After labeling the main grammatical categories of all stories (noun, verb, adverb, adjective, pronoun, and preposition), we observed a consistent pattern in humans and ChatGPT. Humans use more pronouns, verbs, and adverbs compared to ChatGPT, while ChatGPT enriches its speech with prepositions, nouns and adjectives more than humans. While on average 6\% of a sentence of is adverbs and 19\% consists of verbs in humans' stories when we compare the number of adverbs to total words, it is only 3\% for adverbs, and 17\%for verbs in ChatGPT’s sentences. Controlling for the role of verbs to see whether adverb use is only depending on the verb use, showed that adverb use is significantly higher in humans in all iterations compared to ChatGPT. Thus, humans use approximately 1 adverb for 3 verbs through the iterations whereas ChatGPT uses 1 adverb per 5 verbs and this ratio decreases with iterations (See Appendix C.). These findings shows that humans are more focused on action, how these actions are described and people who take part in these actions in the stories than ChatGPT. On the other hand, ChatGPT is paying greater attention to describing the entities, objects in the stories with their features. When we examined the adverbs in depth, we explored both agents used negations (\textit{"not"} and \textit{"n't"}) in their stories, however, there is a huge difference between their usage. Humans used negations more than ChatGPT in all retelllings (first retelling: $M\_{human}$ = .72, $M\_{GPT}$ = .27, \textit{U =} 4692, \textit{p <} .001, second retelling: $M\_{human}$ = .56, $M\_{GPT}$ = .21, \textit{U =} 5168, \textit{p <} .001, third retelling: $M\_{human}$ = .45, $M\_{GPT}$ = .16, \textit{U=} 5147, \textit{p <} .001). Overall, humans use 201 negations and ChatGPT uses 73 negations, excluding the original story. See Figure \ref{fig:negations} for mean negations. Although there is a difference in total, we also examined whether negations are transmitted through iterations, so we calculated the changes of negations between iterations by subtracting the number of negations in the previous version of the story from the number in the following iteration. From original story to first iteration, the change in negation was significant ($M\_{human}$ = -.96, $M\_{GPT}$ = -1.52, \textit{U =} 3787.0, \textit{p =} .003). So, ChatGPT used 1.5 less negations on average when iterating the story again. However, changes in negations for second and third iterations were not significant. Since processing negations is an effortful task (Clark & Chase, 1972; Carpenter & Just, 1975), we observe a general decreasing trend in the use of negations, however the drop is not sharp in humans as it is in ChatGPT. Given the fact that context and expectancy matters for the cost of processing the negations (Nordmeyer \& Frank, 2015), we also examined whether the use of negations differ between happy (\textit{N =} 45), and sad stories (\textit{N =} 32), assuming the use of negations is more appropriate in sad stories. Humans preserve the negations better in sad stories ($M\_{human}$ = -.93, $M\_{GPT}$ = -1.57, \textit{U =} 704.0, \textit{p =} .03), but not in happy stories ($M\_{human}$ = -1.0, $M\_{GPT}$ = -1.45, \textit{U =} 397.0, \textit{p =} .06). On average, they drop 1 negation when iterating original story, but ChatGPT drops almost 1.5 negations. This may imply the tendency of humans to use negation more than ChatGPT when the context is appropriate. However, these differences only exists in first iteration, and our dataset is relatively small.