

# Social Life Simulation for Non-Cognitive Skills Learning

ZIHAN YAN, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, USA

YAOHONG XIANG, Northeastern University, USA

YUN HUANG, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, USA




Fig. 1. The selection and usage of the sage agent in *SimuLife++*. (a) Sage selection - users could select a sage agent from the displayed sage agents list; (b) Sage agent comment messages - The sage agent gives comments after the users make a choice or finish a chat; (c) Consult sage agent during decision-making - Users could consult the sage agent for advice or help when they need to make a decision; and (d) Consult sage agent during conversation with characters - Users could consult the sage agent during a individual chat or group chat if they are unsure about how to continuing conversation.

Non-cognitive skills are crucial for personal and social life well-being, and such skill development can be supported by narrative-based (e.g., storytelling) technologies. While generative AI enables interactive and role-playing storytelling, little is known about how users engage with and perceive the use of AI in social life simulation for non-cognitive skills learning. To this end, we introduced *SimuLife++*, an interactive platform enabled by a large language model (LLM). The system allows users to act as protagonists, creating stories with one or multiple AI-based characters in diverse social scenarios. In particular, we expanded the Human-AI interaction to a Human-AI-AI collaboration by including a sage agent, who acts as a

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](mailto:permissions@acm.org).

Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY

© 2018 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXX>

bystander to provide users with more insightful perspectives on their choices and conversations. Through a within-subject user study, we found that the inclusion of the sage agent significantly enhanced narrative immersion, according to the narrative transportation scale, leading to more messages, particularly in group chats. Participants' interactions with the sage agent were also associated with significantly higher scores in their perceived motivation, self-perceptions, and resilience and coping, indicating positive impacts on non-cognitive skills reflection. Participants' interview results further explained the sage agent's aid in decision-making, solving ethical dilemmas, and problem-solving; on the other hand, they suggested improvements in user control and balanced responses from multiple characters. We provide design implications on the application of generative AI in narrative solutions for non-cognitive skill development in broader social contexts.

CCS Concepts: • **Human-centered computing** → **Collaborative and social computing systems and tools**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Generative AI, Non-Cognitive Skill, Social Life Simulation, Narrative

**ACM Reference Format:**

Zihan Yan, Yaohong Xiang, and Yun Huang. 2018. Social Life Simulation for Non-Cognitive Skills Learning. In . ACM, New York, NY, USA, 24 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Non-cognitive skills (e.g., emotional intelligence, resilience, motivation, perseverance, and teamwork) are essential for effective teamwork, leadership, and problem-solving [10, 33, 37]. Narrative techniques have been applied to support the development of non-cognitive skills [24, 30, 55]. For example, through storytelling, narratives engage students, motivating them to develop empathy, social acumen, and problem-solving skills [34]. Unlike traditional learning methods that focus on knowledge transfer, narrative techniques encourage active participation and reflection, which are crucial for mastering interpersonal skills [5, 25]. Among these techniques, interactive storytelling provides a dynamic platform for users to engage in the narrative actively, making decisions that simulate real-life challenges, thereby fostering decision-making and critical thinking [64]. For example, digital role-playing narratives have been employed to address this need, combining cognitive engagement with practical application in a controlled yet dynamic setting [54, 77].

The rise of generative AI has opened avenues for more dynamic interactive storytelling [65, 73, 76]. For example, large language models (LLMs) are used to generate narratives [78], creating more personalized and socially plausible narratives for diverse scenarios [79]. However, little is known about *how users engage with and perceive the use of generative AI in social life simulation for non-cognitive skills learning*.

To this end, we designed and developed an interactive platform called *SimuLife++*, allowing users to take on the role of the protagonist who interacts with either one or multiple LLM-enabled characters in challenging social scenarios. As illustrated in Fig. 2, users' choices and chats with the AI characters influence the progress and outcomes of their simulated life journey. To further support users' development of non-cognitive skills, we proposed a unique AI role, a sage agent, who may be a real philosopher in history or a fictional character in well-known movies. As shown in Fig. 1, a sage agent can be called upon by users at any moment throughout their journey to help them reflect on different aspects pertaining to non-cognitive skills. Our design aims to enable a rich, multifaceted experience that is not only entertaining but also thought-provoking.

To evaluate the effectiveness of *SimuLife++*, we conducted a within-subject user study. Our quantitative results showed that the sage role significantly improved engagement, with participants sending longer and more frequent messages. It also aided in their reflection on developing several non-cognitive skills, including motivation, self-perceptions, resilience, and coping. Compared to chatting with just one AI character, participants sent significantly more messages in group chats with multiple AI characters. The interview results further explained the benefits of the sage role in supporting participants' decision-making and encouraging open-mindedness, which was particularly helpful when multiple characters gave different opinions. Meanwhile, participants would like to have

more control in calling the sage agent to shape the stories and requested a more balanced conversation when chatting with multiple characters.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We designed and developed a human-AI collaboration system for reflecting on non-cognitive skills through narrative-based social life simulation, featuring a conversational interface for user interaction with multiple LLM-based characters.
- We also proposed a sage agent design to expand the human-AI conversation into a human-AI-AI conversation, where an AI character serves as a bystander to prompt users' reflection on perspectives related to their non-cognitive skills during and after the storytelling.
- We conducted a user study and provided empirical evidence on the effect of the sage and group chat design. Our results provide design implications for using generative AI to better support the development of non-cognitive skills in broader social settings.

## 2 RELATED WORK

In this section, we first present literature on non-cognitive skill enhancement and how narrative-based solutions facilitate non-cognitive skill development via direct involvement, observation, and reflection on storytelling. Finally, we provide background information on generative AI for interactive storytelling, which illustrates how to enable AI-enabled social life simulation with storytelling.

### 2.1 Non-cognitive Skills Enhancement

Non-cognitive skills—rooted in emotional intelligence, adaptability, and collaboration—hold the promise of forging resilient individuals and fostering a society that thrives on mutual success and well-being [35]. They can be cultivated and are malleable, even into adulthood [37, 42]. Numerous theories have been developed for different non-cognitive skills. For example, Carol Dweck's "growth mindset" [21, 22] posits that skills can be improved through effort. Angela Duckworth's concept of grit [20] focuses on perseverance and passion, and Deci and Ryan's self-determination theory (SDT) [17], addresses the influence of motivation and the need for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Social and emotional learning (SEL) [71] promotes empathy, decision-making, and relationship skills.

Extensive literature shows that narratives effectively influence non-cognitive beliefs and behaviors. Stories are inherently motivating, with research identifying psychological elements—temporality, spatiality, protagonist, causality, and intentionality—that readers use to interpret events [82]. Immersion in a story, likened to a state of flow [32, 48], persuasively aligns the reader's beliefs, emotions, and intentions with the narrative [31, 50, 69]. Narrative absorption suppresses counterarguments, reducing cognitive resistance [63]; and the entertaining nature of narratives diminishes cognitive resistance and psychological reactance [15, 18, 49, 58]. Especially, "narrative engagement" builds on the idea of transportation, identifying that people combine information from the text with personal experience to construct a mental model of story events [11, 12], which can have strong impacts on attitude and behavior.

Additionally, interactive storytelling transcends traditional narratives by offering a dynamic platform where users actively shape the story through their decisions and actions, experiencing it from a first-person perspective rather than as mere observers [16, 47]. This participatory approach immerses users in lifelike scenarios to apply and test skills in a controlled environment, while navigating the story in first-person view allowing them to gain insights and learn about critical thinking, problem-solving, and decision-making from their experiences [29, 36]. However, prior solutions did not utilize the capabilities of generative AI, which can offer real-time feedback during storytelling, enabling users to reflect on their non-cognitive skills.

## 2.2 Generative AI for Interactive Storytelling

Digital techniques, such as generative AI, are increasingly influential in the field of interactive storytelling, reshaping how narratives are both created and experienced [72]. LLMs are used to produce narratives [78] and to craft more personalized, socially plausible narratives suitable for a variety of scenarios [79]. Storytelling also makes learning more engaging [38]. Systems like "WoTEdu" have integrated the Web of Things to make museum exhibits more interactive, offering multi-modal engagement with artifacts and providing inclusive access for individuals with motor impairments [2]. Additionally, LLMs are demonstrated in works such as co-authoring fiction, e.g. "A Redhead Walks into a Bar," suggesting the AI's capability to augment human creativity [27].

Moreover, interactive storytelling is expanding with novel methods like physiologically driven storytelling, which personalize the narrative based on the reader's physical responses [26]. For example, Gilroy et al. proposed a system that monitors physiological responses to adapt narrative elements such as character relationships and story pacing [28]. This adaptive approach is further exemplified in projects that allow entire texts to evolve in real-time, influenced by the user's interactive input [53], showcasing the adaptive and responsive capabilities of generative AI in storytelling. Despite the emergence of interactive storytelling tools using AI, there remains a lack of empirical understanding regarding users' engagement with, and perception of, utilizing generative AI in social life simulations for non-cognitive skills learning.

## 3 SIMULIFE++ SYSTEM

Drawing from the literature previously discussed, we propose a Large Language Model (LLM)-based storytelling system, named *SimuLife++*. This system is specifically designed to facilitate reflection on non-cognitive skills through interactive storytelling within social life simulations. In this section, we initially present the system's design, followed by three design requirements identified from a formative study for enhancements. Subsequently, we detail the revised design and its implementation, which were assessed in the final evaluation.

### 3.1 Initial Design: Individual Chat with One AI Character

To understand how to better mimic social life with an interactive storytelling system and how to promote non-cognitive skill learning through social life simulation, we conducted a formative study using an initial probe prototype. The probe prototype featured a basic visual-language interactive storytelling function and was used as a probe to engage users actively. Our focus was on assessing user interactions with generative AI-based story-writing functions and their responses to two fundamental interactive features. The design was intended to reflect key elements of social life: "what we do," as illustrated in Fig. 2 (d), and "what we say," akin to Fig. 2 (e), though featuring only one AI character.

Participants were undergraduate students who utilized the initial prototype as a design resource in an HCI studio class. They were practicing three design methodologies: Reflective Design [61], Critical Design [4], and Narrative Design [6]. Individually, they brainstormed new features to enhance the prototype. They chose one of the design methods and provided voluntary, anonymous feedback via a Google Form, resulting in a total of 18 responses ( $N = 18$ ). The feedback highlighted three key design requirements, outlined as follows.

- **R1: Introducing a Reflective Sage Agent** - Participants recommended the inclusion of an "AI helper" designed to offer strategic guidance in complex situations and respond to questions. This suggestion led to the introduction of a sage agent, akin to a non-player character (NPC), envisioned as a wise companion. Its role is to provide insights, thereby enriching the narratives and facilitating deeper reflection on reflection and skill learning through storytelling.
- **R2: Facilitating Group Chatting** - Participants noted that the current system limits interactions to one character at a time, leading to linear narratives. Introducing multi-agent interactions could add complexity

and depth to the storytelling, better reflecting real-life social intricacies. Enabling interactions with multiple characters could potentially enhance user engagement.

- **R3: Developing Detailed Character Personas** - Participants found the initial AI characters "lacking personality," thus they suggest creating more AI characters with rich social backstories and diverse personalities to "enrich the context" and promote "deeper" social connections.

Note that the first requirement [R1], aims to promote non-cognitive skill development, aligning with our research objective. The last two requirements [R2, R3] focus on creating a more realistic simulation of social life, which is the foundation of our system, in the Human-AI collaborative storytelling. In response to the design requirements and design goal derived from the formative study, we finalized the design. The remainder of this section presents the interaction workflow and implementation details.

### 3.2 Interaction Workflow & Key Features of *SimuLife++*

Our *SimuLife++* system (Fig. 2) offers a digital storytelling experience, enabling users to make decisions and engage in conversations as the main character. LLM adapts the narrative to each user's choices and conversations, creating an adaptive journey of simulated social life. Two key interactive modes, decision-making and character conversation (i.e., individual chat and group chat), reflect two essential aspects of social life: actions and communication. For decision-making, users are presented with three options at some critical moments in the story, allowing them to direct the narrative's continuing. Additionally, users can chat with characters they encounter, checking their personas, fostering immersion, and deepening their understanding of the story world. The conversation will also influence follow-up story development. And during the whole simulated social life journey, users are accompanied by the selected sage agent. After the whole journey, users could engage in reflection activities.

**3.2.1 Before Simulated Social Life Journey.** Registration with email and agreement to the terms and privacy policy is required to start using *SimuLife++*, they will then be directed to the home page to log in, as shown in Fig. 2 (a). We provide two subsection pages. The first page demonstrates stories that could be selected and script play histories that could be revisited. On this page, users can choose a script or story to start a new adventure or view their previous adventures, as shown in Fig. 2 (b). In current *SimuLife++*, three scripts are provided: *Shantaram*<sup>1</sup>, *Harry Potter*<sup>2</sup>, and *The Witcher*<sup>3</sup>. We use them because all of these story settings are far from real life and relatively fair to different participants who have different memories and experiences. The second page is for sage agent selection. Especially, a sage agent [R1] list is provided for users to select their sage agent companion, e.g., Rabindranath Tagore could be selected as shown in Fig.1 (a). Note that, if users don't want to have a sage agent, users could select "None." These sage agents will observe the user's virtual life progression and enrich users' reflections with philosophical insights, spurring users to ponder their choices and the broader consequences of their virtual behaviors.

After users select the social life (e.g., story) they hope to experience, the system will provide some background information about the basic story plot and the main characters involved. On this page, the users will also be informed about which role they will play in the story, and they will experience the story as the main character from the first-person view. This page also introduces the main AI characters users might encounter in the story. As shown in Fig. 2 (c), for instance, detailed character profiles of Harry, Ron, Hermione, Dumbledore, and Voldemort are presented, offering users insightful overviews of the main characters.

<sup>1</sup>[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shantaram\\_\(novel\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shantaram_(novel))

<sup>2</sup>[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harry\\_Potter](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harry_Potter)

<sup>3</sup>[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Witcher](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Witcher)



Fig. 2. The interfaces of *SimuLife++* includes: (a) a login page requiring email, password, and agreement to policies and terms; (b) a home page displaying scripts for users to choose from and their history of script-play collections; (c) a script description page listing information about the story, including its name, original author, description, and main characters; (d) a decision-making page involving an event where users can choose one of three options; (e) an individual chat page primarily featuring a chat event with one character, where the left side shows the story and the right side displays the conversation panel; (f) a social media check page consisting of the social media post information for the character involved in the individual chat; (g) a group chat page displaying a group chat event from the story, with the story on the left and the conversation panel on the right; (h) a character background page enabling users to check background information and persona for each character encountered in the story.

**3.2.2 During Simulated Social Life Journey.** Upon starting on the interactive journey, users will navigate through various stages in the story plot, encountering three types of events (i.e., decision-making, individual chat, and group chat) for story continuation, where the narrative progressively unfolds, captivating users and maintaining their connection to the evolving plot. For the decision making, our system mocks "choices making at life's crossroads." At some critical moments, users are faced with different paths (i.e., action selections), each with its own set of potential risks and rewards. Our *SimuLife++* system will provide three options for users to select, as shown in Fig. 2 (d). For instance, in the story "*Harry Potter*", users might encounter a situation in the story where Hogwarts is under mysterious attacks before a Quidditch event, and the system might let users choose an option to prioritize. Users might choose to "*Investigate the mysterious attacks.*" "*Focus on studying and training for Quidditch.*" or "*Talk to prof. Lupin for guidance.*" Choosing different options will make the story develop in various ways, mirroring how decisions made in social life also have consequential follow-up influences.

Users can engage in a "individual chat" (Fig. 2 (e&f)) or "group chat" (Fig. 2(g&h)) [R2]. Anytime, users can also access the social media page (Fig. 2(f)) and background persona information of a character (Fig. 2(h) [R3] to better understand their personalities and communication styles. Every conversation could influence the LLM's dynamic generation of subsequent story segments, offering a relatively personalized and adaptive experience where users not only live through the characters but also steer the narrative.

For the individual chat, the user only chats with one AI character, and the system gives three social media posts in each character's voice, providing users with a glimpse into their past experiences, interests, and perspectives. For instance, users might converse with one AI character, like Luna Lovegood, who is a unique and eccentric Ravenclaw student known for her dreamy and whimsical nature. She often believes in strange creatures and conspiracy theories, which makes her an interesting but sometimes misunderstood character. The system creates his persona by providing three social media, "*Just spotted a pod of Nargles near the Forbidden Forest! They seemed quite mischievous today.*" "*Spending my afternoon making mystical jewelry. If you need any Wrackspurt protection, let me know!*" and "*Lost in a daydream, wondering if Crumple-Horned Snorkacks could be real. I'm determined to find one!*" Through these media posts, users can gain a relatively comprehensive understanding of Luna's peculiar personality, fostering a sense of connection and investment in their story arc. Such information also enables users to know how to communicate with this character.

Group chats typically involve 3-5 characters. Users can participate in the conversation by messaging, and the multiple AI characters will respond and communicate with each other to facilitate a group discussion. Group chats allow users to experience complex social interactions and practice key skills such as teamwork, conflict resolution, and communication within a multi-character setting. For instance, in a narrative inspired by the Harry Potter universe, users might find themselves in a group chat set within the Gryffindor common room, where characters like Hermione, Ron, Neville, and Ginny are debating the strategy to approach the solve Voltmort's dangerous artifacts during the Triwizard Tournament. Note that, our *SimuLife++* system only provides brief character background information for each character in the group chat, as shown in Fig. 2 (h), rather than their social media post. Such a setting is also similar to our real-life social situation – when we engage in individual chat, we have more time to understand one person, but in the group chat, we might only ask for basic background information.

As shown in Fig.1, if the user has selected a sage, the user will be accompanied by the sage agent [R1], which remains silent during each turn of decision-making or conversation. This is to ensure that the presence of the sage agent does not influence the users' free will. Only after the users make a decision or complete a conversation will the sage agent auto-pop their thoughts. As users contribute their decisions or conversations, the sage agent will auto-engage with and comment on the user's input. For example, imagine in the group Triwizard Tournament, a user dedicated and eager to perform himself/herself, so much so that he overlooks the assistance of his friends. In such instances, a sage agent (e.g., Rabindranath Tagore), could emerge to remind the user about the importance of teamwork and communication, as illustrated in Fig. 1 (b). Besides these automated messages, users can engage

in open-ended conversations with their sage agent to seek help actively during decision-making or conversation. The AI companion takes on the role of an evocative mentor by deriving reflective cues related to non-cognitive skills, spurring users to ponder their choices and the broader consequences of their virtual behaviors.

*3.2.3 After Simulated Social Life Journey.* Upon completing a story, users are presented with philosophical quotes and wisdom, designed to prompt reflection on their simulated life journey. For instance, in the Harry Potter story, the system might show *"It does not do well to dwell on dreams and forget to live," "It takes a great deal of bravery to stand up to our enemies, but just as much to stand up to our friends,"* and *"Fear of a name increases fear of the thing itself."* They also have the opportunity to share their thoughts and reflections on these experiences. In response, our system employs AI to create custom images, visually encapsulating their personal journey and interpretations. This process not only encourages users to introspect but also allows them to visualize their insights, enhancing their understanding and engagement with the narrative they have just experienced. Finally, our system also includes a feature that allows users to review their past simulated life journey experiences. This functionality offers users the chance to reflect on their choices and the narrative paths they took. Key aspects of this feature include a history collection, which contains a curated history of completed stories, decisions made, dialogues, and narrative forks, thereby enhancing the replay value.

### 3.3 Technical Implementation

Our platform leverages React.js<sup>4</sup> for its front-end development, ensuring responsive and dynamic user interactions. Its implementation of a virtual document object model (DOM) could accelerate updates by re-rendering only the necessary parts of the page, thereby enhancing the workflow efficiency of the story page in *SimuLife++*. Concurrently, our backend, powered by Django<sup>5</sup>, handles data operations and AI integration. In general, we use the API of "gpt-3.5-turbo" model for text generation.

*3.3.1 Prompt Templating.* In *SimuLife++*, templated prompts and user data enhance script switching, sage agents, and story events. The backend holds story metadata like background, plot, user roles, characters, and sage agents. New events trigger templated prompts and story lists sent to "gpt-3.5-turbo" for response generation. Our unified character creation includes profiles with descriptions, relationships, traits, and social media posts, with initial conversations in one API call for efficiency and coherence. Responses are in JSON for easy integration with the React.js component. In group chats, characters have memory and chats begin with a random sentence. For initiating character generation, prompt *"Define the relationship between this character and the user and provide the character's first sentence he/she said to the user. Additionally, create three social media posts for the characters to reveal their personality."*

The "sage agent" stands as a pivotal element within our system. Its design is centered around offering perceptive and relevant commentary during script play. However, this interactive feature is activated only under specific conditions: either after the user makes a decision, concludes a chat session, or proactively initiates a dialogue with the Sage Agent. This design ensures that the Sage Agent's contributions are both contextually appropriate and timely, enhancing the overall user experience. The sage agent's comments on events are generated based on prompts to set AI's identity as a given sage and generate a response in the sage's tone. For this functionality, the prompt includes: *"Your task is to write a comment in 30 tokens for user input to help users reflect on their non-cognitive skills in decision-making or dialogue while aiding in the development of these abilities. You should write in the tone of SAGENAME."* Reflective prompts develop non-cognitive skills. Prompt engineering details are attached in **Appendix** (see supplementary material).

<sup>4</sup><https://legacy.reactjs.org/>

<sup>5</sup><https://www.djangoproject.com/>

**3.3.2 Prompt Compress and Memory.** To boost model response speed and maintain AI memory, some strategies are adopted here: (1) Using "gpt-3.5-turbo" for fast processing; (2) Managing input prompt and response lengths. We make a trade-off between the quality and quantity of output words and response time by setting the length of the input prompt within 1000 words and the output within 70 words. The prompt for generating a story is as follows: "Generate the next storyline with 3 to 5 story-relevant keywords in 70 words in the second person's view." (3) Summarization of stories. With story progression, prompts increase input size. A summarization function activates when the prompt list exceeds a certain length. In *SimuLife++*, summarization will be triggered after 10 stories using "gpt-3.5-turbo" to condense and update the total prompt; (4) Summarizing older stories while keeping recent ones. Summarization will be made on the 7 oldest stories out of 10 stories fed to the function, balancing user-driven story generation and narrative quality.

**3.3.3 Data Conversation and Saving.** We employed MongoDB<sup>6</sup> for data persistence, leveraging its schema-less nature for managing event data. MongoDB's flexibility enables the storage of diverse event data without needing a predefined schema. This allows different event types, like marketing and technical support, with varying fields, to coexist in the same collection without conflict.

## 4 USER STUDY

To evaluate users' engagement and perception of the final design, particularly the sage agent's role in enhancing reflection on various non-cognitive skills, we conducted a within-subject user study. This study has been approved by our institute's Institutional Review Board (IRB).

### 4.1 Participants & Apparatus

We recruited 18 participants (12 males, 6 females;  $M_{age} = 22.72$ ,  $std = 1.86$ ) via online advertisements. A registration form yielded 36 applicants, from which we selectively invited 18 participants, prioritizing diversity in academic backgrounds, for interviews. The participants' academic backgrounds varied: five in computer science, four in machine learning and AI, three in mechanical engineering, two each in management and economics/finance, and one each in bioengineering, computational fluid dynamics, and communication studies. 15 participants had previous experience with generative AI, including four professionals versed in OpenAI API and ChatGPT. Participants use their own laptops to access the user interface of the *SimuLife++* system.

### 4.2 Tasks

We designed two tasks for each participant, as detailed below. Participants were required to complete these tasks using our *SimuLife++*. The tasks were assigned in a randomly determined order to each participant. This design, which varies the sequence of tasks for each participant, aims to control for order effects and enables an unbiased assessment of task performance by ensuring the order is unpredictable and varied across the study. Note that, as aforementioned in the formative study, although we propose three requirements, the sage agent feature [R3] is the most important one which is directly related to the learning experience, and thus it is necessary to conduct ablation experiment for this feature.

- **Without Sage Agent (20 mins).** In this trial, participants were required to create stories using our *SimuLife++* independently, without the assistance of a sage agent.
- **With Sage Agent (20 mins).** During this task, participants are required to select a sage agent of their choice to assist them in the story creation and simulated life-experiencing process.

<sup>6</sup><https://www.mongodb.com>

### 4.3 Procedures

During our study, each participant started by signing an informed consent form, understanding the study's purpose, tasks, and risks, and completing a demographic survey that gathered personal information such as age, gender, education, and experience in generative AI or digital storytelling tools. This was followed by a brief tutorial on how to use our system, *SimuLife++*, during which we addressed any concerns and provided clarifications. Participants engaged with *SimuLife++* for 40 minutes, experiencing it both with and without a sage agent across two stories, dedicating 20 minutes to each. After each task, they completed a post-task survey, which included rating scales and open-ended questions for detailed feedback. The session concluded with a 20-minute semi-structured interview, where we delved deeper into their experiences with the tool. This interview focused on aspects such as ease of use, decision-making processes, communication with characters, the impact of the sage agent, and the overall story creation process and its effectiveness in fostering non-cognitive skills development. The overall user study needs around 100mins. Each participant will receive \$25 as compensation for their time and effort.

### 4.4 Questionnaire Metrics

**4.4.1 System Usability Scale.** For the system's usability evaluation, we used the System Usability Scale (SUS) [43]. The SUS is a widely used questionnaire that comprehensively measures participants' subjective perceptions of the usability of a system. It consists of 10 dimensions that assess factors such as learnability, efficiency, and satisfaction.

**4.4.2 Narrative Transportation Scale.** Participants' level of narrative transportation was measured with a 14-item scale proposed by Green et al. [31]). Transportation Scale (TS) is a method to quantify differences in the psychological states of being immersed in a narrative. The six-point Likert-type scale ranged from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much). Example items included "*While I was reading the narrative, I could easily picture the events in it taking place.*" The overall questions could be seen in Fig. 3b).

**4.4.3 Perceived Reflection of Non-Cognitive Skills.** We designed a self-customized questionnaire to enable users to rate their experience with *SimuLife++*. The items are rated on a 7-point Likert scale. It focuses on identifying which types of non-cognitive skills our system could benefit significantly. The assessed skills, informed by Gutman et al., include self-perceptions, motivation, perseverance, self-control, metacognitive strategies, social competencies, resilience and coping, and creativity [33]. By using these customized questionnaires, we can gather more specific feedback on the effectiveness of *SimuLife++* in relation to our research question.

### 4.5 Data Analysis Methods

**4.5.1 Questionnaires Analysis.** For the SUS questionnaire, we calculate the overall score. For the Narrative Transportation and Non-cognitive Skill Scale, we conduct statistical analysis using both descriptive and inferential methods. Descriptive statistics (e.g., mean and std) provide an overview of the data tendencies and distributions. For inferential analysis, non-parametric tests (i.e., Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test), are used. These tests are suitable for the ordinal nature of Likert scale data and the relatively small sample size.

**4.5.2 Conversation Analysis and Narrative Arc Analysis on Story Content.** In the conversation analysis, user engagement was assessed by extracting user-generated content from individual and group chats, while excluding AI-generated messages. This refined dataset was then bifurcated into individual and group chat subgroups for comparative scrutiny. Considering the dataset's deviation from a normal distribution and the varying chat numbers across both subgroups, the statistical analysis will be carried out using the Mann-Whitney U Test.

Given the interactive and co-creative nature of our narratives, the narrative arc of the story can provide insight into the cognitive map and decision-making processes of the participants as they navigate the story. To analyze the

narrative arc of the co-created story plots, we utilized the Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) tool, which is a widely used method for analyzing narrative processes<sup>7</sup>. The Narrative Arc analysis focuses on understanding the progression of the narrative processes within the story and compares them across multiple texts [9]. In our study, the Narrative Arc analysis quantified the "shape" of three key narrative processes (staging, plot progression, and cognitive tension) and provided a "narrativity" score that reflects their similarity to established norms. Stage refers to the setting, background context, or environment that sets the scene for the action or dialogue in a narrative. Plot progression is the sequence of events and developments that move the story from beginning to end, such as a character's journey from poverty to riches, a mystery being unraveled, or a conflict between two factions reaching a climax. Cognitive tension refers to the internal conflicts and psychological dilemmas faced by the characters, which could include conflicting beliefs, values, or thoughts.

*4.5.3 Semi-Structured Interview Analysis.* We analyzed interview transcripts and observational notes using a bottom-up thematic analysis approach. Initially, codebooks were created based on specific themes and later adjusted to reflect the unique design attributes of each app. This process involved open coding of interview transcriptions, followed by iterative discussions and refinements of the codebook. Researchers integrated their observational notes, focusing on participants as the central unit of analysis.

## 5 QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

The user study data is categorized into three main components: user questionnaire data, system usage data, and user interview transcripts. The first includes responses from 18 participants who completed two questionnaires assessing the system with and without the sage agent. The system usage data records interactions within our system, covering generated stories, questions, and user communications in individual and group chats, including those with the sage agent. Out of the initial 43 system usage records, 19 instances each for groups using and not using the sage agent were refined after eliminating erroneous and empty entries. This data was further subdivided into three categories: (b1) generative story data, capturing raw narratives post-interaction: (b1) generative story data, capturing raw narratives post-interaction ( $N_{without\_sage} = 19$ ,  $N_{with\_sage} = 19$ ); (b2) individual chat messages, consisting of user input messages in one-to-one conversations with AI characters ( $N_{without\_sage} = 59$ ,  $N_{with\_sage} = 51$ ); and (b3) group chat messages, detailing group chat inputs ( $N_{without\_sage} = 52$ ,  $N_{with\_sage} = 41$ ). For overall system usability, our *SimuLife++* has an average total score of 72.63 ( $std = 15.49$ ), which is above the benchmark score of 68. Additional analyses are presented in this section. All participants took part in semi-structured interviews.

### 5.1 Sage Agent Improving Reflection on Motivation, Self-Perceptions, and Resilience and Coping

In the study utilizing the non-cognitive skill scale (Fig. 3(a)), the sage agent intervention demonstrated statistically significant improvements in certain domains using the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test. "Motivation," which encompasses internal or external factors driving behavior, showed improvement ( $Z = 6.0$ ,  $p = 0.012$ ), as did "self-perceptions," referring to an individual's beliefs and attitudes about their own abilities, qualities, and characteristics ( $Z = 12.0$ ,  $p = 0.031$ ), and "resilience and coping," which are concepts relating to the ability to manage stress, adversity, and challenges in a positive and effective way ( $Z = 3.5$ ,  $p = 0.012$ ). However, other domains like "perseverance" (the ability to maintain effort and focus towards achieving a goal despite obstacles), "creativity" (the capacity to generate novel and useful ideas or solutions), "social competencies" (the skills needed for effective communication and interaction in various social contexts), "meta-cognitive strategies" skills (the cognitive processes for monitoring and regulating one's own thinking and learning), and "self-control" (the ability to regulate one's emotions, impulses, and behaviors) did not show significant changes, as their p-values exceeded the 0.05

<sup>7</sup><https://www.liwc.app>




Fig. 3. Comparative Analysis of Non-cognitive Skill Scale and Narrative Transportation Scale. (a) A radar chart illustrating the differences in non-cognitive skills between groups with and without the sage agent intervention. Skills assessed include resilience and coping, social competencies, metacognitive strategies, self-control, motivation, perseverance, and self-perceptions. (b) A bar graph showing responses to narrative transportation scale questions, with orange bars representing the "with sage agent" group and blue bars representing the "without sage agent" group. Error bars indicate standard deviation, and p-values are provided to show statistical significance.

threshold. This suggests that while the intervention enhanced certain non-cognitive skills, it had less impact on these specific areas.

### 5.2 Sage Agent Enhancing Perceived Immersion: Insights from Narrative Transportation Scales

The analysis of the narrative transportation scale results (Fig. 3(b)), determined using the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test, offers insight into user engagement and cognitive involvement during the narrative experience. A significant finding is evident in response to the questions, "While I was reading the narrative, what was actively going on in the room around me was on my mind" ( $Z = 17.5, p = 0.0271$ ), "I could picture myself in the scene of the events described in the narrative" ( $Z = 16.5, p = 0.0183$ ) and "I was mentally involved in the narrative while reading it" ( $Z = 15.0, p = 0.027$ ). This suggests a high level of narrative immersion, indicating users were less distracted by their surroundings and more absorbed in the narrative with the presence of the sage agent. Additionally, results showing significant differences in "The narrative affected me emotionally" ( $Z = 21.5, p = 0.048$ ) and "The events in the narrative have changed my life" ( $Z = 2.5, p = 0.047$ ) indicate the sage agent affects users emotion during using *SimuLife++* and helps the narrative to change users life.

### 5.3 Sage Agent Increasing Conversational Messages, Particularly in Group Chats

For the conversation analysis (Fig.4), we analyze the individual chats and group chats during the script play for the "with sage agent" group and "without sage agent" group. We first extract all the individual chats and group chat data from the database and remove all the messages spoken by AI. In this part, we also divide data into two subgroups: individual chats and group chats. The result shows better user engagement during group chat in terms of message length ( $U_{without\_agent} = 12018.5, p_{without\_agent} < 0.001$  and  $U_{with\_agent} = 6189.5, p_{with\_agent} < 0.001$ ) and word




Fig. 4. Box plots of communication metrics in conversations with a sage agent versus without a sage agent in the top panel line and individual chats versus group chat in the bottom panel. Note that the term "message" in this context refers to the input provided by the user to the AI in conversations, and does not include the output generated by the AI in response. (a) Significant differences found in message length comparing individual chats and group chats, in both with and without sage agent groups; (b) Significant differences found in word count comparing individual chats and group chats, in both with and without sage agent groups; (c) No significant differences in message count per chat comparing individual chats and group chats, in both with and without sage agent groups; (e) Significant difference found in message length when comparing with and without sage agent in group chat, but no significant difference in individual chat; (f) Significant difference found in word count when comparing with and without sage agent in group chat, but no significant difference in individual chat; (g) No significant difference found in message count per chat when comparing with and without sage agent in both individual chat and group chat.

counts ( $U_{without\_agent} = 12376.5, p_{without\_agent} < 0.001$  and  $U_{with\_agent} = 6369.0, p_{with\_agent} < 0.001$ ) but the number of messages per chat is not significant ( $U_{without\_agent} = 1352.0, p_{without\_agent} = 0.28$  and  $U_{with\_agent} = 862.0, p_{with\_agent} = 0.15$ ).

#### 5.4 Sage Agent Affecting Story Content Generation: Insights from Narrative Arc Analysis

The comparative analysis utilizes consistent metrics to evaluate "individual chat" and "group chat" interactions using the Mann-Whitney U test, as depicted in Fig. 4. The results reveal a significant distinction between these two modalities when a "sage agent" accompanies users. This difference is evident in message length ( $U = 12126.0, p < 0.01$ ) and word count ( $U = 16493.5, p = 0.02$ ). However, no substantial difference is observed in the message count per chat ( $U_{individual\_chat} = 1583.5, p_{individual\_chat} = 0.64$  and  $U_{group\_chat} = 1073.0, p_{group\_chat} = 0.96$ ), nor in individual chats regarding message length ( $U = 12114.5, p = 0.60$ ) and word count ( $U = 12152.5, p = 0.63$ ). These findings suggest that the involvement of a "sage agent" significantly bolsters user engagement in group chat contexts.

To conduct narrative arc analysis, we first categorized the story data into the "with sage agent" group and the "without sage agent" group. To analyze the language usage and trajectory of the story scripts, we employed the five-act structure commonly used in narrative analysis [7, 45]. Each script was divided into five equal segments based on word count, allowing for a comprehensive examination of language trends and shifts throughout the story, as Nalabandian et al. [51] did. After segmenting the stories, we generated line plots for each narrative




Fig. 5. Comparative Analysis of generated story with and without a sage agent. (a) The line graphs illustrate the average scores across three categories - Staging, Plot Progression, and Cognitive Tension - comparing scenarios with and without the use of a sage agent. (b) A radar chart summarizing the overall and individual category effects.

dimension, comparing the mean and standard deviation for both groups (see Fig. 5). Our findings indicated that the "with sage agent" group exhibited a higher narratives staging score ( $S_{without\_sage} = -12.8$ ,  $S_{with\_sage} = 4.54$ ), overall narratives score ( $S_{without\_sage} = -4.62$ ,  $S_{with\_sage} = 2.04$ ), and plot narratives score ( $S_{without\_sage} = -9.12$ ,  $S_{with\_sage} = -3.86$ ), but a lower cognitive narratives score ( $S_{without\_sage} = 8.07$ ,  $S_{with\_sage} = 5.46$ ). We conducted the Mann-Whitney U test to examine staging, plot progression, and cognitive tension across the five sections. The tests yielded no statistically significant results, suggesting that the presence of a sage agent in the story had minimal influence on script play. This implies that users' decision-making processes were more heavily influenced by their cognitive processes rather than the generated story content. Additionally, when analyzing the changes between each section, we found no significant differences between the two groups.

## 6 QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

We identified four major themes after synthesizing participants' interview feedback, centered on their perceived pros and cons of the sage use, the interactive storytelling with AI, and interaction with multiple characters.

### 6.1 Sage Agent's Supporting Role and Its Limitations

**6.1.1 Enhancing Reflective Thinking.** Participants valued the sage's role in providing thoughtful feedback and fostering skill development beyond simple story interaction, serving as a catalyst for deeper narrative immersion and reflective thinking. For example, P7 said "After I have a conversation and then finish it, Sage provides a corresponding evaluation. It assesses whether the outcome of my conversation is more meaningful or potentially harmful. I think this kind of summary is quite good, especially compared to scenarios without a sage agent." P13 echoed that Sage was very analytical and encouraging: "The sage always told me what I did well and when I did badly. [Additionally], my sage encouraged me by saying that [my cooperation] with others was good, and I felt great about that."

**6.1.2 Enhancing Decision-Making.** Some participants mentioned that sage suggests the inclusion of a specific character archetype, which seemed to provide depth and wisdom, potentially guiding the participant through the narrative. Thus, sage enriched the narrative experience by offering recommendations (e.g., P2), enhancing participants' decision-making and communication skills (P9). For example, P9 shared that: "Without the sage, I was just making decisions based on the character, and what I remembered [about] the character. But with the sage, like the pop-ups did tell you things that are more [accurate], or how [they] would have [been] made so that like slowed my decisions a little bit."

*6.1.3 Improving Communication.* The AI's guidance may lead to improvements in participants' ability to communicate effectively and make better decisions. Participants also value the AI's role in facilitating this exploration. The AI's guidance may help participants to reflect on their own communication styles or approaches and consider alternative ways of interacting with others, for instance, P13 recalled how the sage helped him in developing a story with an AI character named Raj: *"The sage taught me how to communicate and negotiate with Raj. With the help of the AI [sage], I think I changed some of my words that I originally wanted to [use] with him, like not [to be confrontational] in front of him, but [to use] observation to [create] a better approach to working with him."*

*6.1.4 Encouraging Teamwork.* The sage's interventions seem to prompt a more reflective decision-making process. Some participants were encouraged to think beyond their initial impulses, considering alternative approaches and perspectives and resulting in a more positive experience. The sage agent's advice to cooperate with others led the participant to seek help from other characters, which not only advanced the story but also earned them positive feedback for their teamwork. P13 remembered how the Sage changed the interaction with an AI character called Luna: *"When Luna suggested that we investigate some special animals, I initially didn't want to consider that opinion and just skipped that dialogue. But then, my sage said that I should be open-minded and listen to others. Then I changed my decision, and ... it turns out that the story becomes better."*

*6.1.5 Clarifying Contexts.* The sage agent's capacity to actively recognize and respond to participant input in a personalized manner enhances the interactive storytelling aspect and aligns with participants' expectations. The feedback's strategic timing, particularly when integrated before critical decision points, deepens participants' understanding of character dynamics, as illustrated by P1, *"I always click that before making a decision because I need to understand the people's relationships so that I can interact more wisely, especially for the first story, because [there are] betrayal elements and old friends. So I need to understand the deep relationships behind them so that I can say something more reliable."*

*6.1.6 Guiding as a Bystander.* The sage agent acts as a moral compass for the participants, guiding their choices and actions within the story. This guidance could be instrumental in shaping the participant's decision-making process, especially in morally ambiguous or challenging scenarios. Some participant perceives the sage's advice as helpful in resisting temptation, indicating that the system's guidance has a real impact on the participant's choices, as P5 opened: *"I am learning some dark spells and dark hours, and the sage continuously reminds me not to put myself in dangerous situations. So, I think it will help me to resist temptation."*

*6.1.7 Providing a Companionship.* Sage agent not only guided the participant towards better decision-making but also created a sense of connection and companionship, enhancing the overall interactive storytelling experience. The participant's input helped participants build confidence and a sense of worth. This demonstrates the value of designing agents that are not just functional, but also empathetic and responsive to the participant's needs and desires, as illustrated by P1: *"I think he encouraged me, it's the most important thing. It helped me with it. [He was] convinced that my words [are] really contained, someone is listening to my words."*

*6.1.8 Lacking Specificity.* Participants appreciated the sage's feedback, however, they also pointed out that suggestions could be more specific (P3), contextually relevant, and on-demanded advice for better decision-making and narrative integration. Some participants also thought of the personas of different sage agents. For example, P6 thought: *"Maybe that's because I chose the Tagore agent; his response was kind of too abstract for me. When I asked what would you propose as the next step for me to proceed with, he said something like, Okay, you should probably follow some high-level suggestions. But it's not particularly related to the plot itself. I wish there were choices that were more specific, like just telling me, Okay, maybe you should choose that."*

## 6.2 Resonating Real Life through Interactive Storytelling

**6.2.1 Engaging Deeply in the Role Play.** The storytelling design made some participants deeply engaged in the storytelling interaction because the system was able to evolve as the participants "progress to the decisions" (P6). For example, P8 recalled that: *"I found I could easily immerse myself in it [the interactive storytelling], and time flew by. I spent 40 minutes without really feeling the passage of time [even though I] could exit immediately when I wanted to."*

**6.2.2 Practicing Different Skills through Storytelling.** In *SimuLife++*, interactive storytelling serves not only as entertainment but also as a tool for enhancing non-cognitive skills such as creativity, problem-solving, and teamwork. Participants noted the system's effectiveness in creating a dynamic and immersive environment that resembles real-life challenges, thereby facilitating skill development. As P5 shared: *"In the first part of the story, it asked me to find the locations of the Horcruxes and the number [of them], but I do not have enough information about where to start. So, I should communicate with other teammates, and they will give me some useful information about where to start."*

**6.2.3 Resonating Emotionally.** The narrative of *SimuLife++* engages participants on an emotional level, prompting them to navigate moral dilemmas and make choices that echo their personal values and experiences. The system prompts participants to make decisions between morally good and bad actions, as well as choices that benefit the self versus others. This aspect of the system challenges participants to contemplate and navigate complex ethical dilemmas. The narrative content resonates with the participant's past experiences (P5). For example, P15 shared: *"From the beginning of this story, it was really interesting and it involved my emotions when I saw I needed to choose between good and bad choices... I have had some experiences like that in the past, and when I saw those choices in the story, I remembered those experiences and it triggered my emotions."*

**6.2.4 Situating in Real Life.** Though the stories are fictional, participants still connect them in real-life situations. For example, interacting with the AI character Harry Potter in avoiding darkness made P5 think of similar situations in real life. The emotional connection and the reflection on moral dilemmas mirror real-life thought processes, leading to deeper personal insights, as echoed by P14: *"As I said, the [decisions] that I needed to make required me to think about myself and how my character expresses. This is especially true in challenging situations. For example, a decision forced me to reflect on my characteristics in real life. For instance, if I'm a calmer, more conservative person, I should [choose] one decision, and otherwise, I should take another. This was the aspect that reflected some of my real-life characteristics."*

**6.2.5 Simulating the Past.** The adaptive nature of the storytelling made the participants recall their past experiences, offering a more personalized experience. Participants shared a desire for scenarios that mirror realistic life situations, highlighting the potential of re-experiencing through the social life simulation. As P6 believed that: *"I think eventually it gets to a point where the participant [will] find the plot [that] really resonates with their past, and try to dive deep into that. So, I think this is the strongest [aspect] of the system because it's adaptive to how the participant reacts to it."*

**6.2.6 Lacking Flexibility of the Storyline.** While the AI characters are designed to chat with participants along a predefined storyline, this can create a sense of constraint or boundary. Some participants felt there was a general direction or goal for the narrative generation. As P6 complained: *"I find that the characters try to nudge me back onto a specific storyline that I suppose you have probably designed in the back end that it should stick to a particular topic or line of the story. And in that case, I could feel there is a predefined way of behavior, or [oversight] behind these kinds of characters."* Similarly, P8 felt: *"This gave me the impression that there was a main plot element in the story, as initially, I didn't know which options could be available to me."*

### 6.3 Deepening the Engagement with Diverse AI Personas in Groups

**6.3.1 Being Influenced by AI Characters' Distinct Opinions.** *SimuLife++* implemented characters with distinct personalities, motivations, and beliefs to create an engaging and immersive environment. The diverse characters enable more authentic interactions, making the user's choices and interactions more meaningful. By considering the perspectives and motivations of these AI characters, participants were able to think critically about their decisions and their consequences. For instance, P6 shared an experience with the *Witcher* script, noting how the AI characters' opinions and backgrounds influenced their perception and choices during a conversation, as narrated by P6: *"I chose the Witcher story. I remember there was a scene where multiple agents with different personas. I was sitting around the campfire and talked to each other. What left a strong impression on me is that each of the persons has their own beliefs, which has an effect on my perception of and also the choice I made later on after the exchange of opinions with the characters."*

**6.3.2 Engaging More in Small Groups.** Group chatting, particularly with two or three characters, was preferred by participants for a more immersive experience compared to single-character interactions. This preference suggested that a well-balanced group chat can enhance the storytelling experience by simulating more dynamic and realistic social interactions. P14 stated: *"Group chatting was good. In the instances where we had to make a decision and I had to interact with different characters, I think there should be a balance in the number of characters involved. If there are too many, it can become a little confusing. On the other hand, when there's only one character, it's less engaging than when there are two or three characters. Having two or three characters feels more like you are [immersed] in the story, more so than talking to just one."*

**6.3.3 Lacking Emotional Intelligence.** Participants deemed that current AI characters didn't respond to their emotional state, especially in group settings. The characters' repetitive use of certain words and their tendency to agree with the participant's actions made them feel inauthentic, resulting in diminished engagement. And no matter how users communicate with them, even in aggressive or angry tones, the AI's communication tone is always positive and gentle. For example, P2 mentioned: *"The AI characters are always good and nice. It's not like real people, as they don't have too [many] emotions. I can pick out certain modes of their words. Like they will always give me a word like indeed or fantastic something like that. And they will always follow what I say but it's not like they are expressing their own point."*

**6.3.4 Lacking Efficiency in Simultaneous Chats.** Group chats within the story primarily function as tools for narrative progression. This usage, however, raises questions about the balance between driving the story forward and fostering interactive engagement. Participants shared that group chats can sometimes be overwhelming, especially when responses are lengthy or abundant. For instance, P3 thought: *"It seems that after I post a sentence, everyone [AI character] in the group will post their words at once. I become a story facilitator rather than an interactor."* In addition, P6 shared that it was hard to address individual AI characters' questions simultaneously in a group chat: *"I was asking a question, but three of the agents asked me follow-up questions. And I'm not sure which one I should respond to. Sometimes the reply also gets a little bit too long, and I just get lost during the reading."*

**6.3.5 Lacking Conversational Intelligence in Group Chats.** Another major concern for group chatting was that participants felt excluded when AI characters engaged in their own dialogues without responding to the users directly. This scenario not only diminished the participant's lead role but also made participants feel ignored. This issue underscores the importance of AI characters addressing participants' input directly in group chats. P11 deemed that *"With multiple AIs, I encountered several obvious issues. One issue is that these AIs would engage in their own conversations, and once they start talking among themselves, they completely exclude me... They generate over a dozen statements at once, without any room for me [to participate in]."*

## 7 DISCUSSION

### 7.1 LLM-enabled Interactive Storytelling for Skill Development, Guided by an AI Sage

Our quantitative and qualitative findings suggest that *SimuLife++* enhances reflection on non-cognitive skills. Participants' interview feedback revealed several contributing factors: the generation of story content based on decisions and conversations, the characters' reactions embodying distinct personas, the emotional engagement triggered by role-playing that connects with real-life experiences through narrative transportation, and the influence of the sage agent. This is aligned with previous research findings that digital storytelling significantly improves social-emotional learning skills and creative writing [68]. Our results provide new empirical understandings about the effect of group chat and a new AI role, the Sage agent, who further promoted the interactive storytelling process.

The efficacy of most interactive storytelling involves interplay among characters' persona, narrative plot, and users' role-playing. For instance, we found that persona is very important for users' perception and engagement of storytelling. Pera et al. already highlights the role of compelling personas in engaging users and enhancing narrative experiences [57]. But previous studies haven't extensively explored the role of a sage agent in reflecting non-cognitive skills in storytelling. Our research highlights the need for context-specific guidance from the sage agent, supporting Turner et al.'s emphasis on context-mediated behavior for intelligent agents [67]. Context-aware personalization is key for effective narrative interventions, aligning with personalized prompting [23] and "just-in-time" strategies in behavioral support [60]. The sage agent's role in providing encouragement and reflective narrative summaries could enhance engagement and learning. Future research could focus on the sage agent's design, determining effective implementation moments and methods. Exploring a question-driven versus comment-based sage agent, and comparing "just-in-time" intervention with constant presence, could offer insights into effectiveness and user preferences in narrative processes.

### 7.2 Design Implications

**7.2.1 Integrating Human-Like Characters and Social Norms in Digital Social Simulations.** Our interview results suggest that characters should be developed with more well-rounded personas and social relationships. We believe it is important to build more dynamic interrelationships among characters, pre-setting their social roles and relationships. Their social roles and relationships, encompassing various degrees of friendship, rivalry, and other dynamics, could influence the agents' responses and communication tone. Additionally, building on previous research, relationships can change depending on the context. For example, existing collaborative or conflictual relationships tend to foster future interactions of the same nature, while diminishing the likelihood of forming relationships of a different type [66]. In the future, we aim to design character agents that can form and evolve relationships based on conversations and narrative decisions. If the characters' personal relationships vary during storytelling, it could enhance learning. For example, the protagonist might help someone who previously wronged her, leading to a friendship. This could transform the character from being irritable to gentle, illustrating dynamic character development.

Additionally, our qualitative findings suggest AI characters should have emotional intelligence. This is an echo to existing work that deems that agents should respond to emotional states in the chats for empathetic interactions, as suggested by Chaves et al. [14]. We believe that equipping agents with an emotional model would allow for a range of emotions, deepening social connections and mirroring human social dynamics. The Media Equation theory [59] suggests that people view computers and media as social actors, tending to assign human characteristics to agents. In the future, we could design agents with human-like needs, such as hunger and health, to create more dynamic and realistic characters. These needs would influence their behaviors and decisions, with factors like health affecting their decision-making and social interactions. Prior research on "Humanoid Agents"

[70] indicates that including basic needs, emotions, and relationships makes agents behave more like humans. Incorporating these aspects is crucial for realistic social life simulation.

Incorporating social norms into the *SimuLife++* platform might enhance the realism and community engagement of the user experience. Although only a few participants directly mentioned this point in our interviews, some of the feedback indirectly relates to it. For example, comments were made regarding aspects like jail and escaping from jail after interacting with the story *Shantaram*. Drawing inspiration from resources like NormBank [80] and studies on online health communities about modeling social roles [74], we can embed situational social norms into the platform to create a more authentic and dynamic social environment. For instance, in a virtual marketplace scenario, integrating norms for appropriate buyer-seller interactions can help guide users toward more realistic and effective social conduct. By tailoring these norms to different scenarios and contexts, the platform might be able to promote positive community engagement and foster a more engaging and immersive user experience. Additionally, assigning varied social roles, such as seekers, providers, welcomers, and storytellers, enriches community dynamics, and might allow users to engage in activities that align with their roles, fostering a sense of belonging and active participation. It's essential, however, to ensure inclusivity and cultural sensitivity in the portrayal of these norms and roles, avoiding stereotypes and biases.

*7.2.2 Expanding to Challenge Real-Life Social Scenarios, Such as Conflict.* LLM could have more potential for general social skills training [75]. As reported by some participants in the interview, our current story plot is relatively smooth, involving teamwork but seldom includes social conflict. The integration of real-life scenarios, such as conflict resolution, is crucial for enhancing learning, as indicated by Zins et al. [81]. Specifically, conflict is a crucial element in interactive storytelling platforms like *SimuLife++*, where it serves as a catalyst for character development and user engagement. By confronting conflicts, users gain valuable experience in resolving issues, from interpersonal disputes to existential threats. This process helps users to learn effective communication strategies and make moral choices, enhancing their overall experience. For example, the Rehearsal system allows users to practice conflict resolution realistically [62]. Additionally, conflicts in *SimuLife++* add emotional depth and realism, mirroring real life's conflicts. They make stories more immersive and impactful, fostering investment, critical thinking, and empathy. Users learn to understand different perspectives and consider their actions' consequences. However, conflict must be balanced with story coherence and user enjoyment. Conflicts should be relevant and meaningful, not overwhelming, and consider user diversity for accessibility and engagement.

*7.2.3 Enhancing User Agency with Storyline Visualization and Control of Narrative Structure.* Our study reveals a user preference for more control in story progression, with a desire for greater influence over scene selection, pacing, and plot impact. This aligns with Aarseth's emphasis on user agency in narratives [1] and Laurel's focus on user-driven narratives [39]. Balancing AI guidance with user autonomy, as discussed by Mateas and Stern [46], is vital in interactive storytelling. Adapting decision complexity to match individual preferences, reflecting Mirvis's theory of flow [48], is key for optimal user engagement and user agency. Enhancing future system versions with storyline visualization could offer users a visual representation of narrative changes in response to their decisions. This feature helps users understand the overall plot and their impact on it, increasing their sense of agency. Possible formats include flowcharts, mind maps, or interactive graphs, aiming to provide a comprehensive view of the story's trajectory. Taking cues from Ogawa and Ma [52] and StoryFlow [44], we can employ advanced techniques for better depicting complex narrative relationships. This is especially useful for narratives with multiple storylines and characters, aiding users in understanding element interconnections and guiding story shaping. Adding storyline visualization to an adaptive narrative system enhances user control and ownership. It lets users see the consequences of their choices on the plot and characters, facilitating informed and meaningful decisions. Extending this with an editable, interactive storyline allows users to construct and customize the plot non-linearly. Blythe et al. support this concept, noting that well-crafted research fiction enhances reflection

and learning [8]. Integrating storyline visualization and editing tools can create a personalized and engaging storytelling experience.

*7.2.4 Enabling Multi-players Co-Interaction.* Our current system only supports single-player use, but we can make the system support multi-player use. Some participants asked us that since this system simulates a social scene, why not just allow multiple users to participate at the same time. Such a transition to supporting multi-player use aligns with the growing emphasis on social interactivity in digital environments. As mentioned by Pearce [56], we believe that multi-player platforms can enhance the realism of social simulations, offering more authentic experiences. These platforms provide opportunities for collaborative and competitive interactions among players, echoing the findings of Ducheneaut et al. [19], who observed the emergence of community and shared purpose in multiplayer online games. Further, introducing multiplayer mode introduces unique challenges and complexities, such as managing conflicts and accommodating diverse play styles, as discussed by Castronova [13]. These dynamics could be crucial for a comprehensive understanding of human behavior and social interactions in digital settings. The system's capability to model and simulate these interactions can be informed by the work of Bainbridge [3], who emphasizes the importance of virtual environments in studying social phenomena. Furthermore, we could explore whether users can distinguish between AI characters and human-played characters when both are involved in the same setting. In the future, we might also investigate human social behaviors in environments where multiple humans and AIs interact and converse.

### 7.3 Ethical Concerns

Analyzing user interaction data revealed some participants role-playing as "bad people," making harmful choices or being rude to AI characters. This observation is not uncommon, as prior research has found that some users engage in emotionally charged and sensitive conversations with chatbots, including discussing experiences related to abuse and depression [41]. To ensure the safety and privacy of users, the interactive storytelling system should have clear protocols for handling sensitive information, especially that related to self-disclosure information, including measures to keep it confidential and de-identified [40]. In addition, this behavior prompts questions about user motivations and the ethics of interactive storytelling. It's crucial to consider if such actions signify deeper psychological needs or frustrations. Our current participants are screened for mental health issues, a challenging requirement in real-world deployment. Designers and researchers should prioritize users' mental and emotional well-being, designing systems that foster healthy interactions. We should consider implementing features like behavior guidelines, empathy-promoting prompts, or reporting mechanisms for abusive interactions. This approach will contribute to a safer, more responsible interactive storytelling experience.

### 7.4 Limitations

Our study was limited to a single intervention, which did not allow us to determine the long-term effects of the system. It is essential to understand if the benefits observed are transient or enduring to evaluate the system's sustained impact effectively. For future research, longitudinal study designs are recommended to assess the long-term effects of the tool. Such studies would provide valuable insights into the intervention's lasting influence and how it performs across various settings. Additionally, the absence of follow-up interviews to gauge users' post-intervention status is also a limitation. This gap is critical as it hinders understanding how individuals with low self-esteem might react to challenges in controlling their behavior post-intervention. Such individuals may experience self-disappointment and blame, potentially leading to decreased motivation to re-engage with the system and adapt to new challenges. Furthermore, our reliance on the OpenAI API, as opposed to a more tailored or fine-tuned model, may have affected the quality of stories and conversations generated by the system, potentially diminishing the user experience. Future iterations of the system could benefit from the development and integration of a fine-tuned model to enhance narrative and conversational quality.

## 8 CONCLUSION

We have designed and developed *SimuLife++*, an interactive platform that plunges users into a variety of social scenarios, positioning them as the protagonists to experience and interact. This platform is designed to enable users to navigate through stories, make decisions, and engage in deep conversations with AI characters. Guided by a "sage agent", users are encouraged to reflect on non-cognitive behaviors. With a sage agent, participants demonstrated increased motivation, improved self-perceptions, and enhanced resilience and coping abilities. We also found that while the sage agent could enhance narrative and conversation immersion, it still requires more context-specific guidance and user control as per the qualitative analysis. Interview results from participants revealed that the sage agent assisted in decision-making, ethical dilemmas, and problem-solving, while also indicating a need for enhanced user control and balanced responses from multiple characters. We also offer design recommendations for using generative AI in narrative-based approaches to develop non-cognitive skills in wider social contexts.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Espen J. Aarseth. 1997. *Cybertext: Perspectives on Ergodic Literature*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- [2] Mortaza Alinam, Luca Ciotoli, and Ilaria Torre. 2021. WoTEdu: A Multimodal Interactive Storytelling System. In *The 14th Pervasive Technologies Related to Assistive Environments Conference (Corfu, Greece) (PETRA 2021)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 119–120. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3453892.3464900>
- [3] William Sims Bainbridge. 2007. The scientific research potential of virtual worlds. *science* 317, 5837 (2007), 472–476.
- [4] Jeffrey Bardzell and Shaowen Bardzell. 2013. What is "Critical" about Critical Design?. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Paris, France) (CHI '13)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 3297–3306. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2470654.2466451>
- [5] Fran Baum, Colin MacDougall, and Danielle Smith. 2006. Participatory action research. *Journal of epidemiology and community health* 60, 10 (2006), 854.
- [6] Madison Smartt Bell. 2000. *Narrative Design: Working With Imagination Craft And Form*. WW Norton & Company.
- [7] Katherine Geraldine Blackburn et al. 2015. *The narrative arc: Exploring the linguistic structure of narrative*. Ph.D. Dissertation.
- [8] Mark Blythe. 2017. Research Fiction: Storytelling, Plot and Design. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Denver, Colorado, USA) (CHI '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 5400–5411. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3025453.3026023>
- [9] Ryan L Boyd, Kate G Blackburn, and James W Pennebaker. 2020. The narrative arc: Revealing core narrative structures through text analysis. *Science advances* 6, 32 (2020), eaba2196.
- [10] Giorgio Brunello and Martin Schlotter. 2011. Non-cognitive skills and personality traits: Labour market relevance and their development in education & training systems. (2011).
- [11] Rick Busselle and Helena Bilandzic. 2008. Fictionality and perceived realism in experiencing stories: A model of narrative comprehension and engagement. *Communication theory* 18, 2 (2008), 255–280.
- [12] Rick Busselle and Helena Bilandzic. 2009. Measuring narrative engagement. *Media psychology* 12, 4 (2009), 321–347.
- [13] Edward Castronova. 2008. *Synthetic worlds: The business and culture of online games*. University of Chicago press.
- [14] Ana Paula Chaves and Marco Aurelio Gerosa. 2021. How should my chatbot interact? A survey on social characteristics in human–chatbot interaction design. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction* 37, 8 (2021), 729–758.
- [15] Jonathan Cohen. 2018. Defining identification: A theoretical look at the identification of audiences with media characters. In *Advances in Foundational Mass Communication Theories*. Routledge, 253–272.
- [16] Ashlee Cunsolo Willox, Sherilee L Harper, Victoria L Edge, 'My Word': Storytelling, Digital Media Lab, and Rigolet Inuit Community Government. 2013. Storytelling in a digital age: digital storytelling as an emerging narrative method for preserving and promoting indigenous oral wisdom. *Qualitative Research* 13, 2 (2013), 127–147.
- [17] Edward L Deci and Richard M Ryan. 2008. Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian psychology/Psychologie canadienne* 49, 3 (2008), 182.
- [18] James Price Dillard and Lijiang Shen. 2005. On the nature of reactance and its role in persuasive health communication. *Communication monographs* 72, 2 (2005), 144–168.
- [19] Nicolas Ducheneaut, Nick Yee, Eric Nickell, and Robert J Moore. 2006. Building an MMO with mass appeal: A look at gameplay in World of Warcraft. *Games and Culture* 1, 4, 281–317.
- [20] Angela Lee Duckworth and Patrick D Quinn. 2009. Development and validation of the Short Grit Scale (GRIT–S). *Journal of personality assessment* 91, 2 (2009), 166–174.

- [21] Carol Dweck. 2015. Carol Dweck revisits the growth mindset. *Education week* 35, 5 (2015), 20–24.
- [22] Carol Dweck. 2016. What having a “growth mindset” actually means. *Harvard business review* 13, 2 (2016), 2–5.
- [23] Ramin Fallahzadeh, Samaneh Aminikhanghahi, Ashley Nichole Gibson, and Diane J Cook. 2016. Toward personalized and context-aware prompting for smartphone-based intervention. In *2016 38th Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society (EMBC)*. IEEE, 6010–6013.
- [24] Laura S Foote. 2015. Re-storying life as a means of critical reflection: The power of narrative learning. *Christian higher education* 14, 3 (2015), 116–126.
- [25] Barbara Fresko, Lena Rubinstein Reich, Tina Eriksson Sjöo, and Carina Sild Lönroth. 2013. Developing narratives as a pedagogical approach to fostering professional interpersonal competences. *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 39, 4 (2013), 232–239.
- [26] Jérémy Frey, Gilad Ostrin, May Grabli, and Jessica R. Cauchard. 2020. Physiologically Driven Storytelling: Concept and Software Tool. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Honolulu, HI, USA) (*CHI '20*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376643>
- [27] Maliheh Ghajargar, Jeffrey Bardzell, and Love Lagerkvist. 2022. A Redhead Walks into a Bar: Experiences of Writing Fiction with Artificial Intelligence. In *25th International Academic Mindtrek Conference* (Tampere, Finland) (*Academic Mindtrek 2022*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 230–241. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3569219.3569418>
- [28] Stephen Gilroy, Julie Porteous, Fred Charles, and Marc Cavazza. 2012. Exploring Passive User Interaction for Adaptive Narratives. In *Proceedings of the 2012 ACM International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces* (Lisbon, Portugal) (*IUI '12*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 119–128. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2166966.2166990>
- [29] Sophie Goldingay, Sarah Epstein, and Darci Taylor. 2018. Simulating social work practice online with digital storytelling: Challenges and opportunities. *Social work education* 37, 6 (2018), 790–803.
- [30] Ivor F Goodson, Gert Biesta, Michael Tedder, and Norma Adair. 2010. *Narrative learning*. Routledge.
- [31] Melanie C Green and Timothy C Brock. 2000. The role of transportation in the persuasiveness of public narratives. *Journal of personality and social psychology* 79, 5 (2000), 701.
- [32] Melanie C Green, Timothy C Brock, and Geoff F Kaufman. 2004. Understanding media enjoyment: The role of transportation into narrative worlds. *Communication theory* 14, 4 (2004), 311–327.
- [33] Leslie Morrison Gutman and Ingrid Schoon. 2013. The impact of non-cognitive skills on outcomes for young people. A literature review. (2013).
- [34] Leah Henrickson, William Jephcote, and Rhys Comissiong. 2022. Soft skills, stories, and self-reflection: Applied digital storytelling for self-branding. *Convergence* 28, 6 (2022), 1577–1597.
- [35] Richard H Hersh, Matt Bundick, Richard Keeling, Corey Keyes, Amy Kurpius, Richard Shavelson, Daniel Silverman, and Lynn Swaner. 2009. A well-rounded education for a flat world. *Educational leadership* 67, 1 (2009), 50–53.
- [36] Karl M Kapp. 2012. *The gamification of learning and instruction: game-based methods and strategies for training and education*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [37] Tim Kautz, James J Heckman, Ron Diris, Bas Ter Weel, and Lex Borghans. 2014. Fostering and measuring skills: Improving cognitive and non-cognitive skills to promote lifetime success. (2014).
- [38] Jacqueline Kory and Cynthia Breazeal. 2014. Storytelling with robots: Learning companions for preschool children’s language development. In *The 23rd IEEE International Symposium on Robot and Human Interactive Communication*. 643–648. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ROMAN.2014.6926325>
- [39] Brenda Laurel. 2013. *Computers as theatre*. Addison-Wesley.
- [40] Yi-Chieh Lee, Naomi Yamashita, and Yun Huang. 2020. Designing a Chatbot as a Mediator for Promoting Deep Self-Disclosure to a Real Mental Health Professional. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 4, CSCW1, Article 31 (may 2020), 27 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3392836>
- [41] Yi-Chieh Lee, Naomi Yamashita, Yun Huang, and Wai Fu. 2020. “I Hear You, I Feel You”: Encouraging Deep Self-Disclosure through a Chatbot. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (<conf-loc>, <city>Honolulu</city>, <state>HI</state>, <country>USA</country>, </conf-loc>) (*CHI '20*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376175>
- [42] Henry M Levin. 2013. The utility and need for incorporating noncognitive skills into large-scale educational assessments. *The role of international large-scale assessments: Perspectives from technology, economy, and educational research* (2013), 67–86.
- [43] James R Lewis. 2018. The system usability scale: past, present, and future. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 34, 7 (2018), 577–590.
- [44] Shixia Liu, Yingcai Wu, Enxun Wei, Mengchen Liu, and Yang Liu. 2013. StoryFlow: Tracking the Evolution of Stories. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 19, 12 (2013), 2436–2445. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2013.196>
- [45] Jennifer J Malin, Vera J Vine, Amelia Stanton, Kaitlin Cannava, Graham Bodie, and James W Pennebaker. 2014. The arc of narrative: Using language markers to identify stories. In *Poster presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Austin, TX*.

- [46] Michael Mateas and Andrew Stern. 2005. Structuring content in the Façade interactive drama architecture. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Digital Entertainment*, Vol. 1. 93–98.
- [47] Kelly McErlean. 2018. *Interactive narratives and transmedia storytelling: Creating immersive stories across new media platforms*. Taylor & Francis.
- [48] Philip H Mirvis. 1991. *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. JSTOR.
- [49] Emily Moyer-Gusé. 2008. Toward a theory of entertainment persuasion: Explaining the persuasive effects of entertainment-education messages. *Communication theory* 18, 3 (2008), 407–425.
- [50] Sheila T Murphy, Lauren B Frank, Meghan B Moran, and Paula Patnoe-Woodley. 2011. Involved, transported, or emotional? Exploring the determinants of change in knowledge, attitudes, and behavior in entertainment-education. *Journal of communication* 61, 3 (2011), 407–431.
- [51] Taleen Nalabandian and Molly E Ireland. 2019. Genre-typical narrative arcs in films are less appealing to lay audiences and professional film critics. *Behavior research methods* 51 (2019), 1636–1650.
- [52] Michael Ogawa and Kwan-Liu Ma. 2010. Software Evolution Storylines. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Symposium on Software Visualization* (Salt Lake City, Utah, USA) (SOFTVIS '10). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1879211.1879219>
- [53] Gilad Ostrin, Jérémy Frey, and Jessica R. Cauchard. 2018. Interactive Narrative in Virtual Reality. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Mobile and Ubiquitous Multimedia* (Cairo, Egypt) (MUM '18). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 463–467. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3282894.3289740>
- [54] Julia Othlinghaus-Wulhorst and H Ulrich Hoppe. 2020. A technical and conceptual framework for serious role-playing games in the area of social skill training. *Frontiers in Computer Science* 2 (2020), 28.
- [55] M Pasupathi, C Wainryb, K Oldroyd, and S Bourne. 2019. Storied lessons: Learning from anger in childhood by narrating. *International journal of behavioral development* 43, 6 (2019), 553–562.
- [56] Celia Pearce. 2011. Communities of play: Emergent cultures in multiplayer games and virtual worlds. (2011).
- [57] Rebecca Pera, Giampaolo Viglia, and Roberto Furlan. 2016. Who am I? How compelling self-storytelling builds digital personal reputation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing* 35, 1 (2016), 44–55.
- [58] Brian L Quick and Michael T Stephenson. 2007. Further evidence that psychological reactance can be modeled as a combination of anger and negative cognitions. *Communication Research* 34, 3 (2007), 255–276.
- [59] Byron Reeves and Clifford Nass. 1996. The media equation: How people treat computers, television, and new media like real people. *Cambridge, UK* 10, 10 (1996).
- [60] Susan M Schembre, Yue Liao, Michael C Robertson, Genevieve Fridlund Dunton, Jacqueline Kerr, Meghan E Haffey, Taylor Burnett, Karen Basen-Engquist, and Rachel S Hicklen. 2018. Just-in-time feedback in diet and physical activity interventions: systematic review and practical design framework. *Journal of medical Internet research* 20, 3 (2018), e106.
- [61] Phoebe Sengers, Kirsten Boehner, Shay David, and Joseph 'Jofish' Kaye. 2005. Reflective Design. In *Proceedings of the 4th Decennial Conference on Critical Computing: Between Sense and Sensibility* (Aarhus, Denmark) (CC '05). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 49–58. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1094562.1094569>
- [62] Omar Shaikh, Valentino Chai, Michele J Gelfand, Diyi Yang, and Michael S Bernstein. 2023. Rehearsal: Simulating conflict to teach conflict resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.12309* (2023).
- [63] Michael D Slater and Donna Rouner. 2002. Entertainment—education and elaboration likelihood: Understanding the processing of narrative persuasion. *Communication theory* 12, 2 (2002), 173–191.
- [64] Najat Smeda, Eva Dakich, and Nalin Sharda. 2014. The effectiveness of digital storytelling in the classrooms: a comprehensive study. *Smart Learning Environments* 1 (2014), 1–21.
- [65] Yuqian Sun, Zhouyi Li, Ke Fang, Chang Hee Lee, and Ali Asadipour. 2023. Language as Reality: A Co-Creative Storytelling Game Experience in 1001 Nights Using Generative AI. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Digital Entertainment* (Salt Lake City) (AIIDE '23). AAAI Press, Article 44, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aiide.v19i1.27539>
- [66] Maxim Sytch and Adam Tatarynowicz. 2014. Friends and foes: The dynamics of dual social structures. *Academy of Management Journal* 57, 2 (2014), 585–613.
- [67] Roy M Turner. 1998. Context-mediated behavior for intelligent agents. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 48, 3 (1998), 307–330.
- [68] Ali Uslu and Nilüfer Atman Uslu. 2021. Improving primary school students' creative writing and social-emotional learning skills through collaborative digital storytelling. *Acta Educationis Generalis* 11, 2 (2021), 1–18.
- [69] Tom Van Laer, Ko De Ruyter, Luca M Visconti, and Martin Wetzels. 2014. The extended transportation-imagery model: A meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of consumers' narrative transportation. *Journal of Consumer research* 40, 5 (2014), 797–817.
- [70] Zhilin Wang, Yu Ying Chiu, and Yu Cheung Chiu. 2023. Humanoid agents: Platform for simulating human-like generative agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05418* (2023).

- [71] Roger P Weissberg, Joseph A Durlak, Celene E Domitrovich, and Thomas P Gullotta. 2015. Social and emotional learning: Past, present, and future. (2015).
- [72] Ying Xu, Dakuo Wang, Penelope Collins, Hyelim Lee, and Mark Warschauer. 2021. Same benefits, different communication patterns: Comparing Children’s reading with a conversational agent vs. a human partner. *Computers & Education* 161 (2021), 104059.
- [73] Zihan Yan, Chunxu Yang, Qihao Liang, and Xiang ’Anthony’ Chen. 2023. XCreation: A Graph-Based Crossmodal Generative Creativity Support Tool. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology* (San Francisco, CA, USA) (*UIST ’23*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 48, 15 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3586183.3606826>
- [74] Diyi Yang, Robert E Kraut, Tenbroeck Smith, Elijah Mayfield, and Dan Jurafsky. 2019. Seekers, providers, welcomers, and storytellers: Modeling social roles in online health communities. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems*. 1–14.
- [75] Diyi Yang, Caleb Ziems, William Held, Omar Shaikh, Michael S. Bernstein, and John Mitchell. 2024. Social Skill Training with Large Language Models. [arXiv:2404.04204](https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.04204) [cs.CL]
- [76] Pengcheng Yang, Fuli Luo, Peng Chen, Lei Li, Zhiyi Yin, Xiaodong He, and Xu Sun. 2019. Knowledgeable Storyteller: A Commonsense-Driven Generative Model for Visual Storytelling.. In *IJCAI*. 5356–5362.
- [77] Michael F Young, Stephen T Slota, Roger Travis, and Beomkyu Choi. 2015. Game narrative, interactive fiction, and storytelling: Creating a “time for telling” in the classroom. In *Video games and creativity*. Elsevier, 199–222.
- [78] Ann Yuan, Andy Coenen, Emily Reif, and Daphne Ippolito. 2022. Wordcraft: story writing with large language models. In *27th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*. 841–852.
- [79] Zoie Zhao, Sophie Song, Bridget Duah, Jamie Macbeth, Scott Carter, Monica P Van, Nayeli Suseth Bravo, Matthew Klenk, Kate Sick, and Alexandre L. S. Filipowicz. 2023. More Human than Human: LLM-Generated Narratives Outperform Human-LLM Interleaved Narratives. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference on Creativity and Cognition* (Virtual Event, USA) (*C&C ’23*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 368–370. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3591196.3596612>
- [80] Caleb Ziems, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Yi-Chia Wang, Alon Halevy, and Diyi Yang. 2023. NormBank: A Knowledge Bank of Situational Social Norms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17008* (2023).
- [81] Joseph E Zins, Michelle R Bloodworth, Robert P Weissberg, Herbert J Walberg, et al. 2004. The scientific base linking social and emotional learning to school success. *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say* 3 (2004), 22.
- [82] Rolf A Zwaan, Mark C Langston, and Arthur C Graesser. 1995. The construction of situation models in narrative comprehension: An event-indexing model. *Psychological science* 6, 5 (1995), 292–297.