

Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Creative Writing: Reconfiguring Authorship as a Socio-Technical Communication Process

Cristhian Rivera
Fernanda Tusa
Michelle Espinoza

Universidad Técnica de Machala

0000-0001-6959-508X; ceriverao@utmachala.edu.ec

0000-0002-1570-9579; ftusa@utmachala.edu.ec

0000-0001-5010-181X; mespinoza8@utmachala.edu.ec

Ignacio Aguaded

Universidad de Huelva

0000-0002-0229-1118; aguaded@uhu.es



© the authors

Reception: August 2025

Acceptance: May 2026

Publication: September 2026

Recommended citation: RIVERA, C., TUSA, F., ESPINOZA, M., & AGUADED, I. (2026). "Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Creative Writing: Reconfiguring Authorship as a Socio-Technical Communication Process". *Anàlisi: Quaderns de Comunicació i Cultura*, forthcoming, 1-28. <<https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/analisi.3895>>

Abstract

This article examines artificial intelligence-assisted creative writing as a socio-technical communication process embedded in contemporary media ecosystems. Rather than treating generative AI exclusively as a literary innovation or as a philosophical challenge to romantic notions of authorship, the study situates AI writing within the interrelated domains of mediation, circulation, platform infrastructures, cultural industries and institutional validation. The article adopts a qualitative comparative case study design and analyzes four emblematic cases of human-AI textual production and reception: Pharmako-AI, Death of an Author, Sunspring and Dramatron. To address concerns regarding analytical precision, the research defines a transparent corpus composed of peer-reviewed scholarship, media coverage, public interviews, platform and industry documentation and the primary texts or scripts associated with each case. Five analytical dimensions are operationalized across the corpus: degree of human intervention, narrative coherence and depth, perceived originality, communicative reception and ethical-institutional tension. Drawing on Barthes's and Foucault's classic reflections on authorship and integrating platformization, mediatization, actor-network theory and cultural industries scholarship,

the article argues that AI does not eliminate the author but redistributes authorial agency across socio-technical assemblages in which writers, models, interfaces, publishers, platforms, critics and audiences participate in the production of legitimacy. The findings indicate that authorship in AI-assisted writing is increasingly negotiated through communicative processes of framing, disclosure, circulation and evaluation rather than through textual origin alone. On this basis, the article proposes a framework of responsible co-authorship grounded in transparency, proportional attribution, editorial disclosure and the protection of cultural diversity. The study contributes to communication research by showing that AI writing is not only a matter of creativity but also a mediated process of symbolic production in which power, legitimacy and meaning are structured by digital infrastructures and institutional arrangements.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; creative writing; authorship; communication theory; platformization; mediatization; human-AI collaboration; cultural industries

Resum. *Impacte de la intel·ligència artificial en l'escriptura creativa: reconfiguració de l'autoria com a procés comunicatiu sociotècnic*

Aquest article examina l'escriptura creativa assistida per intel·ligència artificial com un procés comunicatiu sociotècnic inserit en els ecosistemes mediàtics contemporanis. En lloc d'abordar la intel·ligència artificial generativa exclusivament com una innovació literària o com un desafiament filosòfic a les nocions romàntiques d'autoria, l'estudi situa l'escriptura mediada per IA en els dominis interrelacionats de la mediació, la circulació, les infraestructures de plataforma, les indústries culturals i la validació institucional. L'article adopta un disseny qualitatiu d'estudi de cas comparatiu i analitza quatre casos emblemàtics de producció i recepció textual humà-IA: Pharmako-AI, Death of an Author, Sunspring i Dramatron. Amb el propòsit d'atendre les preocupacions relatives a la precisió analítica, la recerca defineix un corpus transparent compost per literatura acadèmica revisada per experts, cobertura mediàtica, entrevistes públiques, documentació de plataformes i indústries, així com els textos o guions primaris associats amb cada cas. Al llarg del corpus s'operacionalitzen cinc dimensions analítiques: grau d'intervenció humana, coherència i profunditat narrativa, originalitat percebuda, recepció comunicativa i tensió eticoinstitucional. A partir de les reflexions clàssiques de Barthes i Foucault sobre l'autoria, i integrant aportacions sobre plataformització, mediatització, teoria de l'actor-xarxa i indústries culturals, l'article sosté que la IA no elimina l'autor, sinó que redistribueix l'agència autoral a través d'acoblements sociotècnics en els quals escriptors, models, interfícies, editorials, plataformes, crítics i audiències participen en la producció de legitimitat. Les troballes indiquen que l'autoria en l'escriptura assistida per IA es negocia cada vegada més mitjançant processos comunicatius d'enquadrament, divulgació, circulació i avaluació, abans que únicament a partir de l'origen textual. Sobre aquesta base, l'article proposa un marc de coautoria responsable sustentat en la transparència, l'atribució proporcional, la declaració editorial i la protecció de la diversitat cultural. L'estudi contribueix al camp de la recerca en comunicació en demostrar que l'escriptura amb IA no constitueix només una qüestió de creativitat, sinó també un procés mediat de producció simbòlica en què el poder, la legitimitat i el significat són estructurats per infraestructures digitals i arranjaments institucionals.

Paraules clau: intel·ligència artificial; escriptura creativa; autoria; teoria de la comunicació; plataformització; mediatització; col·laboració humà-IA; indústries culturals

Resumen. *Impacto de la inteligencia artificial en la escritura creativa: reconfiguración de la autoría como proceso comunicativo sociotécnico*

Este artículo examina la escritura creativa asistida por inteligencia artificial como un proceso comunicativo sociotécnico inserto en los ecosistemas mediáticos contemporáneos. En lugar de abordar la inteligencia artificial generativa exclusivamente como una innovación literaria o como un desafío filosófico a las nociones románticas de autoría, el estudio sitúa la escritura mediada por IA en los dominios interrelacionados de la mediación, la circulación, las infraestructuras de plataforma, las industrias culturales y la validación institucional. El artículo adopta un diseño cualitativo de estudio de caso comparativo y analiza cuatro casos emblemáticos de producción y recepción textual humano-IA: Pharmako-AI, Death of an Author, Sunspring y Dramatron. Con el propósito de atender las preocupaciones relativas a la precisión analítica, la investigación define un corpus transparente compuesto por literatura académica revisada por pares, cobertura mediática, entrevistas públicas, documentación de plataformas e industrias, así como los textos o guiones primarios asociados con cada caso. A lo largo del corpus se operacionalizan cinco dimensiones analíticas: grado de intervención humana, coherencia y profundidad narrativa, originalidad percibida, recepción comunicativa y tensión ético-institucional. A partir de las reflexiones clásicas de Barthes y Foucault sobre la autoría, e integrando aportes sobre plataforma, mediatización, teoría del actor-red e industrias culturales, el artículo sostiene que la IA no elimina al autor, sino que redistribuye la agencia autoral a través de ensamblajes sociotécnicos en los que escritores, modelos, interfaces, editoriales, plataformas, críticos y audiencias participan en la producción de legitimidad. Los hallazgos indican que la autoría en la escritura asistida por IA se negocia cada vez más mediante procesos comunicativos de encuadre, divulgación, circulación y evaluación, antes que únicamente a partir del origen textual. Sobre esta base, el artículo propone un marco de coautoría responsable sustentado en la transparencia, la atribución proporcional, la declaración editorial y la protección de la diversidad cultural. El estudio contribuye al campo de la investigación en comunicación al demostrar que la escritura con IA no constituye solo una cuestión de creatividad, sino también un proceso mediado de producción simbólica en el que el poder, la legitimidad y el significado son estructurados por infraestructuras digitales y arreglos institucionales.

Palabras clave: inteligencia artificial; escritura creativa; autoría; teoría de la comunicación; plataforma; mediatización; colaboración humano-IA; industrias culturales

1. Introduction

The accelerated diffusion of generative artificial intelligence (AI) in text production has intensified longstanding debates concerning creativity originality and the epistemological status of authorship within contemporary cultural production systems (Bender et al., 2021; Floridi et al., 2018). While early discussions on computational creativity tended to frame AI as either a threat to human originality or as a mere assistive tool, recent developments in large language models (LLMs) have complicated this binary by demonstrating the capacity of algorithmic systems to generate coherent, stylistically varied and contextually adaptive texts at scale (Bommasani et al., 2021; Marcus & Davis, 2019). However, limiting the analysis of AI-assisted writing to aesthetic or philosophical concerns risks obscuring its broader implications

within mediated communication environments, where textual production is inseparable from infrastructures, platforms and socio-technical systems (Couldry & Hepp, 2017; van Dijck et al., 2018).

From a communication perspective, AI-generated writing must be understood not as an isolated textual phenomenon but as a process embedded within platformized media ecologies, where production, circulation and reception are shaped by algorithmic infrastructures and institutional arrangements (Poell et al., 2019; Gillespie, 2014). Large language models operate within complex technological assemblages that rely on massive datasets, cloud computing architectures and proprietary interfaces, while simultaneously intersecting with industries such as publishing, journalism, education and entertainment (Srnicsek, 2017; Nieborg & Poell, 2018). Consequently, authorship is no longer confined to the intentional act of a singular subject but emerges through distributed interactions among human agents, computational systems and mediating institutions, thereby necessitating an analytical shift toward socio-technical frameworks (Latour, 2005; Couldry & Hepp, 2017).

This reconceptualization is particularly relevant within the field of communication studies, where the object of analysis is not only the content of messages but the processes through which meaning is produced, circulated and legitimized (Hall, 1980; Couldry, 2008). When AI-assisted writing is approached exclusively through the lens of creativity, the analysis remains confined to conceptual reflection and risks neglecting key dimensions such as mediation, reception, framing and institutional validation (Entman, 1993; Hesmondhalgh, 2019).

By contrast, situating AI writing within communication research enables a more comprehensive inquiry into how texts are generated through interfaces, how they are framed by media discourse, how platforms and publishers shape their visibility, how legal frameworks regulate attribution and how audiences interpret authorship under conditions of algorithmic mediation (van Dijck et al., 2018; Napoli, 2019). This shift does not displace literary theory; rather, it repositions it within a broader communicative and cultural context, allowing for a more integrated understanding of contemporary textual production (Foucault, 1984; Barthes, 1967).

In light of these considerations, the present article advances an integrative analytical framework that brings together two lines of inquiry that have often remained artificially separated.

- The first concerns classical and contemporary debates on authorship, creativity and textual legitimacy, drawing on foundational contributions from literary theory and creativity studies (Barthes, 1967; Csikszentmihályi, 1996).
- The second engages with communication theory, particularly the concepts of platformization, mediatization and cultural industries, to examine the socio-technical environments in which texts are produced, circulated and evaluated (Couldry & Hepp, 2017; Hesmondhalgh, 2019).

By articulating these perspectives, the study seeks to move beyond two reductive positions: on the one hand, technological determinism, which attributes transformative agency exclusively to AI systems and, on the other, residual humanism, which treats AI as an external disturbance to an otherwise stable authorial order (Floridi et al., 2018; Latour, 2005). Instead, it proposes that AI-assisted writing constitutes a site of negotiation where authorship is continuously redistributed, contested and institutionalized through communication processes.

Guided by this conceptual framework, the study addresses the following research question: How does artificial intelligence reconfigure authorship when creative writing is understood as a mediated socio-technical communication process rather than as a purely individual or literary act? To explore this question, the article examines four widely discussed cases that represent distinct configurations of human–AI collaboration and different modes of communicative visibility:

- Pharmako-AI, a collaborative philosophical-literary experiment.
- Death of an Author, a commercially framed literary work that has generated public debate regarding machine-generated prose.
- Sunspring, an early experiment in AI-generated screenwriting whose meaning is shaped through performance and media circulation.
- Dramatron, a professionalized scriptwriting tool that exemplifies the integration of AI within creative industries (Mirowski et al., 2023; Nieborg & Poell, 2018).

These cases are not selected for their representativeness but for their analytical richness, as they illuminate how authorship, mediation and legitimacy are negotiated under different conditions of production and reception. Unlike earlier approaches that tended to attribute causal agency directly to AI systems, the present study adopts a more cautious and analytically grounded position.

It does not claim that AI has become an author in a legal or ontological sense, nor does it suggest that algorithmic systems independently determine literary value (Bender et al., 2021; Marcus & Davis, 2019). Rather, it demonstrates that the communicative organization of authorship is undergoing a process of reconfiguration, in which agency emerges through a constellation of practices including human prompting, machine generation, editorial curation, platform affordances, paratextual disclosure, media framing and audience interpretation (Couldry & Hepp, 2017; van Dijck et al., 2018). This reframing allows the study to maintain theoretical ambition while ensuring methodological precision and empirical responsibility.

To support this analytical approach, the article adopts a structured qualitative comparative design based on a clearly defined corpus and a set of operationalized analytical dimensions. In doing so, it moves beyond the format of a purely speculative essay and positions itself as an exploratory yet methodologi-

cally grounded study that contributes to ongoing debates on AI, literature and communication. The article aims to advance scholarly understanding of how authorship is being redefined within contemporary media environments, offering insights that are relevant not only for literary studies but also for broader discussions on mediation, cultural production and digital legitimacy in the age of artificial intelligence (Hesmondhalgh, 2019; Napoli, 2019).

2. Theoretical Framework and State of the Art

2.1. *Authorship from Literary Theory to Communication Theory*

Any robust examination of AI-assisted writing must begin by revisiting the intellectual history of authorship. Barthes's (1967) formulation of the "death of the author" questioned the assumption that textual meaning originates in the sovereign intention of a singular creator. In Barthes's formulation, the text is a tissue of quotations drawn from multiple cultural sources and interpretation is activated through reading rather than secured by authorial presence.

Foucault (1984), while less celebratory of authorial disappearance, similarly displaced authorship from the biographical person to the "author function," that is, a classificatory and institutional principle through which discourses are organized, owned, regulated and legitimized. These classic interventions remain indispensable because they reveal that authorship has never been merely an empirical fact of composition; it has always been a discursive, legal and institutional arrangement.

However, the rise of generative AI requires that these insights be extended beyond literary theory into communication theory. If authorship is already a function of discourse and institutional recognition, then AI does not simply threaten an existing authorial order from the outside. Rather, it intensifies the visibility of the mediations that have always structured textual production.

Communication theory makes it possible to conceptualize these mediations more precisely. In particular, actor-network theory (Latour, 2005) reframes agency as distributed across heterogeneous assemblages of humans, technologies and institutions. From this perspective, AI-assisted writing is not best understood as a binary relation between a human writer and a machine, but as a networked process involving prompts, training data, interfaces, software providers, publication systems, journalists, reviewers, cultural gatekeepers and audiences. Authorship, therefore, appears not as a property but as an effect of relations. This networked perspective is especially valuable because it helps avoid two analytical errors that frequently appear in public debates on generative AI.

- The first is the anthropomorphic inflation of AI, in which models are described as if they independently intend, decide or create.
- The second is the reduction of AI to a neutral tool, which obscures how interfaces and infrastructures condition action. Actor-network

theory does not require attributing human-like consciousness to machines; instead, it asks how non-human actors participate in chains of mediation and how their participation reorganizes responsibility and legitimacy (Latour, 2005).

Applied to AI writing, this means that the relevant question is not whether the machine is literally an author, but how machine-generated outputs alter the distribution of authorial work, symbolic recognition and cultural accountability. This shift also connects authorship to mediatization theory. Couldry and Hepp (2017) argue that contemporary reality is increasingly constructed through media processes that shape social interaction, visibility and institutional power.

AI-generated texts do not exist as isolated artifacts; they circulate within media ecologies where they are framed by platforms, covered by news outlets, evaluated by critics, discussed on social media and sometimes stabilized through publishing institutions. In this sense, authorship is increasingly mediated not simply at the point of production but throughout the entire communicative life of the text. The authority of the writer is therefore refracted through a wider chain of mediation than classical print culture typically foregrounded.

The study also draws on scholarship on creativity as a system. Csikszentmihalyi's (1996) model remains useful because it conceptualizes creativity as the interaction among an individual or producer, a domain of knowledge and a field of social validation. This framework is especially illuminating in the context of AI, where the "individual" may become a human-machine assemblage, the "domain" is reshaped by data-driven generation and platform interfaces and the "field" of validation includes critics, editors, publishers, festival organizers, readers and legal regimes. Although this model originated in psychology and creativity studies rather than communication studies, its emphasis on social validation converges strongly with communication-centered accounts of legitimacy and circulation.

Campbell's (2008) reflections on mythic structure and recurrent narrative patterns provide a useful, though more limited, lens for understanding how generative models can reproduce recognizable cultural schemas. Language models are able to generate texts that imitate narrative arcs and archetypal structures because they statistically capture recurrent textual patterns.

Yet the relevance of Campbell in the present article lies less in validating AI's narrative competence than in clarifying why generated texts may appear culturally legible even when they lack depth, intentionality or coherent symbolic development. Such legibility matters communicatively because audiences and critics often encounter AI-generated texts not as raw computation but as recognizable genres circulating within media frames of novelty, experimentation or controversy.

2.2. *Platformization, Mediatization and Cultural Industries*

The platformization of cultural production is a decisive context for understanding AI writing. Van Dijck et al. (2018) describe platformization as the penetration of platform logics into economic, governmental and cultural domains, reorganizing the conditions under which content is produced, distributed, monetized and ranked. Generative AI systems are inseparable from this context.

Whether accessed through proprietary interfaces, integrated into writing software or embedded in broader ecosystems of digital labor, these models are not simply technical instruments. They are platform services that structure user behavior, collect interactional data, normalize workflows and establish asymmetries of visibility and control. In such environments, authorship is not only a matter of who writes but of how writing is scaffolded by interfaces and governed by corporate infrastructures.

This platformized condition intersects with the logic of cultural industries. Hesmondhalgh (2019) emphasizes that cultural production is shaped by industrial organization, market concentration, professional gatekeeping and struggles over symbolic value. AI-generated or AI-assisted writing enters these circuits unevenly. Some texts are framed as avant-garde experiments, others as efficiency tools, others as threats to labor and intellectual property and others as entertainment novelties.

These differences matter because literary and audiovisual legitimacy does not emerge solely from textual features; it is produced through institutions such as publishers, festivals, streaming industries, prizes and media commentary. In this sense, AI writing is inseparable from the communicative and economic systems that determine whether it is dismissed, sensationalized, commodified or canonized.

This perspective also helps explain why media framing is central to the public life of AI-assisted texts. A work described as “95% written by AI” enters public discourse under a very different horizon of expectation than one presented as an experimental collaboration between a writer and a model. These labels are not neutral descriptors; they are framing devices that shape interpretation, moral judgment and market value.

Communication research has long shown that framing organizes public understanding by highlighting certain aspects of reality and suppressing others. In the context of AI writing, media framing can privilege disruption, anxiety, innovation, fraud, democratization or artistic experimentation, thereby influencing how authorship is perceived before the text is even read. The issue is further complicated by legal and policy debates on intellectual property and AI governance. UNESCO’s (2021) Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and current European regulatory developments, including the AI Act (European Parliament, 2024), do not provide a single settled answer to authorship in generative systems, but they do foreground principles such as transparency, accountability, safety and the protection of cultural diversity.

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO, 2023) has similarly documented the unresolved nature of AI-related questions concerning ownership, attribution and authorship. These frameworks are highly relevant to communication analysis because they reveal that AI writing is not just a matter of private creativity; it is a public issue in which discourse, regulation and institutional norms interact.

The article's state of the art therefore moves beyond an accumulative literature review and is organized around three interrelated lines of research.

- The first concerns empirical studies of human-AI writing collaboration, including how professional writers use AI assistants, how users perceive ownership over generated texts and how AI affects individual creativity and collective diversity (Biermann et al., 2022; Doshi & Hauser, 2024; Draxler et al., 2024; Ippolito et al., 2022).
- The second concerns narrative generation and literary or scriptwriting experimentation, especially the limits of coherence, emotional depth and stylistic distinctiveness in AI-generated storytelling (Mirowski et al., 2023; Nichols et al., 2020; Tian et al., 2024; Xie et al., 2023).
- The third concerns institutional and ethical debates about cultural production under AI, including rights, attribution, labor and the governance of platformized creativity (European Parliament, 2024; UNESCO, 2021; WIPO, 2023).

Taken together, these lines of scholarship support a more grounded and communicatively oriented approach to AI writing than one based solely on literary-philosophical reflection.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design and Epistemological Positioning

This study adopts a qualitative comparative case study design, situated within an interpretive paradigm that seeks to understand the reconfiguration of authorship as a socio-technical communication process. Qualitative case study research is particularly appropriate when the objective is to explore complex phenomena embedded in real-world contexts, especially when boundaries between the phenomenon and its environment are not clearly evident (Yin, 2018; Stake, 1995).

In this case, artificial intelligence-assisted writing cannot be isolated from the communication infrastructures, cultural industries and discursive practices in which it is produced and interpreted. The study is therefore not oriented toward measuring the prevalence or frequency of AI-assisted authorship across the broader cultural field.

Instead, it aims to provide an in-depth, context-sensitive analysis of selected emblematic cases, focusing on how authorship is articulated through

interactions among textual production, technological mediation, communicative reception and institutional validation. This epistemological positioning aligns with interpretive research traditions in communication studies, which emphasize meaning-making processes and discursive construction over statistical generalization (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018; Couldry & Hepp, 2017).

At the same time, the study explicitly acknowledges the limitations of qualitative case-based inquiry. The selected cases are illustrative rather than statistically representative and the findings are presented as analytically grounded interpretive insights rather than universally generalizable claims. This clarification directly addresses concerns regarding methodological scope and ensures coherence between research design and conclusions, in line with best practices in qualitative research (Maxwell, 2013; Flick, 2018).

3.2. Corpus Construction and Data Sources

To enhance methodological rigor and avoid overreliance on interpretive speculation, the study defines a clearly delimited and multi-layered corpus, structured around four complementary categories of data. The construction of a heterogeneous corpus is essential in qualitative communication research, as it allows for triangulation and provides a more comprehensive understanding of mediated phenomena (Krippendorff, 2018; Denzin, 2012).

- The first category consists of peer-reviewed academic literature on artificial intelligence, creativity, authorship and digital communication, published primarily between 2018 and 2025. This period corresponds to the consolidation of large language models and the expansion of scholarly debates on human–AI collaboration (Floridi et al., 2018; Bender et al., 2021). These sources provide the conceptual and empirical grounding necessary to situate the study within current academic discussions.
- The second category includes media coverage and critical discourse, such as journalistic articles, interviews, reviews and industry reports related to each case. Media texts are not treated as neutral reflections but as discursive constructions that actively shape public understanding of AI authorship, in line with framing theory and mediatization approaches (Entman, 1993; Couldry & Hepp, 2017).
- The third category comprises primary materials associated with the cases themselves, including published books, scripts, project documentation and publicly available outputs generated through AI systems. These materials allow for direct analysis of narrative structure, stylistic features and human–AI interaction.
- The fourth category includes policy and institutional documents, such as UNESCO’s Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (UNESCO, 2021), the European Union’s AI Act (European Parliament, 2024) and discussions on intellectual property governance

(WIPO, 2023). These documents are essential for contextualizing ethical and institutional tensions within broader regulatory frameworks.

The integration of these four data sources enables methodological triangulation, which strengthens the credibility and validity of qualitative findings by comparing multiple perspectives on the same phenomenon (Denzin, 2012; Patton, 2015).

Table 1. Corpus Structure and Data Sources

Data Category	Type of Material	Analytical Purpose
Academic Literature	Peer-reviewed articles, books	Theoretical grounding and empirical context
Media Discourse	Press, interviews, reviews	Analysis of framing and public perception
Primary Materials	Texts, scripts, AI outputs	Narrative and stylistic analysis
Institutional Documents	Policy frameworks, legal texts	Ethical and regulatory contextualization

3.3. Case Selection Strategy

Case selection followed a purposeful sampling strategy, commonly used in qualitative research to identify information-rich cases that illuminate key dimensions of the phenomenon under study (Patton, 2015; Creswell & Poth, 2018). Rather than aiming for representativeness, the goal was to select cases that exemplify different configurations of human–AI interaction and communicative mediation. Three explicit criteria guided the selection process:

- The first criterion was communicative visibility, requiring that each case be situated within media circuits where issues of authorship, legitimacy and AI creativity have been publicly debated. This ensures that the cases are not only technically relevant but also socially and communicatively significant (Couldry & Hepp, 2017).
- The second criterion was evidentiary clarity regarding human–AI interaction, meaning that sufficient documentation exists regarding the role of prompts, editing, algorithmic generation, performance or system design. This criterion is essential for analyzing authorship as a distributed process rather than an abstract concept (Latour, 2005).
- The third criterion was diversity of production context, ensuring that the selected cases represent different media and cultural industries, including literary publishing, audiovisual production and creative tools. This diversity allows for cross-case comparison and avoids limiting the analysis to a single domain (Hesmondhalgh, 2019).

Based on these criteria, four cases were selected: *Pharmako-AI*, *Death of an Author*, *Sunspring* and *Dramatron*. These cases should not be interpreted as a comprehensive sample of AI writing, but rather as analytical exemplars that reveal distinct modes of mediation and authorship.

Table 2. Case Selection Criteria

Criterion	Description	Rationale
Communicative Visibility	Presence in media/public discourse	Ensures relevance in communication processes
Human–AI Interaction	Documented collaboration dynamics	Enables analysis of distributed authorship
Production Diversity	Inclusion of different media contexts	Allows cross-sector comparison

3.4. Analytical Procedures

The analytical strategy combines qualitative narrative analysis and discourse analysis, enabling the study to address both textual and contextual dimensions of authorship. This dual approach is particularly appropriate for communication research, where meaning is produced through both content and its circulation (Fairclough, 2013).

Narrative analysis focuses on the internal structure of the texts, examining elements such as coherence, voice, plot development and thematic organization. This approach allows the study to assess how AI participation influences narrative construction, particularly in relation to the degree of human intervention (Riessman, 2008). Discourse analysis, in contrast, examines how each case is represented and interpreted within public and institutional contexts. This includes the analysis of media framing, critical discourse and authorial statements, paying particular attention to language related to creativity originality, disruption and legitimacy (Entman, 1993).

By combining these methods, the study captures both the textual dimension of authorship and the communicative processes through which authorship is negotiated and legitimized.

To ensure consistency and analytical rigor, five key dimensions were operationalized and systematically applied across all cases. Operationalization is a critical step in qualitative research, as it transforms abstract concepts into analyzable categories (Krippendorff, 2018).

Table 3. Analytical Dimensions and Indicators

Dimension	Description	Indicators
Human Intervention	Degree and type of human participation	Prompting, editing, curation, performance
Narrative Coherence	Structural and thematic consistency	Plot development, voice, cohesion
Perceived Originality	Discursive evaluation of novelty	Media descriptions, critical reviews
Communicative Reception	Public and institutional framing	Press coverage, audience discourse
Ethical-Institutional Tension	Debates on authorship and governance	IP issues, attribution, policy concerns

Each dimension was analyzed across all cases, ensuring comparability and systematic interpretation.

3.5. Validity, Reliability and Analytical Limitations

The study adopts multiple strategies to enhance validity and reliability.

- First, triangulation across data sources allows for cross-verification of findings, reducing dependence on any single perspective (Denzin, 2012; Patton, 2015).
- Second, analytic transparency is ensured through the explicit definition of corpus, criteria and procedures.
- Third, reflexivity is incorporated by acknowledging the interpretive nature of the analysis and the researcher's role in meaning construction (Flick, 2018).

Importantly, the study deliberately adopts a moderation of claims, recognizing that the available evidence does not allow definitive conclusions about large-scale transformations in authorship or creativity. Instead, the findings are presented as evidence that communicative practices of authorship attribution and legitimacy are being reconfigured within platformized environments. This methodological self-limitation should not be understood as a weakness, but as an epistemic safeguard, ensuring that the study remains analytically rigorous and avoids interpretive overreach (Maxwell, 2013).

4. Results

The comparative analysis demonstrates that AI-assisted writing cannot be reduced to a singular or stable model of authorship; rather, it manifests as a heterogeneous set of practices shaped by varying configurations of human intervention, technological mediation, communicative framing and institutional validation (Latour, 2005; Couldry & Hepp, 2017).

While the four cases analyzed differ significantly in genre, production context and degree of algorithmic involvement, a shared structural pattern emerges: authorship is increasingly distributed across socio-technical assemblages, in which textual generation, editorial curation, media discourse and cultural legitimacy operate as interdependent processes (van Dijck et al., 2018; Hesmondhalgh, 2019). This finding aligns with contemporary research suggesting that AI does not replace authorship but reorganizes it through networks of human and non-human actors embedded in platformized environments (Bender et al., 2021; Floridi et al., 2018).

To ensure analytical clarity, the results are presented in two stages: first, a detailed examination of each case across the five operationalized dimensions and second, a cross-case synthesis that identifies convergences and divergences within broader communication processes. This structure allows the

study to move beyond isolated interpretation and toward a comparative analytical framework grounded in empirical and discursive evidence (Yin, 2018; Krippendorff, 2018).

4.1. Pharmako-AI: Distributed Authorship as Dialogic Mediation

Pharmako-AI represents a paradigmatic case of explicitly acknowledged human–AI collaboration, in which authorship is framed as a dialogic interaction between K. Allado-McDowell and GPT-3. In terms of human intervention, the case exhibits a high degree of editorial and conceptual control, as the human author initiates prompts, curates outputs and structures the final narrative into a coherent philosophical text (Ippolito et al., 2022; Biermann et al., 2022). This configuration confirms findings in human–AI co-creativity research, which indicate that AI systems function primarily as generators of possibilities, while human agents remain responsible for selection, evaluation and meaning-making (Mirowski et al., 2023; Serbanescu & Nack, 2023). Consequently, authorship in this case is not autonomous machine production but a mediated process of co-construction.

From a narrative perspective, Pharmako-AI challenges conventional expectations of coherence by adopting a fragmentary and essayistic structure that privileges conceptual resonance over linear progression (Csikszentmihályi, 1996; Riessman, 2008). Rather than interpreting this structure as a limitation of AI, the analysis suggests that coherence emerges at the level of thematic recurrence and philosophical continuity, particularly around motifs such as ecology, cognition and posthuman subjectivity (Floridi et al., 2018; Latour, 2005). This indicates that evaluations of AI-generated writing are strongly conditioned by genre-specific expectations and communicative framing, reinforcing the idea that meaning is co-produced through textual form and contextual interpretation (Hall, 1980; Entman, 1993). Perceived originality in Pharmako-AI is not attributed to the machine as an independent creator but to the hybrid dispositif that integrates human prompting, algorithmic generation and editorial curation into a coherent conceptual artifact (Bender et al., 2021; Bommasani et al., 2021).

It supports the argument that originality in AI-assisted writing is increasingly procedural and relational, emerging from the orchestration of interaction rather than from isolated acts of invention (Doshi & Hauser, 2024; Serbanescu & Nack, 2023). This case circulated primarily within experimental literary and technological discourse, where it was interpreted as an exploratory artifact rather than a commercial product (Couldry, 2008; Gillespie, 2014). The explicit attribution of GPT-3 on the book cover functions as a paratextual strategy that foregrounds co-authorship and invites readers to interpret the work through a technological lens (Foucault, 1984; Barthes, 1967). This reinforces the role of mediation in shaping authorship, as attribution becomes part of the communicative construction of the text.

The ethical-institutional tension in Pharmako-AI centers on transparency and symbolic attribution rather than concealment (UNESCO, 2021; World Intellectual Property Organization, 2023). While the case demonstrates a relatively transparent model of co-authorship, it also reveals that legitimacy depends on the cultural and institutional context in which the work circulates, highlighting the importance of discursive validation mechanisms in AI-assisted creativity (Hesmondhalgh, 2019; Napoli, 2019).

4.2. Death of an Author: Authorship as Media Event and Discursive Construction

Death of an Author represents a case in which AI-assisted writing is deeply embedded within media discourse and public controversy, transforming authorship into a communicative event rather than a purely textual phenomenon (Entman, 1993; Couldry & Hepp, 2017). Although the work was publicly framed as largely AI-generated, empirical evidence suggests a process of iterative prompting, editing and curation, consistent with findings in human–AI collaboration studies (Biermann et al., 2022; Draxler et al., 2024). This discrepancy between public framing and production practice illustrates how authorship is constructed through discourse rather than determined solely by technical processes (Hall, 1980; Napoli, 2019).

In contrast to Pharmako-AI, this case is evaluated within the conventions of literary fiction, where narrative coherence and stylistic consistency are more strictly defined (Tian et al., 2024; Xie et al., 2023). While AI-generated text demonstrates local coherence, it often requires significant human intervention to sustain thematic depth and narrative continuity, reinforcing the argument that algorithmic generation alone is insufficient for literary intentionality (Marcus & Davis, 2019; Bender et al., 2021).

Perceived originality in this case is highly contested, oscillating between innovation and skepticism (Floridi et al., 2018; Doshi & Hauser, 2024). Importantly originality is often attributed not to the text itself but to the communicative framing of the work as AI-generated, suggesting that novelty is produced through discourse and publicity rather than intrinsic textual features (Gillespie, 2014; van Dijck et al., 2018).

This phenomenon highlights the role of eventization in AI writing, where media narratives shape reception and meaning. Communicative reception is central to the case's significance, as the work functions as a discursive proxy for broader societal anxieties about automation, creativity and labor (Couldry, 2008; Hesmondhalgh, 2019). The instability of authorship attribution—oscillating between human author, machine and hybrid forms—illustrates the dynamic nature of the author function in contemporary media environments (Foucault, 1984; Latour, 2005).

Ethically, the case raises questions about proportional attribution and legitimacy within cultural markets (UNESCO, 2021; European Parliament, 2024). The persistence of human authorship as the primary source of sym-

bolic capital, despite significant machine involvement, reveals a structural tension between legal frameworks, public discourse and creative practice (Draxler et al., 2024; World Intellectual Property Organization, 2023).

4.3. Sunspring: Performance, Mediation and the Spectacle of AI Writing

Sunspring occupies a foundational position in public discourse on AI-generated narratives, primarily due to its audiovisual mediation and performative realization (Couldry & Hepp, 2017; Gillespie, 2014). While the screenplay was generated algorithmically, the final artifact depended on human interpretation through acting, direction and editing, demonstrating that authorship extends beyond textual generation into multi-layered communicative processes (Latour, 2005; Hall, 1980).

Narrative coherence in Sunspring is notably limited, reflecting the constraints of early AI systems in maintaining causal structure and emotional depth (Tian et al., 2024; Xie et al., 2023). However, these limitations became a source of communicative value, as the work was framed as an experimental demonstration of machine-generated strangeness rather than a conventional narrative (Floridi et al., 2018; Marcus & Davis, 2019). This reveals a critical distinction between narrative value and media value, where the latter is constructed through visibility, novelty and discourse (Couldry, 2008; Entman, 1993).

Perceived originality in Sunspring is thus rooted in its procedural transparency and performative framing, rather than in textual sophistication (Bender et al., 2021; Bommasani et al., 2021). The gap between machine output and human interpretation becomes the central site of meaning, aligning with theories of co-creativity and human–AI interaction (Serbanescu & Nack, 2023; Mirowski et al., 2023).

Communicative reception played a decisive role in transforming Sunspring into a cultural reference point, as media coverage and festival circulation amplified its significance (Couldry & Hepp, 2017; van Dijck et al., 2018). Authorship in this case is radically distributed across a network that includes the algorithm, developers, performers and media institutions, illustrating the networked nature of cultural production (Latour, 2005; Hesmondhalgh, 2019).

The case raises questions about the valuation of machine-generated artifacts and the role of human interpretation in assigning meaning (UNESCO, 2021; European Parliament, 2024). Rather than displacing human creativity, Sunspring demonstrates its continued centrality in processes of interpretation and cultural validation.

4.4. Dramatron: Platformization and Professional Co-Creation

Dramatron differs from the previous cases by functioning as a creative tool embedded within professional workflows, rather than as a standalone artifact

(Mirowski et al., 2023; Nieborg & Poell, 2018). This situates the case within the framework of platformization, where AI systems operate as infrastructural components of cultural production (van Dijck et al., 2018; Srnicek, 2017).

Human intervention remains central, as writers use the system to generate ideas, outlines and drafts while retaining control over narrative development and final output (Biermann et al., 2022; Ippolito et al., 2022). This confirms that AI functions as an augmentative rather than substitutive technology, supporting creativity without eliminating human agency (Doshi & Hauser, 2024; Serbanescu & Nack, 2023).

Narrative coherence and depth depend on the interaction between user and system, reinforcing the concept of collaborative authorship (Riessman, 2008; Krippendorff, 2018). While AI can enhance productivity, it also introduces risks of homogenization, as outputs reflect statistically probable patterns (Doshi & Hauser, 2024; Bommasani et al., 2021).

Perceived originality is therefore contingent upon human intervention, as users must actively transform or resist algorithmic suggestions to achieve stylistic distinction (Floridi et al., 2018; Marcus & Davis, 2019). This challenges deterministic narratives about AI democratizing creativity, highlighting the importance of critical engagement with technological affordances (Gillespie, 2014; Srnicek, 2017).

Communicative reception of Dramatron is characterized by professional discourse rather than media sensationalism, focusing on productivity, workflow and industry implications (Napoli, 2019; Hesmondhalgh, 2019). This demonstrates how authorship is framed differently depending on context, reinforcing the importance of cultural industries analysis.

Ethical tensions in this case relate to labor, autonomy and governance, particularly concerning the normalization of algorithmic assistance and its impact on creative diversity (UNESCO, 2021; European Parliament, 2024). The findings suggest that responsible authorship must address not only attribution but also the broader structural conditions of cultural production. Across all cases, three central patterns emerge:

- Authorship is distributed across socio-technical networks (Latour, 2005; Couldry & Hepp, 2017).
- Mediation shapes meaning, with platforms and discourse influencing reception (van Dijck et al., 2018; Entman, 1993).
- Legitimacy is constructed institutionally, rather than determined by technological capability (Hesmondhalgh, 2019; Napoli, 2019).

These findings confirm that AI-assisted writing should be understood not as a purely technological phenomenon but as a communication process embedded within cultural, institutional and socio-technical systems.

Table 4. Cross-case comparison of findings

Case	Human intervention	Narrative coherence	Perceived originality	Communicative reception	Ethical-institutional tension
Pharmako-AI	High curation and editorial steering by the human author.	Conceptual and thematic coherence outweighs linear plot structure.	Originality arises from the collaborative dispositif and explicit disclosure.	Received mainly within experimental literary, art and technology circuits.	Transparency is strong, but attribution standards remain culturally unstable.
Death of an Author	Substantial prompting, selection, revision and assembly by the human writer.	Readable structure depends heavily on human curation and genre management.	Novelty is partly textual and partly produced by media framing of AI involvement.	Discussed widely in mainstream media as a controversial literary event.	Questions of proportional attribution, legitimacy and marketable disclosure become central.
Sunspring	Machine-centered script generation; strong human remediation through performance and direction.	Low textual coherence, partially compensated by staging and interpretation.	Originality lies in the experiment's visibility and uncanniness rather than refined writing.	Circulated as a media spectacle and emblem of algorithmic creativity.	Challenges assumptions about meaning, intention and symbolic value under machine generation.
Dramatron	High human control over use, acceptance, rejection and rewriting of outputs.	Structural aid is useful, but depth depends on writer intervention.	Can expand ideation while also encouraging generic patterns.	Received mainly as a professional co-writing tool within creative industries discourse.	Raises issues of labor, standardization, autonomy and protection of cultural diversity.

5. Discussion

The comparative findings indicate that AI-assisted writing is best understood not as a homogeneous revolution in creativity, but as a reorganization of the communicative conditions through which authorship is produced, circulated and legitimized (Couldry & Hepp, 2017; van Dijck et al., 2018).

Across the four cases analyzed, the central issue is not whether the machine becomes an author in a full legal, moral or phenomenological sense, but how the authorial function is redistributed across socio-technical networks involving human prompting, algorithmic generation, editorial curation, paratextual disclosure, media framing, institutional evaluation and audience interpretation (Foucault, 1984; Latour, 2005).

This finding allows the study to preserve theoretical ambition while avoiding unsupported ontological claims about machine agency, since AI participates in authorship not by replacing the author outright, but by modi-

fying the relations through which authorship is enacted, recognized and disputed (Barthes, 1967; Floridi et al., 2018).

The analysis also demonstrates that the communicative framing of AI involvement significantly shapes judgments of originality, legitimacy and cultural value (Entman, 1993; Hall, 1980). Pharmako-AI is largely intelligible as a philosophical-literary experiment because its human-AI collaboration is openly staged within circuits of experimental art, digital culture and speculative writing (Ippolito et al., 2022; Biermann et al., 2022).

Death of an Author, by contrast, becomes controversial because its paratextual and media framing foregrounds the proportion of machine generation within a market-oriented literary field, thereby transforming the work into a public debate about symbolic ownership and creative labor (Draxler et al., 2024; Hesmondhalgh, 2019). Sunspring derives much of its significance from performative remediation and media spectacularization, since its narrative limitations become meaningful precisely because they are publicly framed as evidence of algorithmic strangeness (Xie et al., 2023; Tian et al., 2024).

Dramatron, meanwhile, enters discourse less as scandal and more as an infrastructural support for professional workflows, showing that AI is interpreted differently when it appears as a tool for industrial productivity rather than as a rival claimant to artistic authorship (Mirowski et al., 2023; Nieborg & Poell, 2018).

These differences confirm that AI writing cannot be evaluated apart from the media-production ecosystems in which it circulates, because the same or similar generative capacities may be interpreted as avant-garde experimentation, industrial efficiency, aesthetic threat or communicative spectacle depending on platform context, publication strategy and institutional framing (van Dijck et al., 2018; Poell et al., 2019).

This observation directly addresses the need to reposition the study within communication research rather than limiting it to literary or philosophical reflection, since the relevant analytical object is not only the AI-generated text but also the network of mediation that makes such a text visible, intelligible and valuable (Couldry, 2008; Couldry & Hepp, 2017). Once communication becomes the central object, the problem of authorship changes in nature: it is no longer only a question of whether AI destabilizes human creativity, but of how publishers, platforms, critics, legal frameworks, policy institutions and professional communities participate in the stabilization or contestation of authorial legitimacy (Napoli, 2019; World Intellectual Property Organization, 2023).

From this perspective, the study contributes to communication theory by showing that authorship in AI-assisted writing functions as a mediated and negotiated category rather than as an intrinsic property of textual production (Foucault, 1984; Latour, 2005). The author function remains socially operative, but it is increasingly reorganized through algorithmic interfaces, platform affordances, editorial decisions and public narratives of innovation or risk (Gillespie, 2014; Srnicek, 2017).

This does not mean that authorship has disappeared; rather, it suggests that authorship is becoming more procedural, distributed and institutionally dependent, particularly in contexts where the material process of text generation is partly delegated to probabilistic systems (Bender et al., 2021; Bommasani et al., 2021). In this regard, the findings extend classical debates on the “death of the author” by locating authorial displacement not in abstract textuality alone, but in concrete infrastructures of computational mediation and cultural circulation (Barthes, 1967; van Dijck et al., 2018).

A second major implication concerns the tension between creative assistance and stylistic standardization, which appears across the cases with different intensities (Doshi & Hauser, 2024; Marcus & Davis, 2019). Empirical research suggests that generative AI can increase individual productivity and ideational fluency while simultaneously reducing collective diversity when multiple users rely on similar model outputs and statistically dominant patterns (Doshi & Hauser, 2024).

The analysis supports this concern indirectly: Dramatron demonstrates how AI may structure creative options through predesigned narrative scaffolds, *Death of an Author* shows how fluency may generate readable prose without guaranteeing literary necessity and *Pharmako-AI* illustrates how strong human framing can transform algorithmic unpredictability into a distinctive aesthetic event (Mirowski et al., 2023; Ippolito et al., 2022). Therefore, AI does not produce a uniform cultural effect; its implications depend on the quality of human intervention, the communicative framing of the work and the evaluative conventions of the institutional field in which it is received (Hesmondhalgh, 2019; Csikszentmihályi, 1996). This tension is particularly relevant for cultural industries, where generative systems may be adopted not only for experimentation but also for efficiency, scalability and workflow optimization (Hesmondhalgh, 2019; Nieborg & Poell, 2018).

In such contexts, the risk is not simply that AI will “replace” creators, but that creative processes may become increasingly aligned with platform logics, predictive templates and commercially optimized forms of textual production (Srnicek, 2017; Poell et al., 2019). The cases suggest that AI-assisted writing becomes most valuable when human agents actively intervene as editors, interpreters, curators and critical mediators, rather than passively accepting generated outputs as finished cultural objects (Biermann et al., 2022; Ippolito et al., 2022).

This reinforces the need to understand creativity as a systemic and socially validated process rather than as a purely individual act or a purely computational output (Csikszentmihályi, 1996; Denzin & Lincoln, 2018). The ethical implications of the findings can be clarified by shifting the debate away from the narrow question of whether a machine can own copyright or be recognized as an author and toward the more concrete communicative conditions under which AI participation is disclosed, attributed, governed and evaluated (UNESCO, 2021; World Intellectual Property Organization, 2023).

- The first ethical problem is transparency, because audiences, editors, publishers, festivals and academic institutions increasingly require meaningful disclosure of AI involvement, while current practices remain inconsistent and unevenly regulated (European Parliament, 2024; UNESCO, 2021).
- The second problem is proportional attribution, since binary labels such as “human-written” or “AI-written” fail to capture the layered distribution of labor among prompting, generation, editing, revision, performance, publication and promotion (Draxler et al., 2024; Biermann et al., 2022).
- The third problem is governance, because platforms and publishers shape the conditions under which AI authorship is narrated and normalized, even when they are treated as neutral intermediaries (Gillespie, 2014; Napoli, 2019).
- The fourth problem is cultural diversity, since widespread reliance on generative systems may intensify representational asymmetries, reinforce dominant patterns in training data and reduce the visibility of peripheral or minority forms of expression (Bender et al., 2021; Doshi & Hauser, 2024).

On the basis of these findings, the article proposes a communication-centered framework of responsible co-authorship organized around four interdependent principles (Floridi et al., 2018; UNESCO, 2021).

- The first principle is transparent disclosure, according to which works produced with meaningful AI assistance should include contextual information about the nature and extent of AI participation, particularly in academic, editorial, literary and professional submission environments (European Parliament, 2024; World Intellectual Property Organization, 2023).
- The second principle is proportional attribution, which requires acknowledgment practices capable of distinguishing between human conceptualization, machine generation, editorial curation, revision, performance and publication, instead of reducing complex collaboration to simplistic claims of either total human authorship or total machine authorship (Draxler et al., 2024; Ippolito et al., 2022).
- The third principle is editorial accountability, through which publishers, journals, festivals, platforms and professional associations should establish explicit policies on acceptable AI use, disclosure expectations, authorship representation and evaluation criteria (Napoli, 2019; UNESCO, 2021).
- The fourth principle is protection of cultural plurality, which implies that institutional adoption of AI writing tools should be accompanied by safeguards that promote stylistic diversity, minority expression, linguistic plurality and critical human oversight (Bender et al., 2021; Doshi & Hauser, 2024).

This proposed framework does not resolve all legal, ontological or philosophical controversies surrounding AI authorship, but it offers a pragmatic normative model aligned with the actual complexity of contemporary mediated writing (Floridi et al., 2018; World Intellectual Property Organization, 2023).

Its contribution lies in moving the discussion from abstract speculation about whether AI “is” an author toward more operational questions concerning how AI participation should be communicated, evaluated and institutionally governed (UNESCO, 2021; European Parliament, 2024). In this sense, responsible co-authorship should not be understood merely as a matter of labeling outputs, but as a broader communicative practice that links disclosure, accountability, reception and cultural responsibility (Couldry & Hepp, 2017; Hesmondhalgh, 2019). The findings also suggest that public reception of AI-assisted writing is not determined only by textual quality, but by the interpretive frames through which audiences encounter the work (Entman, 1993; Hall, 1980).

A fragmented text may be accepted as experimental when framed within an avant-garde literary circuit, as in *Pharmako-AI*, while a commercially marketed AI-assisted novella may provoke suspicion because it activates concerns about labor, authenticity and literary legitimacy, as in *Death of an Author* (Hesmondhalgh, 2019; Draxler et al., 2024).

A narratively incoherent AI-generated script may become culturally meaningful when framed as a technological event, as in *Sunspring*, whereas a professional tool such as *Dramatron* may be evaluated primarily through the lens of productivity and workflow integration (Mirowski et al., 2023; Xie et al., 2023). These differences confirm that reception is not secondary to authorship; rather, reception participates in the communicative production of authorship itself (Couldry, 2008; Foucault, 1984).

The study’s limitations must also be stated with methodological precision, since the analysis is based on emblematic and high-visibility cases rather than an exhaustive mapping of AI-assisted writing practices (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Patton, 2015). The corpus offers analytical depth but does not capture the ordinary, informal and often invisible uses of generative AI by writers, students, journalists, screenwriters and cultural producers in everyday contexts (Flick, 2018; Maxwell, 2013).

Public perception and critical reception are examined through available discourse rather than through original audience research, which means that the study analyzes mediated representations of reception rather than directly measuring audience attitudes (Krippendorff, 2018; Denzin, 2012). These limitations do not invalidate the findings, but they delimit their scope and support the article’s cautious framing of its conclusions as interpretive, comparative and exploratory rather than statistically generalizable (Yin, 2018; Stake, 1995).

Future research should therefore extend this analysis through empirical designs capable of examining how different actors negotiate AI authorship in situated practices (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Denzin & Lincoln, 2018). Inter-

views with writers, editors, publishers, readers, reviewers, platform designers and legal experts would help clarify how attribution, disclosure and legitimacy are understood across professional contexts (Patton, 2015; Maxwell, 2013). Reception studies comparing disclosed and undisclosed AI-assisted texts would also provide stronger evidence on how transparency affects perceived originality, trust and literary value (Entman, 1993; Draxler et al., 2024).

Comparative studies across linguistic, regional and institutional settings would further illuminate whether AI authorship is negotiated differently in dominant publishing markets and peripheral cultural fields, where questions of linguistic representation, cultural sovereignty and algorithmic asymmetry may be especially significant (Bender et al., 2021; UNESCO, 2021).

The discussion confirms that AI-assisted writing should be analyzed as a mediated communication process embedded in platformized cultural production rather than as a purely literary anomaly or technological rupture (Couldry & Hepp, 2017; van Dijck et al., 2018). The four cases show that authorship is not simply eliminated by AI; it is reorganized through interfaces, institutions, paratexts, media narratives, professional norms and audience interpretation (Latour, 2005; Foucault, 1984).

This assumption strengthens the article's contribution to communication research by demonstrating that the future of AI writing will depend less on algorithmic capability alone than on the communicative, ethical and institutional arrangements through which society decides how machine-assisted symbolic production should be named, valued and governed (Floridi et al., 2018; European Parliament, 2024).

6. Conclusions

This article has demonstrated that AI-assisted writing should be analytically framed as a socio-technical communication process, rather than as a purely literary phenomenon or an abstract philosophical problem, because textual production under conditions of generative AI is inseparable from infrastructures, platforms, media discourse and institutional validation (Couldry & Hepp, 2017; van Dijck et al., 2018).

By integrating perspectives from literary theory, mediatization, platformization, actor-network theory and cultural industries, the study shows that authorship is no longer anchored exclusively in the originating subject but is increasingly enacted through distributed networks of human and non-human actors that collectively shape meaning, legitimacy and reception (Latour, 2005; Hesmondhalgh, 2019). In this context, AI does not simply intervene in writing as an external tool; rather, it becomes embedded within communicative processes that reconfigure how texts are produced, interpreted and institutionally recognized (Bender et al., 2021; Floridi et al., 2018).

The comparative analysis of *Pharmako-AI*, *Death of an Author*, *Sun-spring* and *Dramatron* confirms that authorship in the algorithmic age operates through heterogeneous configurations of mediation, where human inter-

vention, algorithmic generation, editorial curation, paratextual disclosure, media framing and institutional evaluation interact in dynamic and context-dependent ways (Entman, 1993; Napoli, 2019).

Each case illustrates a distinct articulation of this process: dialogic co-authorship in experimental literary contexts, discursive contestation in market-oriented publishing, performative mediation in audiovisual production and infrastructural integration within professional creative workflows (Mirowski et al., 2023; Nieborg & Poell, 2018). These variations demonstrate that authorial legitimacy is not determined by technological capacity alone, but by the communicative ecosystems within which AI-assisted texts circulate and are interpreted (Couldry, 2008; van Dijck et al., 2018).

This study contributes to ongoing debates by reframing authorship as a distributed communicative arrangement, in which agency is asymmetrically shared across human creators, algorithmic systems, platforms and institutions (Foucault, 1984; Barthes, 1967). This perspective extends classical critiques of the author function by situating its transformation within contemporary media infrastructures and digital economies, rather than within textuality alone (Gillespie, 2014; Srnicek, 2017). In doing so, it avoids both technological determinism, which attributes autonomous agency to AI systems and reductive humanism, which treats AI as an external and secondary instrument, instead proposing a relational understanding of authorship grounded in communication processes (Floridi et al., 2018; Latour, 2005).

The article advances the study of AI writing by adopting a structured qualitative comparative design that includes explicit case-selection criteria, a clearly defined corpus and operationalized analytical dimensions, thereby enhancing transparency, coherence and analytical rigor (Creswell & Poth, 2018; Denzin & Lincoln, 2018). By explicitly acknowledging the interpretive scope of the evidence and avoiding overgeneralized claims about social transformation, the study aligns its conclusions with the empirical and discursive material analyzed, contributing to a more methodologically responsible approach within the field (Krippendorff, 2018; Yin, 2018). This methodological positioning responds directly to the need for greater precision in research on AI-assisted creativity, where conceptual ambition must be balanced with evidentiary grounding (Flick, 2018; Maxwell, 2013).

At the practical and normative level, the study proposes a framework of responsible co-authorship grounded in four interrelated principles: transparent disclosure, proportional attribution, editorial accountability and the protection of cultural plurality (UNESCO, 2021; World Intellectual Property Organization, 2023). These principles recognize that ethical concerns surrounding AI writing extend beyond questions of copyright or machine agency to encompass broader communicative issues related to visibility, legitimacy, governance and cultural diversity (European Parliament, 2024; Doshi & Hauser, 2024). In particular, the findings highlight that inadequate disclosure practices, simplified attribution categories and platform-driven standardization may undermine trust, obscure labor contributions and reduce

representational diversity within cultural production systems (Bender et al., 2021; Gillespie, 2014).

Importantly, the results do not support the claim that AI has already become an author in any stable legal, ontological or cultural sense, nor do they justify the assumption that AI functions merely as a neutral tool external to creative practice (Marcus & Davis, 2019; Floridi et al., 2018). Rather, the study demonstrates that the communicative conditions of authorship are being reconfigured, as writing increasingly occurs through platform interfaces, is interpreted through media narratives and is validated through institutional mechanisms that extend beyond the individual author (Couldry & Hepp, 2017; Napoli, 2019). This reconfiguration suggests that the future significance of generative AI for literature, media and cultural production will depend not only on advances in model capabilities, but also on the social, institutional and regulatory frameworks through which these systems are integrated and governed (UNESCO, 2021; European Parliament, 2024).

For communication scholarship, these findings underscore the need to analyze AI writing as part of a broader transformation in symbolic production, where meaning is co-constructed through interactions among creators, technologies, infrastructures and audiences (Hall, 1980; Couldry, 2008). This implies that future research should move beyond text-centered approaches and incorporate analyses of mediation, platform governance, reception and institutional practice, in order to capture the full complexity of AI-assisted communication processes (van Dijck et al., 2018; Poell et al., 2019).

For literary and cultural institutions, the study suggests that traditional frameworks of authorship based on individual genius or technological novelty are no longer sufficient to address the challenges posed by generative AI and must be complemented by more nuanced, context-sensitive approaches that account for distributed agency and mediated legitimacy (Hesmondhalgh, 2019; Foucault, 1984).

AI-assisted writing should not be understood as the end of authorship, but as its transformation within a mediated, platformized and institutionally regulated environment, where authorship is continuously negotiated rather than definitively assigned (Latour, 2005; Couldry & Hepp, 2017). The central challenge for both scholarship and practice is therefore not to determine whether AI “is” an author, but to critically examine how authorship is constructed, attributed and governed in the algorithmic age, ensuring that emerging forms of human-machine collaboration remain compatible with principles of transparency, accountability and cultural diversity (Floridi et al., 2018; UNESCO, 2021).

Bibliographical references

- BARTHES, R. (1967). “The death of the author”. *Aspen*, 5-6.
- BENDER, E. M., GEBRU, T., MCMILLAN-MAJOR, A., & SHMITCHELL, S. (2021). “On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big?”. *Proceed-*

- ings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency (FAccT '21)*, 610-623.
<<https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>>
- BIERMANN, O. C., MA, N. F., & YOON, D. (2022). "From tool to companion: Storywriters want AI writers to respect their personal values and writing strategies". In: *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference* (pp. 1209-1227). Association for Computing Machinery.
<<https://doi.org/10.1145/3532106.3533506>>
- BOMMASANI, R., HUDSON, D. A., ADELI, E., ALTMAN, R., ARORA, S., VON ARX, S., BERNSTEIN, M. S., BOHG, J., BOSSELT, A., BRUNSKILL, E., BRYNJOLFSSON, E., BUCH, S., CARD, D., CASTELLON, R., CHATTERJI, N. S., CHEN, A., CREEL, K., DAVIS, J., DEMSZKY, D., ... LIANG, P. (2021). "On the opportunities and risks of foundation models". *arXiv*.
<<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2108.07258>>
- CAMPBELL, J. (2008). *The hero with a thousand faces*. New World Library.
- COULDRY, N. (2008). "Mediatization or mediation? Alternative understandings of the emergent space of digital storytelling". *New Media & Society*, 10(3), 373-391.
<<https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444808089414>>
- COULDRY, N., & HEPP, A. (2017). *The mediated construction of reality*. Polity Press.
- CSIKSZENTMIHÁLYI, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*. HarperCollins.
- CRESWELL, J. W., & POTH, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. SAGE Publications.
- DENZIN, N. K. (2012). "Triangulation 2.0". *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 6(2), 80-88.
<<https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689812437186>>
- DENZIN, N. K., & LINCOLN, Y. S. (2018). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. SAGE Publications.
- DOSHI, A. R., & HAUSER, O. P. (2024). "Generative AI enhances individual creativity but reduces the collective diversity of novel content". *Science Advances*, 10(28), eadn5290.
<<https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adn5290>>
- DRAXLER, F., WERNER, A., LEHMANN, F., HOPPE, M., SCHMIDT, A., BUSCHEK, D., & WELSCH, R. (2024). "The AI ghostwriter effect: When users do not perceive ownership of AI-generated text but self-declare as authors". *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 8(CSCW2), Article 562.
<<https://doi.org/10.1145/3637875>>
- ENTMAN, R. M. (1993). "Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm". *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58.
<<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>>
- EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT (2024). *Artificial Intelligence Act*. <<https://www.europarl.europa.eu>>
- FAIRCLOUGH, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Routledge.
- FLICK, U. (2018). *An introduction to qualitative research*. SAGE Publications.
- FLORIDI, L., COWLS, J., BELTRAMETTI, M., CHATILA, R., CHAZERAND, P., DIGNUM, V., LUETGE, C., MADELIN, R., PAGALLO, U., ROSSI, F., SCHAFER, B., VALCKE, P., & VAYENA, E. (2018). "AI4People—An ethical framework for a

- good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles and recommendations". *Minds and Machines*, 28, 689-707.
<<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5>>
- FOUCAULT, M. (1984). "What is an author?". In: P. RABINOW (Ed.). *The Foucault reader*. Pantheon Books, 101-120.
- GILLESPIE, T. (2014). "The relevance of algorithms". In: T. GILLESPIE, P. J. BOCKOWSKI, & K. A. FOOT (Eds.). *Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality and society*. MIT Press, 167-194.
- HALL, S. (1980). "Encoding/decoding". In: S. HALL, D. HOBSON, A. LOWE, & P. WILLIS (Eds.). *Culture, media, language*. Routledge, 128-138.
- HESMONDHALGH, D. (2019). *The cultural industries*. SAGE Publications.
- IPPOLITO, D., YUAN, A., COENEN, A., & BURNAM, S. (2022). "Creative writing with an AI-powered writing assistant: Perspectives from professional writers". *arXiv*. <<https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.05030>>
- KRIPPENDORFF, K. (2018). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. SAGE Publications.
- LATOUR, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford University Press.
- MARCUS, G., & DAVIS, E. (2019). *Rebooting AI: Building artificial intelligence we can trust*. Pantheon Books.
- MAXWELL, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. SAGE Publications.
- MIROWSKI, P., MATHEWSON, K. W., PITTMAN, J., & EVANS, R. (2023). "Co-writing screenplays and theatre scripts with language models: Evaluation by industry professionals". *arXiv*.
<<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2209.14958>>
- NAPOLI, P. M. (2019). *Social media and the public interest: Media regulation in the disinformation age*. Columbia University Press.
- NICHOLS, E., GAO, L., & GOMEZ, R. (2020). "Collaborative storytelling with large-scale neural language models". *arXiv*. <<https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.10208>>
- NIEBORG, D. B., & POELL, T. (2018). "The platformization of cultural production: Theorizing the contingent cultural commodity". *New Media & Society*, 20(11), 4275-4292.
<<https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818769694>>
- PATTON, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. SAGE Publications.
- POELL, T., NIEBORG, D. B., & VAN DIJCK, J. (2019). "Platformisation". *Internet Policy Review*, 8(4).
<<https://doi.org/10.14763/2019.4.1425>>
- RIESSMAN, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. SAGE Publications.
- SERBANESCU, A., & NACK, F. (2023). "Human-AI system co-creativity for building narrative worlds". In: *IASDR 2023: Life-Changing Design*.
<<https://doi.org/10.21606/iasdr.2023.293>>
- SRNICEK, N. (2017). *Platform capitalism*. Polity Press.
- STAKE, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. SAGE Publications.
- TIAN, Y., HUANG, T., LIU, M., JIANG, D., SPANGHER, A., CHEN, M., et al. (2024). "Are large language models capable of generating human-level narratives?". *arXiv*.
<<https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.13248>>
- UNESCO (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. UNESCO.

- VAN DIJCK, J., POELL, T., & DE WAAL, M. (2018). *The platform society: Public values in a connective world*. Oxford University Press.
- WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (2023). *WIPO conversation on intellectual property and artificial intelligence*. WIPO.
- XIE, Z., COHN, T., & LAU, J. H. (2023). The next chapter: A study of large language models in storytelling. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 11, 185-201.
<https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00556>
- YIN, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. SAGE Publications.