the other task?". Topic analysis performed by clustering the answers into three main topics and counting occurrences shows that motivations can be classified into




Fig. 3. Creativity scores across tasks and conditions.

three main categories: pure tastes, performance-related concerns, task-related characteristics, such as the words that had to be used in the Closed task, or the 15 minutes allowed to complete each task (thus the task constraints). Participants' responses could be classified into multiple categories, as some responses contained more than one explanation. The results are summarized in Fig. 2.

Tastes are extremely relevant in both tasks: 58 % of subjects choosing the Closed task and 65 % choosing the Open task ($Z = 0.919$, $p = 0.358$, two-sample Wilcoxon rank-sum test) explain their choice by saying that one task was “more inspiring”, “interesting” or “stimulating” than the other, using words referring to their “preference”, “desire” or “appeal” for one task instead of the other. On the other hand, subjects who preferred the Closed task were mainly driven by performance-related concerns: 66 % of those who choose the Closed task motivated their choice by mentioning aspects related to their expected ability: either they did not feel to be creative enough for the Open task, or not to have an idea that could be good enough, or did not have confidence enough in their success, or perceived the task as “too difficult”, or entailing “too much pressure”. This percentage was significantly lower for those opting for the Open Task (47%: $z = 2.833$, $p = 0.004$, Wilcoxon rank sum test of two samples). Finally, a substantial percentage of respondents who choose the Open task (61 %) justify this choice by referring to the characteristics of the unselected task, such as the presence of constraints, the words to be used compulsorily, and the limited time. This proportion drops to 39 % for the Open task ($z = -2.482$, $p = 0.013$, Wilcoxon rank sum test of two samples).

4.3. Performance

Fig. 3 shows the distributions of performance scores, based on external judges' assessment, in Open and Closed tasks across conditions. Table 3 and Table 4 describe the summary statistics of these scores.

As appears from Tables 3 and 4, allowing subjects to self-select into a task does not entail a significantly higher score. This is confirmed by non-parametric tests (Open task: $z = 0.296$, $p = 0.767$, Wilcoxon rank sum test of two samples; Closed task: $z = -0.365$, $p = 0.715$, Wilcoxon rank sum test of two samples).

Besides the effective performance of subjects, as assessed through external judges' evaluations, we also collected information on absolute and relative creative performance as self-assessed by the subjects. For what concerns the effect of task openness on subjects' perceived performance, we observe that subjects rated their absolute performance higher in the Closed task than in the Open task ($z = -2.881$, $p = 0.004$, Wilcoxon signed rank test); the same happens for their relative self-assessed performance ($z = -3.621$, $p = 0.0003$, Wilcoxon signed rank test). Subjects thus appear more confident when dealing with the Closed task, probably because, as emphasized above, it is perceived as better defined and clearer in the goal to pursue, and so easier to make predictions about, in line with what emerged from text analysis.

However, this does not translate into significantly higher average scores, neither when subjects have to complete both tasks ($t = 0.805$, $p = 0.422$, t -test), nor when they choose the Closed task ($z = 1.014$, $p = 0.386$, t -test). Notably, standard deviation is higher in the case of the Open task, consistently with the fact that open tasks potentially allow for the emergence of answers with a higher degree of creativity. In fact, higher variance means also higher potential creative outputs, which might not be reflected in the average scores. Since the results shown in Table 5 hold on average, a deeper look into the case of highly creative subjects becomes necessary. In particular, we are interested in understanding whether self-selection may act more on highly creative subjects or on less creative

Table 3
Summary statistics for open task by condition.

Condition	Obs	Mean Score	Std. Dev.	Min Score	Max Score
NCFP	79	5.433	1.423	1.000	8.333
NCI	80	6.140	1.428	3.000	10.000
CFP	43	5.872	1.264	1.200	8.333
CI	34	5.447	1.510	1.333	7.750

Table 4
Summary Statistics for closed task by condition.

Condition	Obs	Mean Score	Std. Dev.	Min Score	Max Score
NCFP	79	5.767	1.488	2.000	8.800
NCI	80	6.030	1.531	1.667	9.200
CFP	37	5.906	1.246	3.750	8.333
CI	46	5.781	1.495	1.400	8.167

Table 5
Summary statistics for self-assessed task performance by condition.

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Absolute (Open)	236	5.9025	2.3199	1	10
Absolute (Closed)	242	6.4835	2.1388	1	10
Relative (Open)	236	4.9831	2.3283	1	10
Relative (Closed)	242	5.5826	2.2304	1	10

Absolute scores: “How would you rate your creative performance in this task?” - Relative scores: “Do you think you performed better than the average of the other participants?”

Table 6
Effect of self-selection on scores: quantile regression.

	Open				Closed			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Choice_Treatment	0.003 [0.341]	-0.040 [0.280]	-0.091 [0.258]	-0.253 [0.234]	-0.092 [0.336]	-0.038 [0.208]	-0.211 [0.244]	-0.417** [0.199]
Constant	2.525** [1.135]	2.886*** [0.931]	4.695*** [0.856]	5.172*** [0.778]	2.728** [1.165]	3.189*** [0.723]	4.629*** [0.845]	5.962*** [0.691]
Observations	236	236	236	236	242	242	242	242

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

Notes: Quantile regression (standard errors in parentheses). The dependent variable is the average score assigned by the external judges recruited on Prolific, and ranges from 1 to 10. Choice_Treatment is a dummy variable assuming value equal to 1 when the subject chooses to complete one of the two tasks (Treatment Choice), and 0 when she had to complete both (Treatment NoChoice). Controls include: incentives, gender, age, native language, risk attitude, ambiguity attitude, task order, how frequently the subject is engaged in creative tasks in a 1–10 scale, how much the subject enjoyed the task in a 1–10 scale.

ones, having in mind that subjects choosing the Closed task are generally more confident in their performance than subjects choosing the Open task, both in absolute and in relative terms.

We thus investigate whether the effect of self-selection on subjects' creative output differs at different points of the distribution of creative output. We use quantile regressions to estimate the conditional distribution of the creative output of subjects at each quintile [0,1] for both the Open and the Closed task, see 6. Table 6 presents quintile regressions (QR) from 1st to 4th for the Open task (Columns 1–4) and for the Closed task (Columns 5–8).

The results show that choosing the task plays a significant, and *negative*, role only for very creative subjects, namely subjects in the highest quintile of the distribution of creative score, but only for the Closed task. On the contrary, it is not significant for subjects with lower performance and for subjects choosing the Open task. We interpret this finding as the consequence of the higher confidence exhibited by subjects in the Closed task, which increases self-selection and thus competition in the highest part of the distribution of creative scores, reducing those subjects' scores. Indeed, the number of subjects in each group who self-select in the Closed task (which captures the actual degree of competition) is higher than in the Open task (2.59 out of 5 versus 2.40, respectively). It is also important to note that, although external judges assign absolute scores in a 1–10 range, since they evaluate six answers each, it is implicit that their score reflects a comparison across the six answers.

5. Conclusions

This paper contributes to the understanding of creativity by examining how perceptions of open and closed tasks influence creative performance and task choice. This paper contributes to the understanding of creativity by examining how perceptions of open and closed tasks influence creative performance and task choice. While experiments in the literature typically present subjects with creative tasks that are exogenously defined as open or closed without considering how subjects actually perceive them, our experiment is designed to study the distinct characteristics that make tasks perceived as open or closed, particularly in terms of goal clarity and the freedom to explore. Our first take-away is that task perception matters, since it affects individual preferences and motivation significantly.

Secondly, while previous experiments tend to provide no choice among tasks, we investigate how individuals self-select into a task. Our results show that the degree of openness of a task affects subjects' preferences for it. Incentives do not affect the choice per se but amplify the importance subjects assign to freedom when choosing open tasks, and to clarity when choosing the closed tasks. These findings are particularly relevant to be applied to environments where individuals have autonomy, such as in workplaces, providing valuable guidance for designing work environments that align personal and organizational goals. Our second takeaway suggests that self-selection into tasks depends heavily on personal perceptions, which can differ across individuals. This is especially pronounced when performance-based incentives are present, emphasizing the role of perceptions. Although choosing tasks based on self-selection does not necessarily enhance performance, it does enhance confidence particularly in closed tasks, due to their clarity. Interestingly, while constraints can support creative output by providing structure, self-selection in closed tasks can lead to increased competition, which can negatively impact the creative scores of top performers.

In sum, our findings stress the importance of understanding individual perceptions of task features for organizational strategy in task allocation and incentive design, pointing towards more informed decisions when managing creative engagement within the workplace.

Data availability

Data will be made available on request.

Declaration of competing interest

Conflict of interest: On behalf of all the authors, I declare we have no conflict of interest.

Appendix A. Instructions and questionnaires (in-lab experiment)

The following instructions, translated from French to English, were presented to subjects during our in-lab experimental sessions for all conditions. Fig. 4 presents the screens shown to subjects in the specific case of the NCFP condition Figs. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

General instructions

You are going to participate in a social science experiment. All your responses will be collected anonymously.

The experiment is divided into two parts, called "Part 1" and "Part 2". These instructions correspond to Part 1. You will receive the specific instructions for Part 2 once Part 1 is completed.

At the end of the experiment, you will be asked to complete a socio-demographic questionnaire.

Part 1

NCFP:

In this first part, you are part of a group of 5 participants and you will be asked to complete two tasks, each lasting 15 minutes. After finishing each task, you will be asked to answer a few questions.

In addition to the 6 euros that will be automatically credited to you at the end of your participation in this experiment, you will receive an additional payment of 9 euros for completing these tasks in the most creative way possible.

Your creative outputs will also be evaluated by five other participants who are not part of your group and ranked against those of four other participants. The ranking results will be communicated to you at the end of the experiment. However, your additional payment will not depend on this evaluation and will always amount to 9 euros.

The two tasks will appear successively on your screen, and we ask you to complete each task in the most creative way possible.

[The Open and the Closed tasks appear on the screens in a random order.]

[Start of the follow-up questionnaire]

Considering your first (second) task : [Instructions of the specific task.]

1. *To what extent did you like performing this task? [1–10]*
2. *How clear was the goal to be achieved in this task? [1–10]*
3. *To what extent did you feel free to explore in this task? [1–10]*
4. *How would you rate your creative performance in this task? [1–10]*
5. *Do you think you performed better than the average of the other participants? [1–10]*




Fig. 4. Experimental screens in the NCFP condition (Part 1).




Fig. 5. Experimental screens in the NCFP condition (Part 2).




Fig. 6. Experimental screens in the NCFP condition (Part 3).

Questionnaire concernant vos tâches

Concernant votre deuxième tâche : Si vous aviez le talent d'inventer des choses juste en y pensant, que créeriez-vous et pourquoi ?

1. À quel point avez-vous aimé réaliser cette tâche ?

Notiez votre réponse sur une échelle de 1 à 10, 1 indiquant Pas du tout et 10 Totalement.

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

2. À quel point l'objectif à atteindre dans cette tâche était-il clair ?

Notiez votre réponse sur une échelle de 1 à 10, 1 indiquant Pas du tout et 10 Totalement.

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

3. Dans quelle mesure vous êtes-vous senti libre d'explorer dans cette tâche ?

Notiez votre réponse sur une échelle de 1 à 10, 1 indiquant Pas du tout et 10 Totalement.

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

4. À combien évaluez-vous votre performance créative dans cette tâche ?

Notiez votre réponse sur une échelle de 1 à 10, 1 indiquant Pas du tout créative et 10 Très créative.

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

5. Pensez-vous avoir été plus performant que la moyenne des autres participants ?

Notiez votre réponse sur une échelle de 1 à 10, 1 indiquant Pas du tout et 10 Totalement.

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

[Suite](#)

© EconPlay 2023

Partie 2 - Evaluations

Dans cette deuxième partie il vous est demandé d'évaluer les productions créatives d'autres participants rattachées à votre groupe pour chacune des tâches. Pour cela, des textes vont être affichés sur votre écran et nous vous demanderons de les classer dans l'ordre croissant de vos préférences, 1 pour le meilleur et 5 pour le moins bon.

À la suite de cette évaluation nous vous demanderons de remplir un questionnaire socio-démographique et les résultats de votre classement vous seront dévoilés.

[Suite](#)

© EconPlay 2023

Item 1

Item 2

Item 3

Item 4

Item 5

Item 6

Item 7

Item 8

Item 9

Item 10

Item 11

Item 12

Item 13

Item 14

Item 15

Item 16

Item 17

Item 18

Item 19

Item 20

Item 21

Item 22

Item 23

Item 24

Item 25

Item 26

Item 27

Item 28

Item 29

Item 30

Item 31

Item 32

Item 33

Item 34

Item 35

Item 36

Item 37

Item 38

Item 39

Item 40

Item 41

Item 42

Item 43

Item 44

Item 45

Item 46

Item 47

Item 48

Item 49

Item 50

Item 51

Item 52

Item 53

Item 54

Item 55

Item 56

Item 57

Item 58

Item 59

Item 60

Item 61

Item 62

Item 63

Item 64

Item 65

Item 66

Item 67

Item 68

Item 69

Item 70

Item 71

Item 72

Item 73

Item 74

Item 75

Item 76

Item 77

Item 78

Item 79

Item 80

Item 81

Item 82

Item 83

Item 84

Item 85

Item 86

Item 87

Item 88

Item 89

Item 90

Item 91

Item 92

Item 93

Item 94

Item 95

Item 96

Item 97

Item 98

Item 99

Item 100

Item 101

Item 102

Item 103

Item 104

Item 105

Item 106

Item 107

Item 108

Item 109

Item 110

Item 111

Item 112

Item 113

Item 114

Item 115

Item 116

Item 117

Item 118

Item 119

Item 120

Item 121

Item 122

Item 123

Item 124

Item 125

Item 126

Item 127

Item 128

Item 129

Item 130

Item 131

Item 132

Item 133

Item 134

Item 135

Item 136

Item 137

Item 138

Item 139

Item 140

Item 141

Item 142

Item 143

Item 144

Item 145

Item 146

Item 147

Item 148

Item 149

Item 150

Item 151

Item 152

Item 153

Item 154

Item 155

Item 156

Item 157

Item 158

Item 159

Item 160

Item 161

Item 162

Item 163

Item 164

Item 165

Item 166

Item 167

Item 168

Item 169

Item 170

Item 171

Item 172

Item 173

Item 174

Item 175

Item 176

Item 177

Item 178

Item 179

Item 180

Item 181

Item 182

Item 183

Item 184

Item 185

Item 186

Item 187

Item 188

Item 189

Item 190

Item 191

Item 192

Item 193

Item 194

Item 195

Item 196

Item 197

Item 198

Item 199

Item 200

Item 201

Item 202

Item 203

Item 204

Item 205

Item 206

Item 207

Item 208

Item 209

Item 210

Item 211

Item 212

Item 213

Item 214

Item 215

Item 216

Item 217

Item 218

Item 219

Item 220

Item 221

Item 222

Item 223

Item 224

Item 225

Item 226

Item 227

Item 228

Item 229

Item 230

Item 231

Item 232

Item 233

Item 234

Item 235

Item 236

Item 237

Item 238

Item 239

Item 240

Item 241

Item 242

Item 243

Item 244

Item 245

Item 246

Item 247

Item 248

Item 249

Item 250

Item 251

Item 252

Item 253

Item 254

Item 255

Item 256

Item 257

Item 258

Item 259

Item 260

Item 261

Item 262

Item 263

Item 264

Item 265

Item 266

Item 267

Item 268

Item 269

Item 270

Item 271

Item 272

Item 273

Item 274

Item 275

Item 276

Item 277

Item 278

Item 279

Item 280

Item 281

Item 282

Item 283

Item 284

Item 285

Item 286

Item 287

Item 288

Item 289

Item 290

Item 291

Item 292

Item 293

Item 294

Item 295

Item 296

Item 297

Item 298

Item 299

Item 300

Item 301

Item 302

Item 303

Item 304

Item 305

Item 306

Item 307

Item 308

Item 309

Item 310

Item 311

Item 312

Item 313

Item 314

Item 315

Item 316

Item 317

Item 318

Item 319

Item 320

Item 321

Item 322

Item 323

Item 324

Item 325

Item 326

Item 327

Item 328

Item 329

Item 330

Item 331

Item 332

Item 333

Item 334

Item 335

Item 336

Item 337

Item 338

Item 339

Item 340

Item 341

Item 342

Item 343

Item 344

Item 345

Item 346

Item 347

Item 348

Item 349

Item 350

Item 351

Item 352

Item 353

Item 354

Item 355

Item 356

Item 357

Item 358

Item 359

Item 360

Item 361

Item 362

Item 363

Item 364

Item 365

Item 366

Item 367

Item 368

Item 369

Item 370

Item 371

Item 372

Item 373

Item 374

Item 375

Item 376

Item 377

Item 378

Item 379

Item 380

Item 381

Item 382

Item 383

Item 384

Item 385

Item 386

Item 387

Item 388

Item 389

Item 390

Item 391

Item 392

Item 393

Item 394

Item 395

Item 396

Item 397

Item 398

Item 399

Item 400

Item 401

Item 402

Item 403

Item 404

Item 405

Item 406

Item 407

Item 408

Item 409

Item 410

Item 411

Item 412

Item 413

Item 414

Item 415

Item 416

Item 417

Item 418

Item 419

Item 420

Item 421

Item 422

Item 423

Item 424

Item 425

Item 426

Item 427

Item 428

Item 429

Item 430

Item 431

Item 432

Item 433

Item 434

Item 435

Item 436

Item 437

Item 438

Item 439

Item 440

Item 441

Item 442

Item 443

Item 444

Item 445

Item 446

Item 447

Item 448

Item 449

Item 450

Item 451

Item 452

Item 453

Item 454

Item 455

Item 456

Item 457

Item 458

Item 459

Item 460

Item 461

Item 462

Item 463

Item 464

Item 465

Item 466

Item 467

Item 468

Item 469

Item 470

Item 471

Item 472

Item 473

Item 474

Item 475

Item 476

Item 477

Item 478

Item 479

Item 480

Item 481

Item 482

Item 483

Item 484

Item 485

Item 486

Item 487

Item 488

Item 489

Item 490

Item 491

Item 492

Item 493

Item 494

Item 495

Item 496

Item 497

Item 498

Item 499

Item 500

Item 501

Item 502

Item 503

Item 504

Item 505

Item 506

Item 507

Item 508

Item 509

Item 510

Item 511

Item 512

Item 513

Item 514

Item 515

Item 516

Item 517

Item 518

Item 519

Item 520

Item 521

Item 522

Item 523

Item 524

Item 525

Item 526

Item 527

Item 528

Item 529

Item 530

Item 531

Item 532

Item 533

Item 534

Item 535

Item 536

Item 537

Item 538

Item 539

Item 540

Item 541

Item 542

Item 543

Item 544

Item 545

Item 546

Item 547

Item 548

Item 549

Item 550

Item 551

Item 552

Item 553

Item 554

Item 555

Item 556

Item 557

Item 558

Item 559

Item 560

Item 561

Item 562

Item 563

Item 564

Item 565

Item 566

Item 567

Item 568

Item 569

Item 570

Item 571

Item 572

Item 573

Item 574

Item 575

Item 576

Item 577

Item 578

Item 579

Item 580

Item 581

Item 582

Item 583

Item 584

Item 585

Item 586

Item 587

Item 588

Item 589

Item 590

Item 591

Item 592

Item 593

Item 594

Item 595

Item 596

Item 597

Item 598

Item 599

Item 600

Item 601

Item 602

Item 603

Item 604

Item 605

Item 606

Item 607

Item 608

Item 609

Item 610

Item 611

Item 612

Item 613

Item 614

Item 615

Item 616

Item 617

Item 618

Item 619

Item 620

Item 621

Item 622

Item 623

Item 624

Item 625

Item 626

Item 627

Item 628

Item 629

Item 630

Item 631

Item 632

Item 633

Item 634

Item 635

Item 636

Item 637

Item 638

Item 639

Item 640

Item 641

Item 642

Item 643

Item 644

Item 645

Item 646

Item 647

Item 648

Item 649

Item 650

Item 651

Item 652

Item 653

Item 654

Item 655

Item 656

Item 657

Item 658

Item 659

Item 660

Item 661

Item 662

Item 663

Item 664

Item 665

Item 666

Item 667

Item 668

Item 669

Item 670

Item 671

Item 672

Item 673

Item 674

Item 675

Item 676

Item 677

Item 678

Item 679

Item 680

Item 681

Item 682

Item 683

Item 684

Item 685

Item 686

Item 687

Item 688

Item 689

Item 690

Item 691

Item 692

Item 693

Item 694

Item 695

Item 696

Item 697

Item 698

Item 699

Item 700

Item 701

Item 702

Item 703

Item 704

Item 705

Item 706

Item 707

Item 708

Item 709

Item 710

Item 711

Item 712

Item 713

Item 714

Item 715

Item 716

Item 717

Item 718

Item 719

Item 720

Item 721

Item 722

Item 723

Item 724

Item 725

Item 726

Item 727

Item 728

Item 729

Item 730

Item 731

Item 732

Item 733

Item 734

Item 735

Item 736

Item 737

Item 738

Item 739

Item 740

Item 741

Item 742

Item 743

Item 744

Item 745

Item 746

Item 747

Item 748

Item 749

Item 750

Item 751

Item 752

Item 753

Item 754

Item 755

Item 756

Item 757




Fig. 8. Experimental screens in the NCFP condition (Part 5).

The figure displays four sequential screenshots of the ECON RFL 7.0 experimental interface, showing the questionnaire, instructions, and results screens.

Questionnaire Screen: The interface shows a questionnaire titled "Questionnaire Socio-démographique". It includes sections for "Mes Révis" (with checkboxes for "Cliquez ici" and "Cliquez ici"), "Quel âge avez-vous ?" (with a dropdown menu set to 18), "Quel est votre niveau de diplôme ?" (with radio buttons for "Diplôme", "Licence", "Master", "PhD", "Autre"), "Quel est votre domaine d'étude ?" (with a dropdown menu set to "Autre"), "Quel est votre domaine d'activité ?" (with a dropdown menu set to "Autre"), and "Quel est votre langue maternelle ?" (with a dropdown menu set to "Français"). A "Suite" button is at the bottom.

Instructions Screen: The interface shows instructions for the experiment. It includes a section for "1. Choisissez le jeu de données à jouer, à partir de quatre options : vous jouerez avec des données réelles ou fictives." (with radio buttons for "Réelles" and "Fictives"), "2. Choisissez le jeu de données à jouer, à partir de quatre options : vous jouerez avec des données réelles ou fictives." (with radio buttons for "Réelles" and "Fictives"), "3. Choisissez le jeu de données à jouer, à partir de quatre options : vous jouerez avec des données réelles ou fictives." (with radio buttons for "Réelles" and "Fictives"), and "4. Choisissez le jeu de données à jouer, à partir de quatre options : vous jouerez avec des données réelles ou fictives." (with radio buttons for "Réelles" and "Fictives"). A "Suite" button is at the bottom.

Results Screen: The interface shows the results of the experiment. It includes a section for "L'expérience est terminée." (with a dropdown menu set to "Fin"), "Votre note de la tâche ou il fallait créer une histoire intéressante en utilisant tous les 10 mots à été classé 1ème." (with a dropdown menu set to "1ème"), "Votre gain pour la tâche réelle est égal à 9€." (with a dropdown menu set to "9€"), "Votre gain total pour le jeu d'investissement est égal à 16€." (with a dropdown menu set to "16€"), and a "Suite" button.

Final Screen: The interface shows the final results of the experiment. It includes a section for "L'expérience est terminée." (with a dropdown menu set to "Fin"), "Merci d'avoir participé à cette expérience." (with a dropdown menu set to "Fin"), and a "Fin" button.

Fig. 9. Experimental screens in the NCFP condition (Part 6).

Cette étude est réalisée par des chercheurs universitaires. L'objectif de cette recherche est de comprendre comment les personnes évaluent les réponses d'autres personnes.

L'étude a été approuvée par le Comité d'éthique pour la recherche (CER) de l'Université de Strasbourg. Veuillez noter que **toutes vos réponses resteront anonymes** et seront traitées de manière confidentielle. Les chercheurs ne connaissent pas votre identité et ne pourront pas associer votre nom aux réponses que vous fournissez.

En complétant ce questionnaire, vous consentez à participer à cette étude. **Votre participation est volontaire** et vous pouvez arrêter à tout moment. Le paiement est conditionnel à l'achèvement rigoureux de l'ensemble du questionnaire ; cependant, il vous est possible de quitter le questionnaire à tout moment si vous le souhaitez (toutes les données collectées seront détruites).

Pour toute question, vous pouvez contacter Dr. Anne-Gaëlle Maltese à l'adresse suivante, ag.maltese@unistra.fr

Si vous acceptez de participer à cette étude, veuillez choisir "Continuer". Si vous ne souhaitez pas participer, veuillez choisir "Quitter".

Continuer

Quitter



Quelques réponses ont été rédigées en réponse à la question : **"Si vous aviez le talent d'inventer des choses juste en y pensant, que créeriez-vous et pourquoi?"**. Nous vous demanderons d'évaluer le niveau de créativité de ces réponses.

J'aurais crée une machine pour connaître réellement les intentions des personnes. Si la personne démontre ce qu'elle réellement veut ou si tout simplement elle ment pour bien être dans la société. Je trouve qu'actuellement on connaît pas les vraies intentions ou envies des personnes puisqu'ils ont peur de se faire juger ou tout simplement parce qu'ils ne sont pas ce qu'ils disent être. Je pense à un monde qu'on pourrait être nous et pouvoir se faire confiance. Cela nous permet nous aussi de nous protéger et de prévoir nos actions dans pas mal de domaines de la vie.

1 (Pas du tout créatif)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 (Extrêmement créatif)



Quelle est votre genre?

Homme

Femme

Ne souhaite pas le dire

Quel âge avez-vous ?

18-24

25-34

35-44

45-54

55-64

plus de 65



À quelle fréquence vous engagez-vous dans des activités créatives ?

rarement 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 très fréquemment 9 10

Fréquence



À quel point aimez-vous vous engager dans des activités créatives ?

pas du tout 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 énormément 9 10

Préférence



Fig. 10. Evaluation screens on prolific.

NCI:

The NCI only differs from the NCFP condition due to a change in the payment structure.

In addition to the 6 euros that will be automatically paid to you at the end of your participation in this experiment, you may receive an additional payment for completing these tasks in the most creative way possible.

To determine this additional amount, your creative productions will be evaluated by 5 other participants who are not in your group and ranked against four other participants, and you will receive the amount corresponding to your ranking. You will receive 15 euros if you are first, 12 euros if you are second, 9 euros if you are third, 6 euros if you are fourth, and 3 euros if you are fifth. The ranking results will be communicated to you at the end of the experiment.

Note: Only one of the two tasks will be randomly selected to be actually paid. Each task has an equal 50 % chance of being selected. So, make sure to put in equal effort for both, as they have an identical chance of being paid.

CFP:

In this first part, you are part of a group of 5 participants and you will be asked to complete a task for which you will have 15 minutes. After finishing this task, we will ask you to answer a few questions.

In addition to the 6 euros that will be automatically paid to you at the end of your participation in this experiment, you will receive an additional payment of 9 euros for completing this task in the most creative way possible.

Your creative productions will also be evaluated by 5 other participants who are not in your group and ranked against four other participants, and the ranking results will be communicated to you at the end of the experiment. However, your additional payment will not depend on this evaluation and will always be 9 euros.

Among the two tasks that will be presented to you, we ask you to choose the one you wish to complete. As a reminder, we ask you to complete this task in the most creative way possible.

[The instructions of the Open and Closed tasks are presented on the screen.]

[Start of the follow-up questionnaire]

Chosen task : [Instructions of the specific task.]

1. *To what extent did you like performing this task?* [1–10]
2. *How clear was the goal to be achieved in this task?* [1–10]
3. *To what extent did you feel free to explore in this task?* [1–10]
4. *How would you rate your creative performance in this task?* [1–10]
5. *Do you think you performed better than the average of the other participants?* [1–10]

Unchosen task : [Instructions of the specific task.]

1. *How clear was the goal to be achieved in this task?* [1–10]
2. *To what extent did you feel free to explore in this task?* [1–10]
3. *Why did you prefer not to select this task compared to the other one?* [Open question]

CI:

The CI only differs from the CFP condition due to a change in the payment structure.

In addition to the 6 euros that will be automatically paid to you at the end of your participation in this experiment, you may receive an additional payment for completing this task in the most creative way possible.

To determine this additional amount, your creative production will be evaluated by 5 other participants who are not in your group and ranked against four other participants, and you will receive the amount corresponding to your ranking. You will receive 15 euros if you are first, 12 euros if you are second, 9 euros if you are third, 6 euros if you are fourth, and 3 euros if you are fifth. The ranking results will be communicated to you at the end of the experiment.

Part 2

In this second part, you are asked to evaluate the creative productions of other participants for each task. For this, each person's texts will be displayed on your screen, and we will ask you to rank them. After this evaluation, we will ask you to fill out a socio-demographic questionnaire, and the results of your ranking will be revealed to you.

Please rank the five texts below in ascending order from the best to the least good, with no ties allowed between two texts.

Questionnaires**Sociodemographic and creativity-related information**

1. You are: [Gender]
2. How old are you?
3. What is your level of education?
4. What is your field of study?
5. What is your native language?
6. In everyday life, how often do you engage in creative activities?
7. In everyday life, how much do you enjoy engaging in creative activities?

Risk and ambiguity questions

You have 100 units and can invest part of this amount in an asset with a 50 % chance of success, which pays 2.5 times the invested amount in case of success. You can keep the uninvested units. Please note that a lottery will be played, consisting of a jar with 5 blue balls and 5 yellow balls. If a yellow ball is drawn, the invested amount will be multiplied by 2.5. If a blue ball is drawn, the invested amount will be lost. One of you will be randomly selected and paid based on the amount indicated in this question, with 100 units being equivalent to 1 euro. How much would you like to invest in this asset?

You have 100 units and can invest a portion of this amount in an asset whose chances of success are unknown, and which pays 2.5 times the amount invested in case of success. You can keep the uninvested units. Please note that a lottery will be played, which consists of a urn containing blue and yellow balls. You do not know how many yellow and blue balls are in the urn. If a yellow ball is drawn, the invested amount will be multiplied by 2.5. If a blue ball is drawn, the invested amount will be lost. One of you will be randomly selected and paid based on the amount indicated in this question, 100 units is equivalent to 1 euro. How much would you like to invest in this asset?

A.1. Instructions for creativity assessment

The following instructions, translated from French to English, were presented to external judges who evaluated the creative outputs collected during in-lab experimental sessions. Fig. 10 presents the screens shown to online external judges.

General Instructions

This study is conducted by university researchers. The objective of this research is to understand how people evaluate the responses of others. The study has been approved by the Research Ethics Committee (CER) of the University of Strasbourg. Please note that all your responses will remain anonymous and will be treated confidentially. The researchers do not know your identity and will not be able to associate your name with the responses you provide.

By completing this questionnaire, you consent to participate in this study. Your participation is voluntary, and you may stop at any time. Payment is conditional upon the thorough completion of the entire questionnaire; however, you are free to exit the questionnaire at any time if you wish (all collected data will be deleted).

For any questions, you may contact Dr. Anne-Gaëlle Maltese at the following Email address: ag.maltese@unistra.fr

If you agree to participate in this study, please select “Continue”. If you do not wish to participate, please select “Exit”.

Creative evaluation

Some responses were written in answer to the question: [Task instructions] We will ask you to evaluate the level of creativity of these responses. [Scale from 1 (Not creative at all) to 10 (Extremely creative).]

Additional questions

1. What is your gender?
2. How old are you?
3. How often do you engage in creative activities?
4. How much do you enjoy engaging in creative activities?

References

- Acar, O.A., Tarakci, M., Van Knippenberg, D., 2019. Creativity and innovation under constraints: a cross-disciplinary integrative review. *J. Manage.* 45 (1), 96–121.
- Amabile, T.M., 1982. Social psychology of creativity: a consensual assessment technique. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 43, 997–1013.
- Amabile, T.M., Gryskiewicz, N.D., 1989. The creative environment scales: work environment inventory. *Creat. Res. J.* 2 (4), 231–253.
- Amabile, T.M., Hennessey, B.A., Grossman, B.S., 1986. Social influences on creativity: the effects of contracted-for reward. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 50 (1), 14.
- Ariely, D., Gneezy, U., Loewenstein, G., Mazar, N., 2009. Large stakes and big mistakes. *Rev. Econ. Stud.* 76 (2), 451–469.
- Attanasi, G., Chessa, M., Gil-Gallen, S., Llerena, P., 2021. A survey on experimental elicitation of creativity in economics. *Revue d'écon. Indust.* (174), 273–324.
- Bandura, A., 1997. Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. Vol. 604. Freeman.
- Charness, G., Grieco, D., 2019. Creativity and incentives. *J. Eur. Econ. Assoc.* 17 (2), 454–496.
- Charness, G., Grieco, D., 2023. Creativity and corporate culture. *Econ. J.* 133 (653), 1846–1870.
- Collins, M.A., Amabile, T.M., 1999. Motivation and creativity.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., Getzels, J.W., 1970. Concern for discovery: an attitudinal component of creative production. *J. Pers.*
- Danz, D., 2020. Never underestimate your opponent: hindsight bias causes overplacement and overentry into competition. *Games Econ. Behav.* 124, 588–603.
- Deci, E.L., Ryan, R.M., 2002. Self-determination research. Reflections and Future Directions. In: E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research*, University of Rochester Press. pp.431–441.
- Deci, E.L., Ryan, R.M., Deci, E.L., Ryan, R.M., 1985. Conceptualizations of intrinsic motivation and self-determination. *Intrin. Motiv. Self-determin. Human Behav.* 11–40.
- Dillon, J.T., 1982. Problem finding and solving. *J. Creat. Behav.*
- Eddy, E.R., Tannenbaum, S.I., Mathieu, J.E., 2013. Helping teams to help themselves: comparing two team-led debriefing methods. *Pers. Psychol.* 66 (4), 975–1008.
- Erat, S., Gneezy, U., 2016. Incentives for creativity. *Experim. Econ.* 19, 269–280.
- Galenison, D.W., 2006. A portrait of the artist as a young or old innovator measuring the careers of modern novelists. *Histor. Methods: A J. Quantit. Interdiscipl. History* 39 (2), 51–72.
- Getzels, J.W., Csikszentmihalyi, M., 1967. Scientific creativity. *Sci. J.* 3, 80–84.
- Gneezy, U., Potters, J., 1997. An experiment on risk taking and evaluation periods. *Q. J. Econ.* 112 (2), 631–645.
- Guilford, J.P., 1956. The structure of intellect. *Psychol. Bull.* 53 (4), 267.
- Haught-Tromp, C., 2017. The green eggs and ham hypothesis: how constraints facilitate creativity. *Psychol. Aesthet. Creat. Arts.* 11 (1), 10.
- Kaufman, J.C., Sternberg, R.J., 2010. Constraints on Creativity: Obvious and Not So Obvious. *The cambridge handbook of creativity*, 467–482.
- Knight, F.H., 1921. Risk, Uncertainty and Profit. Vol. 31. Houghton Mifflin.

- Laske, K., Schroeder, M., 2017. Quantity, quality and originality: the effects of incentives on creativity.
- Lazear, E.P., 2000. Performance pay and productivity. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 90 (5), 1346–1361.
- List, J.A., Shaikh, A.M., Xu, Y., 2019. Multiple hypothesis testing in experimental economics. *Experim. Econ.* 22, 773–793.
- Locke, E.A., Latham, G.P., 1990. A theory of goal setting & task performance. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Mittelstädt, V., Mackenzie, I.G., Baier, D., Goetz, L., Wittbecker, P., Leuthold, H., 2025. The benefit of choice on task performance: reduced difficulty effects in free-choice versus forced-choice tasks. *Memory Cognit.* 53 (4), 1162–1177.
- Neckermann, S., Warnke, A.J., Bradler, C., 2014. Rewards and performance: a comparison across creative and routine tasks. In: *Academy of Management Proceedings*. Vol. 2014. Academy of Management Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510, p. 14335.
- Schwartz, B., 2004. *The Paradox of Choice: Why Less is More*. New York: Ecco.
- Tromp, C., Sternberg, R.J., 2024. How constraints impact creativity: an interaction paradigm. *Psychol. Aesthet. Creat. Arts.* .
- Unsworth, K., 2001. Unpacking creativity. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 26 (2), 289–297.
- Wrzesniewski, A., Dutton, J.E., 2001. Crafting a job: revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 26 (2), 179–201.