



PART 1

Read the text below and answer questions 1–13.

AI AS A CREATIVE PARTNER: FROM TOOL TO COLLABORATOR

A For much of its public history, artificial intelligence has been framed as a technology for calculation: sorting data, predicting demand, or optimising logistics. Yet in the past decade, a different picture has taken hold. AI systems now compose background music, generate concept art, draft advertising copy, and propose architectural sketches, shifting the debate from efficiency to imagination. This has revived an old philosophical provocation—can machines be creative?—but practitioners increasingly ask a more practical question: how does AI change what humans can create? In many studios and classrooms, AI is not treated as a replacement for human imagination but as a partner that can prompt, accelerate, and complicate the creative process. The collaboration is imperfect, sometimes uncanny, and often surprisingly productive, because it introduces a new kind of “other mind” into the act of making.

B Most creative AI tools are built on neural networks trained through an iterative process on vast datasets of existing human work. These datasets may include photographs, paintings, musical scores, film scripts, product designs, or billions of sentences of text. Rather than learning explicit rules for what a poem or a portrait “should” be, the model learns statistical regularities: patterns of colour and composition, rhythms and harmonic movement, or the typical structure of a persuasive paragraph. With generative models, a user can then request new outputs by setting parameters—style, mood, length, or level of randomness—and the system produces material that is similar to what it has seen without being identical to any single source. In simple terms, the output is a recombination of learned elements guided by user choices, a form of algorithmic mimicry that can still yield novel-seeming combinations when the search space is large.

C In practice, this capacity is most useful at the stage where creators need options quickly. In music production, a composer may ask an AI assistant for variations on a chord progression to match a particular emotional tone. In visual design, a creator might generate a set of rough images from text prompts and then refine the most promising draft by hand. Writers use similar workflows. When a project stalls—because a narrative feels flat or the first paragraph will not land—an AI tool can offer alternative outlines, openings, metaphors, or examples that help the author move past a temporary lack of ideas. The key point is not that the machine “knows” what is best, but that it can produce a large menu of possibilities in minutes, allowing the human to focus on selection, revision, and coherence.



D The spread of these practices has unsettled traditional ideas about originality. A painting may be conceived by a human, generated in seconds by a model, and then edited for hours; a song might be built from AI-suggested motifs but arranged with distinctly human taste. This blurs the line between intention and execution, making questions of attribution unusually complicated. If a model has learned style patterns from many artists, what does it mean to credit a single final work? The passage of creative labour through a system trained on collective cultural production challenges older assumptions that authorship is easy to locate in one maker. Even where the law has not caught up, the philosophical issue remains: when part of the creative act is delegated to an algorithm, credit becomes harder to assign in the familiar way.

E Many working artists and designers respond by treating AI as a component in a hybrid approach rather than as an autonomous creator. In this approach, the human sets goals, defines constraints, and provides emotional direction, while the machine supplies rapid iteration. The human then curates: choosing what to keep, what to discard, and what to reshape. This curation is not trivial. It requires a developed sense of quality and a willingness to reject outputs that are superficially impressive but conceptually weak. In effect, the partnership changes the distribution of effort. Instead of spending most time producing a first draft, the creator may spend more time directing the system and refining the final version. The process resembles working with a fast but unreliable assistant: valuable for speed and variety, but dependent on strong human judgment.

F That shift has consequences for skills and workflow. Prompt design becomes a practical craft, because a vague request often yields generic results, while a precise request can steer the system toward a clearer aesthetic. Likewise, evaluation becomes central. When an AI generates ten options, the crucial competence is not generating more, but recognising which option has potential and which is misleading. This can be uncomfortable for people trained in traditional craft routes, because the visible “making” appears to happen quickly, while the hidden labour becomes decision-making and editing. Yet in professional contexts, these editorial skills have always mattered; AI simply brings them to the foreground. It also changes collaboration inside teams: designers may iterate faster, clients may expect more variations, and deadlines may shift toward rapid prototyping rather than slow development.

G At the same time, AI-generated work can display a tendency toward sameness. Because many systems learn from mainstream examples—popular genres, common compositional templates, frequently repeated visual motifs—the default outputs can converge on familiar patterns. Early drafts may look polished yet predictable, especially when users choose safe prompts or accept the first plausible result. To avoid this, skilled creators deliberately



push for novelty by introducing constraints, mixing unusual references, or using prompts that break typical patterns. They may also treat AI outputs as raw material rather than finished products, imposing narrative logic and personal style that the model cannot reliably maintain on its own. In this sense, AI can increase the risk of cliché while also providing tools to escape it—depending on the user’s intent and skill.

H One widely noted effect of AI-assisted creation is democratization. People without formal training can generate a logo concept, a video soundtrack, or a short story draft that appears professional at first glance. This lowers barriers to entry in many creative markets and can broaden participation. However, democratization does not eliminate expertise; it redistributes it. Expertise shows up in the ability to set clear goals, detect weak outputs, and recognise when an image is inconsistent, a text is subtly wrong, or a musical idea is derivative. In classrooms, teachers increasingly describe AI not as a shortcut to excellence but as a new medium that demands critical literacy. Those who can evaluate and refine will gain more from the tools than those who simply accept what is produced.

I Ultimately, the most accurate description of AI in creativity may be that it amplifies. It can accelerate iteration, widen the range of possible ideas, and make certain kinds of experimentation cheaper and faster. But it does not automatically supply meaning, responsibility, or taste—the elements that tie creative work to human values and to the social world. When creators treat AI as a magic solution, outputs can become shallow or incoherent; when they treat it as a threat, they may miss opportunities for new forms of craft. The strongest work tends to emerge when humans approach AI as a collaborator with distinct strengths and clear limitations, and when they remain accountable for what they choose to publish, perform, or build.

Questions 1–5

The text has nine paragraphs, **A–I**. Which paragraph contains the following information? Choose the correct letter, **A–I**.

- 1** A warning that early results may become predictable unless users deliberately push for novelty.
- 2** An example of AI being used to help creators move past a temporary lack of ideas.
- 3** An explanation that AI outputs are produced by recombining learned material under human-controlled settings.
- 4** An explanation that unclear instructions tend to produce generic results, making the formulation of prompts an important skill.



5 A claim that creative credit becomes unclear when intention and execution are split between human and machine.

Questions 6–9

Complete the summary below. Choose **NO MORE THAN TWO WORDS** from the text for each answer.

AI-Assisted Creative Work

AI creative systems are trained on **6** of existing human work. Using **7**, they can produce new material that resembles what they have learned without copying a single source. When part of the creative act is delegated to an algorithm, **8** becomes harder to assign in the familiar way. Many practitioners therefore adopt a **9** that combines rapid machine iteration with human direction and judgement.

Questions 10–13

Choose **TRUE** if the statement agrees with the information given in the text, choose **FALSE** if the statement contradicts the information, or choose **NOT GIVEN** if there is no information on this.

10 The passage suggests that AI is mainly useful for producing rapid variations that humans can then evaluate and shape.

11 The passage states that AI-generated creative tools are already regulated by international copyright law.

12 The passage suggests that many AI outputs can look similar because models often learn from mainstream examples.

13 The passage argues that AI automatically provides human meaning and responsibility in creative work.

Answer Key

1. G
2. C
3. B
4. F
5. D
6. vast datasets



- 7. generative models
- 8. credit
- 9. hybrid approach
- 10. TRUE
- 11. NOT GIVEN
- 12. TRUE
- 13. FALSE