HUMANIS
Journal of Arts and Humanities
p-ISSN: 2528-5076, e-ISSN: 2302-920X
Terakreditasi Sinta-3, SK No: 105/E/KPT/2022
Vol 29.2. Mei 2025: 351-367

Ethical Questions on AI-Generated Literature: The Evolution of Literary Creativity in the Post-Humanistic Era

Rahmat Setiawan[1], **Agung Benta Febria Nuryanto**[2], **Komm Pechinthorn**[3]
[1]Universitas PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya, Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia
[2]Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Purwokerto, Central Java, Indonesia
[3]Thai Global Business Administration Technological College, Mueang Samut Prakan, Samut Prakan, Thailand
Correspondence e-mail: rahmatsetiawan@unipasby.ac.id, agung.benta@unsoed.ac.id, komm.p@tgbc.ac.th

Article Info
Submitted:30th June 2025
Revised:10th August 2025
Accepted: 2nd August 2025
Published: 31st August 2025

Keywords: *authorship; originality; creative process; literature and technology; artificial intelligence; post-humanism*

Corresponding Author:
Rahmat Setiawan
e-mail:
rahmatsetiawan@unipasby.ac.id

DOI:
https://doi.org/10.24843/JH.2025.v29.i03.p08

Abstract
This study aims to examine the involvement of AI, particularly ChatGPT, in the creation of literary works, as well as its implications for the concepts of authorship, originality, the creative process, and the future of literature with technology. This study uses Barthesian Authorship concept and Floridi's Ethics of Technology. The method used is a mixed method with a parallel convergent design approach. Data collection techniques include a survey of 50 students who have written literary works as part of their coursework and semi-structured interviews with three literature professors from different epistemological backgrounds. Quantitative analysis uses descriptive statistics, while qualitative data is analysed thematically. The results of the study show that all student respondents have used AI to write literary works, and the majority claim these works as their own without mentioning AI's involvement in the process, reflecting an ethical crisis and creative subjectivity. The results of the interviews revealed that the concept of authorship has shifted from a single authority to a collaborative and negotiated relationship between humans and machines; originality is no longer considered an absolute value but rather a constantly evolving construction; the creative process must maintain its existential value; and literary ethics must be re-evaluated in the context of the current digital and academic landscape. This is literature in the post-humanist era, where AI is not merely a technological tool but a cultural agent involved in reshaping the contemporary literary landscape.

INTRODUCTION

In the ever-shifting and transforming landscape of literature, especially as it unfolds today, without any hypocrisy or romanticisation of the past, ink has been replaced by algorithms, and the creativity of poetry or prose has been supplanted by the skill of crafting prompts for digital technology known as *Artificial Intelligence* (AI). AI's capabilities have emerged as an agency that transforms the creative process of creating works into the creativity of guiding machines to meet the expectations of the prompt

writers (Epstein et al., 2023; Vinchon et al., 2023). From here, an author's inspiration takes the form of machine learning (prompting), so the concept of authorship, with all due respect, is quietly collapsing—yet shaking from within. How could it not? Writing, once regarded as a romantic and even sacred act of baring one's feelings and soul through language, word choice, and even punctuation, now is at risks of being replaced by prompts and generated text; with a single click of the enter button, AI completes the work. The question is, when the work is created by AI, whose work is it? Amid the clamour of technological progress, the presence of AI in the literary realm is not merely marking a shift in the way we write or create, but also is shaking the very roots of authorship (Bysaga et al., 2023; Teixeira da Silva & Tsigaris, 2023) and the aesthetic values that have long been the essence of literature. In academic circles, AI is not just a tool to assist in the writing process but is increasingly seen as a partner that replaces the creative process itself (Hwang, 2022; Zhou & Lee, 2024). With prompts, AI can generate poetry and prose in seconds—a phenomenon that, while practical, leaves a deep sense of unease: has creativity now been reduced to an algorithmic product? Of course, this situation raises a number of issues that must be seriously and thoroughly examined, including the trend of using AI for literary creation, plagiarism, the originality of ideas and creativity, and the ethical and aesthetic dimensions of works produced with AI assistance.

The democratisation of AI, particularly through the emergence of platforms such as ChatGPT, has given rise to a paradoxical dilemma that shakes the very foundations of the literary universe. Literature created by AI can be categorised as a literary event. On one hand, AI offers ease in the creative process—it can assist writers, even laypeople, in creating poetry and even short stories in a matter of seconds, acting as an inexhaustible creative partner with endless ideas and variations. This ease provides broader access for anyone to write, express themselves and their feelings, and engage in text production, even for those who feel they lack literary talent. However, on the other hand, this ease gives rise to fundamental ethical concerns: the blurring of boundaries between writers and machines, the erosion of authorship authority, and doubts about the originality of literary works. This can occur when metaphors, emotions, and imagination can be reproduced by algorithms based on data and information. AI is a machine and it has no soul and has never had experiences, feelings, or even traumas that influence its writing (Oritsegbemi, 2023; W. Zhao & Sun, 2024). This means that AI only follows commands and processes them based on data; of course, what is at stake is not only aesthetic quality, but also the meaning of literature itself—as a space for contemplation, inner struggle, and human existential experience. From here, AI may simplify the process of producing literary works, but at the same time, it raises the question: does this ease strengthen literature, or does it gradually strip away the soul that has always kept it alive?

AI has become both a writing partner and a ghostwriter (Draxler et al., 2024; Nowak-Gruca, 2022; Yeo, 2023). In a survey of 50 students who were assigned to write a poem or short story, the majority admitted to using AI—some to generate ideas, others to produce the entire text. However, what is surprising is not just the use of AI itself, but how casually they view creativity as merely a matter of configuration, not confrontation (Sumakul et al., 2022). This phenomenon raises urgent and uncomfortable questions: Is a literary work still worthy of being called literature if it is written by a digital machine? Can literature emerge through the compilation of data and algorithms without intention, without memory, without pain? Is writing with AI assistance a new form of plagiarism, or rather originality that need not be questioned? Or are we witnessing the birth of a

new hybrid form of authorship between humans and machines—one that demands a redefinition of originality, ownership, and even ethics? These are post-humanistic questions in which humans are now bound to technology.

The phenomenon among students prompted this research to be negotiated with arguments from literary academics among the faculty. They, who may have studied and analysed literature theoretically, see the power of literature in non-textual elements, such as emotion, motive, and even the author's inner resonance. That is why literature can be intertwined with layers of other disciplines such as sociology, psychology, anthropology, and so on (English & Underwood, 2016; Soker-Schwager, 2019; Yimer, 2019). AI can incorporate technical or extrinsic factors in the aesthetic creation of literary works, such as language style, word choice, rhyme, plot, characters, and so on, but it cannot provide the author's touch because the mediation of emotional expression cannot be conveyed through the vehicle called AI prompts. For some literature lecturers, texts generated by AI are merely imitations—copying form without the depth of soul. Like a machine producing products, without soul, without subjectivity, and without the characteristics of the author. However, for others, literary works created by AI represent a literary revolution that liberates creativity from the boundaries of ego and the body (Jones, 2022). Through in-depth interviews with three literature professors, this study explores the perceptions of literary authorities regarding the integration of AI into the creative process: Does this mark the end of authorship as we know it, or the beginning of post-human literary ethics?

To examine this phenomenon, this study uses a multidisciplinary theoretical approach. Roland Barthes' idea of *the death of the author* forms the basis. In Barthes' discourse, texts are considered independent of the author's intentions, so that meaning can be interpreted in various ways (Almujalli, 2023; Biswas, 2021). However, in the context of this study, the text was not even written by a human being. The text is created by AI commanded by the writer's instructions, so can AI be called an author? On the other hand, Julia Kristeva's *intertextuality* is used to explore AI texts and view them as constructions of fragments of previous texts—a form of literature that creates new meanings from the constellation of existing texts (Aistrope, 2020; Raj, 2015; Zengin, 2016). Texts in the context of AI can be read as data that forms the basis of algorithms (Friedrich et al., 2022; Nitzberg & Zysman, 2022; Yu & Kumbier, 2018). The death of the author without an author, up to the production of texts from data, raises ethical issues that become an important focal point in reading this phenomenon. Luciano Floridi's theory of technological ethics provides a critical lens for understanding and seeing how AI challenges the boundaries of copyright, authority, and honesty (Byron, 2010; Doyle, 2010; Durante, 2017), the context in this research is in literary works. This theoretical framework guides the research here, not only observing the practice of using AI as a tool but also using it as a reflection to re-examine the relationship between humans, technology, and the essence of literary production.

Thus, this study does not merely discuss or analyse 'who writes,' but also 'what remains of literature' when algorithms begin to emerge as masters and experts in crafting aesthetic language and weaving together experiences, traumas, and emotions that they have never even felt. Could this be a sign of the death of human creativity, or the birth of a new literary ethics in the post-human era? This study, of course, does not aim to demonise or dismiss the presence of AI, nor to romanticise human weaknesses in creating literary works or glorify AI and its advantages. Rather, this research, based on interviews with literature professors, seeks to map the cultural tensions that have been unfolding since the era of typewriters and printing presses in the early modern era: What

is the meaning of literature in the present day? Furthermore, what remains of a writer if digital machines, armed with their digital data, have already learned to mimic and modify pain, experience, and beauty through algorithmic statistics? Ultimately, this is not merely a study of AI and its prompts; it goes beyond that, becoming a study of trust; of the dynamically shifting line or alignment between inspiration and automation, between modification and theft, between creation and production. On the brink of a new literary paradigm, researchers here are driven to ask critical, even urgent, questions about literary works created by AI through human-generated prompts. Once again, this is not just about what humans write, but about who or what is actually writing and collecting all the data-based information to evolve into a machine with more perfect products. Starting from this concern, this study aims to map the phenomenon of AI use in the practice of literary creation among students, as well as to understand how literature lecturers respond to these changes in terms of ethics, aesthetics, and authorship identity. Specifically, this study: 1) describes the patterns of AI use by students in writing literary works; 2) reveals literature lecturers' perceptions of the ethical issues surrounding AI-generated literary works regarding authorship (subjectivity), originality (plagiarism), and the production process; and 3) explores literature lecturers' views on the possibilities brought by AI in the contemporary literary landscape.

METHODOLOGY

This type of research is **mixed methods** with a **parallel convergent design**, in which quantitative and qualitative data are collected simultaneously but analysed separately (Chu & Chang, 2017; Guetterman et al., 2015; Timans et al., 2019). The two data sets are integrated to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon of AI in the process of writing literary works. The approach is used to examine the complexity of the issue in this research, which cannot be explained solely by numbers or narratives; a comparison of both is necessary to explore the tension between AI and literature. Quantitative data were obtained through a **closed-ended questionnaire survey** distributed to 50 students in the Language Studies, both Education and Literature, from both Indonesian and English language groups, who have been involved or have experience in using AI ChatGPT in the process of writing literary works, both poetry and prose. There are 9 ***Survey Statements*** (**SS**): 1) I have used AI (ChatGPT) to write poetry for literature assignments; 2) I claimed the AI-generated work as my own when submitting it; 3) I did not inform the lecturer that the work was AI-generated work; 4) I am confident that AI-generated literary works are as aesthetical/beautiful as human-written literary works; 5) I think AI-generated literary works are free and it is original; 6) I consider there is no ethical issue in using AI for writing literary works; 7) I edited the AI-generated literary works before submitting it as my work; 8) I experience more confidence when employing AI to complete literary works as the assignment; and 9) I do not feel confident to make good literary works without using AI. These survey statements are distributed through a ***1–5 Agreement Likert* scale** (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree)

This survey was designed to measure the frequency of AI use for literary tasks, the extent to which AI-generated works are claimed as personal works, the reasons for using AI, perceptions of AI-generated literary works, and the ethics of AI use. Survey results are analysed using descriptive statistics to identify general patterns and trends in students' attitudes at an aggregate level. On the other hand, qualitative data are obtained through **in-depth interviews** with three lecturers teaching literature courses, selected

purposefully, based on their reflective capabilities and academic backgrounds in literary criticism. The first lecturer (L1) is a 47-year-old male lecturer in Comparative Literature and Literary Theory (Postmodernism). The second lecturer (L2) is a 52-year-old male lecturer in Structuralism and Cultural Studies. The third lecturer (L3) is 34-year-old in Literary Criticism and Creative Writing (Digital). The interviews were conducted in a semi-structured style to explore philosophical, ethical, and pedagogical perspectives on the issue of this research, with the following procedures: 1) Selection of Informants (from different affiliations), 2) Scheduling and Ethical Approval, 3) Conducting the Interview (face-to-face sessions lasting 45–60 minutes each, recorded with implicit consent), 4) Transcription and Coding (verbatim transcription by the researcher, coded as L1, L2, and L3), and 5) Data Confirmation and Ethical Validation (member checking). The interview results were analysed thematically to identify patterns of responses and meanings from the informants and the critical dialectic of academics regarding the paradigm shift in authorship in the post-digital era.

Quantitative and qualitative data were converged in the interpretation stage to examine the intersection of literary events, between AI-generated literary works among students' and the lecturers' reflection. The validity of the quantitative instrument used **content validity** to design the questionnaire (instrument) based on issues of authorship, originality, and literary production with AI. The instrument was validated by **expert judgement** (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2007; Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2009; Teddlie & Yu, 2007) from two lecturers specialising in Literature and Digital Literacy. **Trustworthiness** in the data was assessed across four aspects: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (McKim, 2017; Palinkas et al., 2019). ***Credibility*** is achieved through triangulation of sources; interviews with three lecturers with different academic backgrounds (postmodernist, structuralist, and humanist). Member checking was also conducted by confirming interview statements with the lecturers to ensure no distortion of meaning. ***Transferability*** refers to the contextual description of the lecturers' backgrounds, academic environments, and teaching experiences, ensuring that the applicability of this study's findings aligns with the research objectives. ***Dependability*** was achieved by documenting the interview procedures, data coding techniques, and thematic analysis process. ***Confirmability*** is achieved through complete documentation of the analysis process and the use of direct statements from the lecturers to avoid subjective and biased interpretations by the researcher.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

RESULT

This part consists of two-sided parts; the first part is the presentation of the quantitative results taken from survey and the second part is the qualitative results taken from in-depth interview.

1. Quantitative Data

The first part presents the results of a survey conducted by the researchers. The research topic was *The Engagement of AI in Writing Literary Works* (Poetry & Short Stories), with 50 students as respondents. The results of the survey can be seen from this SPSS-styled table as follows:

Table 1. *Survey Results*

Statistics

		SS1	SS2	SS3	SS4	SS5	SS6	SS7	SS8	SS9
N	Valid	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		4.76	4.50	4.34	4.24	4.02	3.68	3.68	4.12	4.14
Median		5.00	5.00	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
Mode		5	5	5	4[a]	5	4[a]	5	4	4
Std. Deviation		.431	.647	.872	.894	1.078	1.269	1.316	.918	.857

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Note:

SS : Survey Statement
SD : Strongly Disagree
D : Disagree
N : Neutral
A : Agree
SA : Strongly Agree

The table exhibits a significant majority (100%) that have used AI for writing literary works, most students (96%) confessed to claiming the work as their own, over 90% did not inform their lecturer that their works are AI-generated works, and the students realise the aesthetics of AI-generated literary works, their standpoint on ethics and originality is in divided opinion.

This study involved 50 students majoring in Indonesian and English from various universities. They had been assigned to create literary works in the form of poetry or short stories. The survey was designed to reveal the extent to which students use artificial intelligence (AI) such as ChatGPT in the process of creating literary works, as well as how they view the ethical, aesthetic, and self-assessment aspects of the production process of literary works generated by AI. The survey results revealed that all respondents (100%) admitted to having used AI to create literary works as part of their coursework. This indicates that the use of AI in the classroom has become a widespread and regular phenomenon, no longer experimental in nature. Furthermore, 96% of the students claimed the AI-generated works as their own, without informing or acknowledging the role of AI in the writing process. This is further supported by another finding: 92% of respondents did not inform their lecturers that the work was generated by AI, indicating a tendency to obscure AI's involvement in an academic context. From an aesthetic perspective, most students assessed that AI-generated literary works have sufficient literary quality (comparable to human writing). This can be seen in the fact that 88% of students agreed or strongly agreed that AI works are aesthetically pleasing, while 76% considered AI-generated literary works to be free and therefore original. This indicates cognitive and emotional acceptance of literary works created by AI as a legitimate form of literary expression, despite originating from a non-human system. However, the data also shows a spectrum of ethical ambiguity. In fact, only 64% of respondents considered there to be no ethical issues in using AI to create literary works, while the rest disagreed with this view. This indicates an internal conflict and perplexity between what AI provides and the academic ethical call and authentic creative process. Additionally, in terms of the process, only 60% of students edit AI-generated works before submitting them, indicating that most AI-generated texts undergo little modification. On the other hand, 82% of students also feel more confident

when involving AI, and 84% feel less confident in writing literary works if AI is not involved in the writing process. This implies students' dependence on AI in writing literary works, especially in completing tasks that involve creativity and personal expression.

This data reveals that the involvement of AI in the process of creating literary works is not merely a technical phenomenon; rather, it erodes deeper layers: aesthetics, ethics, and even identity. Here, students can be seen as a metaphor for the phenomenon of literary authorship; AI as part of the strategy and production machine. The creative process in literature, which was once inspired by reflection, contemplation, personal experience, trauma, and inner struggle, may now be undergoing degradation or perhaps a major redefinition when replaced by algorithmic data compilation. This should also be seen as an urgency in the world of literature. For educational institutions, policies regarding the use of AI in an academic context must be established immediately, without rejecting societal changes, but rather adapting to the phenomena occurring. Without ethical and educational regulations, students will remain caught between two extremes: pragmatic exploitation of technology or rejection of modern developments. Thus, this survey not only provides statistical data on literary events involving AI but also opens up a discussion space on literary ethics in the post-human era.

2. Qualitative Data

The researchers conducted semi-structured interviews with three literature lecturers who had the same academic background (literature) but different epistemological orientations: L1 is a postmodern deconstructionist, L2 is a conservative structuralist, and L3 is a critical humanist. Although they have different approaches to texts and literature teaching, all three imply openness to the phenomenon of AI in literature, with diverse perspectives on philosophical, ethical, and pedagogical aspects. The following are some of the themes found in the data through interviews.

a. Deconstruction of Authorship in the AI Era

All three sources indicate that the concept of authorship cannot be understood in a conventional manner; the concept of authorship has undergone a significant shift. L1 radically states that, “Texts are like mosaics composed of other texts. Even before the advent of AI, I already believed that the author is not the centre of the text; this has been extensively explained in the theories of Derrida and his colleagues [post-structuralist thinkers]” (L1). For L1, the presence of AI does not threaten the author's authority; on the contrary, it exposes the old myth of the single author, with their singular meaning and originality. While L2 maintains the importance of subjectivity in authorship, they acknowledge a shift in perspective regarding the author's position: “I still believe that human subjectivity is important, even very important. The author is not merely someone who writes and arranges words; the writer also processes experiences, and many writers who have endured horrific and painful experiences often produce heart-wrenching writings. In other words, writings have a soul” (L2). A similar view is expressed by L3, who, with a sociological and critical approach, introduces the term *negotiated authorship*: “The decision to use AI alone is already a form of authorship in itself, regardless of how it is created... Besides, someone writes a prompt and AI turns it into a poem according to the prompt; let’s just call it a collaborative work between humans and machines... In the post-human era, humans cannot escape technology; with all due respect, that’s the fact” (L3). From these three statements, it can be said that L1 disagrees with the idea of the author as the centre of meaning. He argues that AI is

exploring a possibility that had not been considered before, that all works are mosaics that cannot be built alone. Perhaps, in the past, there was no AI, but people adapted and modified texts from other sources, and it became a work. However, today, with prompts, AI collects data and becomes data. For L1, AI appears to be dismantling the romantic myth of authorship. L2, despite holding a conservative view, acknowledges that the role of the author is undergoing transformation. However, he sees that human experience, trauma, and existential awareness are elements that cannot be replaced by machines, though they can be mediated through AI. L3 appears to have a perspective that transcends both. For L3, authorship is now a process of negotiation between humans and machines. The decision to use AI is made consciously and collaboratively by humans. This means that the phenomenon of AI has shaken the conventional boundaries between authors, texts, and technology; there is a process of decentralising authorial authority, which for some lecturers opens up new opportunities and for others may prompt a re-examination of the essence of literary writing. In short, AI poses a challenge to the classical and conventional definitions of authorship. They suggest that new civilisations always bring about more complex, reflective, and inclusive definitions of literary authorship.

b. Dynamics of Originality and Plagiarism

From the interviews, all lecturers seemed to criticise the tendency of students to claim AI works as their own. L1 stated emphatically that, “I am not concerned about plagiarism from AI. I am more concerned about humans who still think they are original, because we are creatures who modify things. Humans only have willpower; the rest of us cannot produce anything besides carbon dioxide, vomit, excrement, sweat, whatever it is... we have the intelligence to process energy, not create it... our ideas are not original; our ideas are also the result of modifying other ideas” (L1). L1 implies that one must view originality, at present, not as an absolute value, but as a cultural construct that must be deconstructed, as it continues to evolve in tandem with societal changes. Conversely, L2 views claims without AI acknowledgment as a serious violation: “If you submit work that you didn’t write yourself and claim it as your own creation, that means you’re falsifying the process... or, to put it bluntly, stealing. Even if you wrote the prompt, what you collected isn’t the prompt itself, but the AI’s output from your prompt. Your prompt is only five sentences, but you’re collecting one short story. A work is a work, not a guide to creating one” (L2). L3 delves into the psychological and sociological aspects of this issue, “It seems that this technological acceleration is evolving students; they appear to be experiencing a creativity crisis, or even, if I may say so, an identity crisis. They even lack confidence in their own abilities. They are confused about what to become after graduation, confused about their competencies and potential... they are worried about many things, or perhaps they are even afraid of their own shadows! So, it is not surprising that AI, whether we like it or not, inevitably... [becomes] a rational escape” (L3). They seem to highlight that the issue of plagiarism in the context of AI cannot be viewed in black-and-white, rigid, and binary terms, but must be understood as part of a new pedagogical and ethical crisis. When discussing ethical aspects, all sources highlight the habit of students claiming AI-generated work as their own, which could be a new phenomenon. L1 has a radical tolerance for originality. Originality is a modern illusion, and implicitly, plagiarism is a practice that has been and continues to be carried out, even unconsciously. L2 asserts that students' actions of claiming AI-generated work as their own constitute academic plagiarism. L2 emphasises that there are two important points to underscore: transparency and

accountability. L3 raises the ethical dimension psychologically and sociologically. L3 views this practice as a transformation of the human identity crisis in the creative process. Plagiarism is not merely about the intent to deceive but also a reflection of systemic imbalances; culture and technology that have not yet integrated with existing human resources. In short, originality in the context of AI presents a spectrum of dilemmas. A new, more adaptive ethics is needed, yet one that maintains integrity. This discursive debate can be seen as a transitional phase from an individualistic authorial paradigm toward a collaborative one, while also demonstrating that technology cannot be separated from its social context. Post-humanist civilisation, in short, creates post-humanist works.

c. Creativity Process and Human–Technology Relationship

After authorship and originality, another issue that can be discussed is the creative process, as it involves the transition from manual to technological humans, which shortens the creative process from manual to automatic. L1 views the collaborative process with AI as a more honest form of aesthetic expression: "Currently, we are not interested in tracing genealogy [origin or originality], but we are more interested in its logical consequences, effects, and impact—how it [AI] can write like that, how it can predict readers' feelings solely from data. I am certain that AI does not write from thin air; it is based on data and information" (L1). On the other hand, L2 prioritises human experience in the creative process, "AI can mimic form, but it cannot suffer. That's what makes AI-generated works lack vitality… however, it could be because of the prompt writer; perhaps when the prompt writer writes in great detail about their feelings, experiences, and wounds, the AI replicates and modifies the input into output" (L2). In other words, L2 emphasises that the writing process must still touch on the existential realm of humanity; the process cannot be eliminated, as that is where the work is formed. On the other hand, L3 illustrates that the AI process is not merely a technical tool but also a psychosocial reflection: "I cannot directly accuse them of being lazy or stupid. I really want to engage them in discussion, to understand why everything is done with AI, whether they want to improve their competencies and process things. Indeed, processing requires energy, patience, and perseverance, but the end product of all that is self-development assessment. Of course, I want them to go through the process; writing literary works isn't about the work being perfect, ideal, or sophisticated, but it's the process of releasing expression into another form of energy through writing. Isn't the beauty [aesthetics] there?" (L3). All three sources agree that the creative process should not be degraded by the presence of AI, but rather facilitated with a new approach. L1 welcomes the collaboration between humans and machines as an aesthetic experiment. He views this process as a new face of literary writing. L2, on the other hand, suggests that AI be used as a structural tool, such as narrative patterns or language style, not to replace personal creativity. For L2, the process must exist. L3 sees motives behind the creation of literary works by AI, whether due to the ease it offers, academic pressure, or a lack of self-confidence. For L3, creative experience is important so that students do not lose their identity in creativity and work. The creative writing process in the AI era should be a space for negotiation between literature and technology. Collaboration with AI can become a new formation: post-humanistic literature. AI does not replace creativity but rather enhances it and navigates emotions, as the creative writing process is not just about the final product but the personal experience of delving into the depths of the writer's imagination and thoughts.

Therefore, AI intervention should not bypass this process but rather serve as a means of discussing literature in an increasingly automated world.

d. The Future of Literature

From the interviews, all three interviewees were open to change, but they also mentioned some prerequisites that must be met. L1 emphasised the transition in evaluating works, saying, "Perhaps the poetry of the future will not be written by a person, but performed by a network of minds and logic. We never know; life is always full of surprises. Perhaps in the future, people won't read novels but instead become characters within novels through VR [Virtual Reality]" (L1). L2, on the other hand, highlighted the importance of the essence of literature in this cultural shift, "We must not lose our sanity, we must not lose the essence of value, and of course, we cannot be replaced by AI. We are human, and we must uphold humanistic competencies such as creativity and critical thinking" (L2). Meanwhile, L3 appears more optimistic about the expansion of new literary forms, "What can I call it… Hybrid Literature, or Algorithmic Poetry… or perhaps Machine Literature? It's funny, but what else can we do? We interact with and are even dependent on technology, especially AI. Literature will certainly undergo a transformation; I'm sure of it. just like how oral literature evolved into written literature, and handwritten literature was replaced by typewritten literature, then shifted to the computerised era, and in the future, everything that seems impossible and fictional could become reality" (L3). From this, it can be seen that the future of literature is not about rejecting or accepting AI outright, but about how to build new ethical and aesthetic awareness to manage such complexity. This interview explains that: 1) The concept of the author undergoes a profound transformation, 2) Originality and plagiarism need to be reinterpreted ethically and contextually, and 3) AI must be positioned as a creative tool that still requires human *proxy-sensitivity*.

DISCUSSION

AI can be categorised as a literary event. It is a literary phenomenon, and literary works produced by AI have disrupted conventional and traditional epistemological structures in the world of literature, particularly in terms of authorship, originality, creative processes, and literary ethics. Interviews with three literature lecturers in this study have opened up a space for dialectical exploration that is more critical and deeper. This exploration has resulted in a paradigm shift occurring in the post-humanism era; humans are no longer the sole centre of literary creation.

First, the concept of authorship must be seen as an issue that has undergone decentralisation. Roland Barthes (1967) in his essay *The Death of the Author* explains that the author is not the sole and absolute source of meaning; literary texts live through their readers who interpret them (Caughie, 2021; Elliott & Waggoner, 2021; Hans et al., 1978; Samoyault & Manghani, 2020). In other words, the relationship between the writer and the literary work ceases the moment the text is created, and the text comes alive again through the reading process by the reader. This means that meaning arises from the interpretation made by the reader, which may seem anthropocentric, but this view is affirmed and strongly echoed in L1's opinion, which radically states that 'the text is a mosaic of other texts,' and AI only accelerates our awareness of the nature of authorship, which has been fragmented by the presence of the author. In this context, AI is not merely an instrument; it is a partner in the production of discourse through literary works. The data and information possessed by AI are not a package that falls from the sky, not a revelation from God, but a compilation of data owned by humans in this

universe. Thus, indirectly, a writer using AI is, in essence, contemplating and collaborating with the minds of other humans through AI (Coman & Cardon, 2024; Nguyen et al., 2024). We are not alone, and our ideas are not Adam and Eve in the authentic, naked, unblemished paradise; we are collaborative beings, including with non-living things like technology or AI. In conventional mode, we need tools, even manual ones like pencils, ballpoint pens, typewriters, or computers. For distribution, we need other readers, mass media, and now digital platforms. AI prompts should be seen as a form of human agency negotiating meaning (Korzynski et al., 2023; Li, 2024; Oppenlaender, 2023), as mentioned by L3, who refers to this as negotiated authorship; a situation where the boundary between humans and machines in the creation of works is no longer clear-cut but fluid and deconstructive. At this focal point, post-structuralism finds its practical application in the digital ecosystem, where our subjectivity is now a contemplation between the human and technological sides in a dialogical manner.

Secondly, on the issue of originality in the context of AI, it experiences problematic dynamics. Originality, which has long been seen as the standard ethical and aesthetic monster in literature, must now be re-examined. Like other cultural products, it is a construction of a dynamic. Since the phase of oral literature (folklore, legends, fables, and so on), originality has never been an issue because literature has a public rather than a personal function (Pask, 2012). When literature entered the personal sphere, works had owners, and from this ownership, authors armed themselves with copyright, which resulted in biases towards originality and plagiarism. In his interview, L1 rejects the myth of originality, stating that humans are never truly original. This implies that every idea and even emotion, even before the advent of AI, is always constructed through patterns of intertextuality and modification. This statement aligns with Kristeva's (1980) theory of intertextuality. For Kristeva, every text emerges from and through the process of absorption and transformation of other texts (Allen, 2000; Alzahrani, 2012; Mirenayat & Soofastaei, 2015). Conversely, L2 represents a structural and normative voice that prioritises transparency and intellectual responsibility. He emphasises that claims regarding works created by AI, without editing processes and without acknowledgment of sources, should be viewed as a form of infringement. Between these two extremes, L3 offers a socio-psychological analysis, arguing that AI-generated literary works are actually the logical consequence of a crisis, particularly among generations unprepared to face the turbulence and acceleration of technological progress, leading to a crisis of creative identity—they lose confidence in their own abilities, and ultimately AI becomes a rational escape route. However, the main point of this finding is *technological ethics*. Floridi (2013) argues that in the digital world, we do not only live in the world but also within information (the infosphere). In the infosphere, AI, humans, and data are interconnected as an information ecosystem. As such, technology influences human agency, autonomy, and responsibility (Brayford, 2020; Chapman, 2016; Floridi, 2018; Floridi & Strait, 2020). In the context of AI generating poetry or short stories, we can ask whether AI replaces humans or expands human capabilities. Who is responsible for the works produced by AI? Does the use of AI in literary works undermine or enrich the moral-informational values of society? The best way to evaluate the ethics of AI use here is to consider literary works created by AI as *co-authored* human-machine works in literature (Craig & Kerr, 2019).

Third, the creative process is undergoing a transformation from an existential practice to a functional action. If previously the writing process was a medium for self-expression, reflection, and sublimation of experience, then in the context of AI use, we are now shortening, abbreviating, or even skipping that process into a single stage: the

prompt. This trend has sparked an argument from L2, who states that AI can mimic technical aspects of literary works, but AI cannot convey feelings. L2 emphasises the importance of affection and inner experience in aesthetic production, so for him, if the writer transforms their thoughts and feelings into a very clear prompt, then AI can breathe life into what is missing. Conversely, L1 views collaboration with AI as a new form of honesty in aesthetic expression. The creative process is no longer solely about individual inspiration but also about data manipulation and algorithms (Dahlstedt, 2019; Toivonen & Gross, 2015; T. Zhao et al., 2021). Meanwhile, L3 highlights the importance of restoring the writing experience as a space where imagination, emotion, and ethical creative work intersect. Technology should bridge that gap, not replace it; expressive aesthetics. The value of literature lies not only in the final product but in the act of creation itself. It is an expression of the creator's emotions, experiences, or personal feelings. An art form, including literature, is not judged solely by its technical beauty but by its ability to convey the writer's feelings deeply. For example, a gloomy poem written by someone who is *ecstatic* will be less expressive than one written by someone who is miserable. Feelings are considered to have aesthetic value because they possess emotional honesty and depth of feeling, so a work that may appear ordinary and simple, uncomplicated, and not using sophisticated language, can still be considered aesthetic if it can touch the reader's emotions, this is in line with what Rosenblatt called as *transactional reading*. Rosenblatt rejects the view that meaning is objectively embedded in the text, locked within it. Instead, he insists that meaning arises from a process of transaction between the text and the reader in a particular context. This means that readers play an active role as creators of meaning; readers' knowledge influences the production of meaning from the text. There are two stances in reading: Efferent Stance and Aesthetic Stance. In the Efferent Stance, readers focus on extracting information or factual meaning from the text, while in the Aesthetic Stance, readers engage emotionally and imaginatively with the text, thereby enjoying the reading experience and actively assessing its aesthetic value. This is what is referred to as the process of interpreting text with aesthetic value (Marhaeni, 1998; Rosenblatt, 1969, 2018). Expressive aesthetics is a way of interpreting works of art as reflections of the human soul and inner expression, not merely visual beauty or technical structure.

Finally, ethical issues in AI literacy have become a hotly debated topic. Ethics, in a philosophical sense, is not just about morality or social etiquette; it is a critical reflection on how humans should live and act in a dynamic world. Ethics arises from an existential awareness that human actions always have consequences, whether for oneself, others, or the social order (Choung et al., 2023; Edwards, 2003). Ethics is not merely about good and bad, right and wrong, but a space for contesting values where decisions are made in situations that are grey, ambiguous, and full of conflict. Ethics becomes a philosophical praxis, not a rigid, frozen doctrine, but a field of continuous reflection on power relations, responsibility, freedom, and justice (McMahon, 1999). In other words, ethics can no longer be built on a binary foundation between plagiarism and originality, between humans and machines, and between feelings and data (Waelen, 2022). The current discourse on ethical literacy demands a contextual and reflective approach. As highlighted by L3, ethical issues in AI literature cannot be separated from the education system, social pressure, or even necessity. The tendency to seek ease is natural, and AI offers ease. An education system that imposes ideal truths on the humanities also contributes to the stagnation of one's determination and resilience to think critically, let alone creatively. If education becomes a prison with students as hostages, while their social lives are also trapped in economic issues, then literacy

becomes impossible. Low literacy combined with the digital technology world results in fallacy, superficiality, and deficiencies in self-development. The absence of a curriculum addressing technology ethics also contributes to this phenomenon. This is highly complex and intricate, so we cannot view it as mere cheating but rather as a shortcut revealing the potential for literature that is truly astonishing. Academics must strive to explore the untouched spaces of literature and technology, as we no longer live in a romanticised world of autonomous humans with feelings and thoughts, but are bound by technology. AI literacy ethics must be understood not merely as a set of norms, but as pedagogical practices that prioritise transparency, reflection, and collaborative responsibility.

Thus, this discussion not only presents an empirical reflection but also expands the conceptual space to reinterpret what it means to write in the AI era. Authorship can no longer be seen as an absolute individual whole; originality must be re-read historically and intertextually; the creative process cannot be independent and may involve technology because aesthetics belongs to anyone and anything; and AI literacy ethics must become part of collective consciousness, especially in the world of literature. In this context, we must see that literature is not a field undergoing degradation or threatened by technology, but rather ruins that are redefining themselves with a new civilisation in post-humanist society.

CONCLUSION

This study stems from epistemological concerns about the proliferation of AI practices, such as ChatGPT, in the process of creating literary works by students, which raises ethical issues related to authorship, originality, production processes, and literacy ethics in the academic world. Quantitative findings from a survey of 50 students show that all respondents have involved AI in the writing of literary works, whether poetry or short stories, with most even claiming the works as their own, reflecting dependence on technology, as well as an ethical crisis and creative identity crisis. Meanwhile, qualitative findings reveal a fundamental shift in the meaning of classical concepts in literature. The literature lecturers interviewed shared reflective and diverse perspectives: from deconstructive and post-humanist to conservative and humanistic. They emphasised that authorship today is a process of contemplation or negotiation between humans and machines; originality is no longer seen as an absolute value but as a constantly dynamic construct; the creative process must retain its existential value; and literary ethics must be re-examined in the context of the digital and academic landscape of today. The discussion intertwines to form a common thread that AI is not merely a technological tool but a cultural entity forcing the literary world to evaluate and redefine itself; from its original basis in personal expression toward a hybrid form between data, prompts, and affect. Therefore, literature in this post-humanist era is not enough to merely demonstrate writing skills, but must begin to build ethical awareness, creative reflection, and critical sensitivity and intimacy towards the changing landscape of literacy, which is no longer entirely written by human hands, but by half-human, half-robot hands. Thus, this research reaffirms that AI is not merely a technological tool but a cultural agency involved in reshaping the contemporary literary landscape.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research was not birthed from lucidity, but from an unceasing disquietude; an epistemic dynamic provoked by the unhurried erosion of authorship, the seductive opacity of artificial agency, and the mysterious bridge connecting algorithms and

imagination. My sincere gratitude extends to the three literary lecturers who did not merely answer our inquiries, but ignited ideas. Their voices—radical, conservative, and humanist—twisted a dissonant harmony that mirrored the fractured symphony of our posthuman literary epoch. They reminded us that literature is not a sanctuary for purists, but a battlefield for meanings in flux. We are proportionately indebted to the students who, whether naively or defiantly, entrusted AI to execute the sacred process of literary writing that ends in human-machine works, and in doing so, uncovers a glimpse into a future where authorship is no longer authored. Their responses, sometimes earnest, sometimes evasive, constitute the data of a generation negotiating its identity between autocorrect and autoethnography. To the machinic entity, ChatGPT, that inspires this inquiry; we offer neither praise nor accuse, only appreciation that your algorithms and bots are neither muse nor menace, but ambiguity that distorts as much as it reveals, infinities and impossibilities, and perhaps, the future is precisely your weapon. Lastly, we thank to the time for silencing impatience to complete this intellectual provocation and for still permitting us to mean things, even when meaning is increasingly in doubts.

REFERENCES

Aistrope, T. (2020). Popular culture, the body and world politics. *European Journal of International Relations*, *26*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066119851849

Allen, G. (2000). Intertextuality: The new critical idiom. In *Science*.

Almujalli, H. (2023). Author, Text, and Writing: Roland Barthes and "The Death of the Author." *Journal of the College of Languages*, *0*(48). https://doi.org/10.36586/jcl.2.2023.0.48.0001

Alzahrani, M. A. (2012). From the death of the author to the death of intertextuality: The birth of cultural intertextuality. *International Journal of the Humanities*, *9*(10). https://doi.org/10.18848/1447-9508/cgp/v09i10/43353

Biswas, A. (2021). A Critical Analysis of the Post-structuralist Thought with Reference to 'The Death of the Author' by Roland Barthes. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, *4*(1). https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2021.4.1.18

Brayford, K. (2020). Myth and technology: Finding philosophy's role in technological change. *Human Affairs*, *30*(4). https://doi.org/10.1515/humaff-2020-0045

Byron, M. (2010). Floridi's Fourth Revolution and the Demise of Ethics. *Knowledge, Technology & Policy*, *23*(1–2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12130-010-9103-y

Bysaga, Y. M., Byelov, D. M., & Zaborovskyi, V. V. (2023). Artificial intelligence and copyright and related rights. *Uzhhorod National University Herald. Series: Law*, *2*(76). https://doi.org/10.24144/2307-3322.2022.76.2.47

Caughie, J. (2021). Roland Barthes: "The death of the author." In *Theories of Authorship*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315002279-23

Chapman, D. (2016). Comment on Floridi's The Ethics of Information. *APA Newsletter*, *15*(2).

Choung, H., David, P., & Ross, A. (2023). Trust and ethics in AI. *AI and Society*, *38*(2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01473-4

Chu, PH. and Chang, YY. (2017). John W, Creswell, Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. *Journal of Social and Administrative Sciences*, *4*(June).

Coman, A. W., & Cardon, P. (2024). Perceptions of Professionalism and Authenticity in AI-Assisted Writing. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*. https://doi.org/10.1177/23294906241233224

Craig, C. J., & Kerr, I. R. (2019). The Death of the AI Author. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3374951

Dahlstedt, P. (2019). Big Data and Creativity. *European Review*, *27*(3). https://doi.org/10.1017/S1062798719000073

Doyle, T. (2010). A Critique of Information Ethics. *Knowledge, Technology & Policy*, *23*(1–2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12130-010-9104-x

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. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, *31*(2). https://doi.org/10.1145/3637875

Durante, M. (2017). Ethics, Law and the Politics of Information: A Guide to the Philosophy of Luciano Floridi. In *International Library of Ethics, Law and Technology* (Vol. 18).

Edwards, R. B. (2003). Moral Knowledge and Ethical Character. *International Studies in Philosophy*, *35*(4). https://doi.org/10.5840/intstudphil200335419

Elliott, S. S., & Waggoner, M. (2021). Roland Barthes The Death of the Author. In *Readings in the Theory of Religion*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315475615-17

English, J. F., & Underwood, T. (2016). Shifting scales: Between literature and social science. *Modern Language Quarterly*, *77*(3). https://doi.org/10.1215/00267929-3570612

Epstein, Z., Hertzmann, A., Akten, M., Farid, H., Fjeld, J., Frank, M. R., Groh, M., Herman, L., Leach, N., Mahari, R., Pentland, A., Russakovsky, O., Schroeder, H., & Smith, A. (2023). Art and the science of generative AI. *Science*, *380*(6650). https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adh4451

Floridi, L. (2018). Soft ethics, the governance of the digital and the General Data Protection Regulation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, *376*(2133). https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2018.0081

Floridi, L., & Strait, A. (2020). Ethical Foresight Analysis: What it is and Why it is Needed? *Minds and Machines*, *30*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-020-09521-y

Friedrich, S., Antes, G., Behr, S., Binder, H., Brannath, W., Dumpert, F., Ickstadt, K., Kestler, H. A., Lederer, J., Leitgöb, H., Pauly, M., Steland, A., Wilhelm, A., & Friede, T. (2022). Is there a role for statistics in artificial intelligence? *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification*, *16*(4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11634-021-00455-6

Guetterman, T. C., Fetters, M. D., & Creswell, J. W. (2015). Integrating quantitative and qualitative results in health science mixed methods research through joint displays. *Annals of Family Medicine*, *13*(6). https://doi.org/10.1370/afm.1865

Hans, J. S., Barthes, R., & Heath, S. (1978). Image-Music-Text. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, *37*(2). https://doi.org/10.2307/429854

Hwang, A. H. C. (2022). Too Late to be Creative? AI-Empowered Tools in Creative Processes. *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - Proceedings*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3491101.3503549

Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2007). Toward a Definition of Mixed Methods Research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *1*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689806298224

Jones, N. (2022). Experiential Literature? Comparing the Work of AI and Human Authors. *APRIA Journal*, *5*(5). https://doi.org/10.37198/apria.04.05.a5

Korzynski, P., Mazurek, G., Krzypkowska, P., & Kurasinski, A. (2023). Artificial intelligence prompt engineering as a new digital competence: Analysis of generative AI technologies such as ChatGPT. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, *11*(3). https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2023.110302

Leech, N. L., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2009). A typology of mixed methods research designs. *Quality and Quantity*, *43*(2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-007-9105-3

Li, R. (2024). A "Dance of storytelling": Dissonances between substance and style in collaborative storytelling with AI. *Computers and Composition*, *71*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2024.102825

Marhaeni, A. A. I. N. (1998). Rosenblatt's Transactional Theory and Its Implementation in the Teaching of Integrated Reading. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Negeri Malang*, *5*(4).

McKim, C. A. (2017). The Value of Mixed Methods Research: A Mixed Methods Study. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *11*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689815607096

McMahon, T. F. (1999). Transforming Justice: A Conceptualization. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *9*(4). https://doi.org/10.2307/3857937

Mirenayat, S. A., & Soofastaei, E. (2015). Gerard genette and the categorization of textual transcendence. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *6*(5). https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n5p533

Nguyen, A., Hong, Y., Dang, B., & Huang, X. (2024). Human-AI collaboration patterns in AI-assisted academic writing. *Studies in Higher Education*, *49*(5). https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2323593

Nitzberg, M., & Zysman, J. (2022). Algorithms, data, and platforms: the diverse challenges of governing AI. *Journal of European Public Policy*, *29*(11). https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2022.2096668

Nowak-Gruca, A. (2022). Could an Artificial Intelligence be a Ghostwriter? *Journal of Intellectual Property Rights*, *27*(1). https://doi.org/10.56042/jipr.v27i1.51259

Oppenlaender, J. (2023). A taxonomy of prompt modifiers for text-to-image generation. *Behaviour and Information Technology*. https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2023.2286532

Oritsegbemi, O. (2023). Human Intelligence versus AI: Implications for Emotional Aspects of Human Communication. *Journal of Advanced Research in Social Sciences*, *6*(2). https://doi.org/10.33422/jarss.v6i2.1005

Palinkas, L. A., Mendon, S. J., & Hamilton, A. B. (2019). Innovations in Mixed Methods Evaluations. In *Annual Review of Public Health* (Vol. 40). https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040218-044215

Pask, K. (2012). Ancients and moderns: The origins of literary history. In *Modern Language Quarterly* (Vol. 73, Issue 4). https://doi.org/10.1215/00267929-1723334

Raj, P. P. E. (2015). Text/Texts: Interrogating Julia Kristeva's Concept of Intertextuality. *Ars Artium*, *3*(January).

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1969). Towards a transactional theory of reading. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/10862969609546838

Rosenblatt, L. M. (2018). THE TRANSACTIONAL THEORY OF READING AND WRITING. In *Theoretical Models and Processes of Literacy, Seventh Edition*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315110592-28

Samoyault, T., & Manghani, S. (2020). On Barthes' Biography: A Dialogue. *Theory, Culture and Society*, *37*(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276420910471

Soker-Schwager, H. (2019). The discipline of literature as superfluity. *Poetics Today*, *40*(1). https://doi.org/10.1215/03335372-7259901

Sumakul, D. T. Y. G., Hamied, F. A., & Sukyadi, D. (2022). Students' Perceptions of the Use of AI in a Writing Class. *Proceedings of the 67th TEFLIN International Virtual Conference & the 9th ICOELT 2021 (TEFLIN ICOELT 2021), 624*. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220201.009

Teddlie, C., & yu, F. (2007). Mixed Methods Sampling: A Typology With Examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2345678906292430

Teixeira da Silva, J. A., & Tsigaris, P. (2023). Human- and AI-based authorship: Principles and ethics. *Learned Publishing*, *36*(3). https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1547

Timans, R., Wouters, P., & Heilbron, J. (2019). Mixed methods research: what it is and what it could be. *Theory and Society*, *48*(2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-019-09345-5

Toivonen, H., & Gross, O. (2015). Data mining and machine learning in computational creativity. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, *5*(6). https://doi.org/10.1002/widm.1170

Vinchon, F., Lubart, T., Bartolotta, S., Gironnay, V., Botella, M., Bourgeois-Bougrine, S., Burkhardt, J. M., Bonnardel, N., Corazza, G. E., Glăveanu, V., Hanchett Hanson, M., Ivcevic, Z., Karwowski, M., Kaufman, J. C., Okada, T., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Gaggioli, A. (2023). Artificial Intelligence & Creativity: A Manifesto for Collaboration. In *Journal of Creative Behavior* (Vol. 57, Issue 4). https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.597

Waelen, R. (2022). Why AI Ethics Is a Critical Theory. *Philosophy and Technology*, *35*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-022-00507-5

Yeo, M. A. (2023). Academic integrity in the age of Artificial Intelligence (AI) authoring apps. *TESOL Journal*, *14*(3). https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.716

Yimer, D. M. (2019). On the Interaction Between Literature and Psychology. *Ieee-Sem Publications*, *7*(8).

Yu, B., & Kumbier, K. (2018). Artificial intelligence and statistics. *Frontiers of Information Technology and Electronic Engineering*, *19*(1). https://doi.org/10.1631/FITEE.1700813

Zengin, M. (2016). An Introduction to Intertextuality as a Literary Theory: Definitions, Axioms and the Originators. *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, *2016*(50). https://doi.org/10.5505/pausbed.2016.96729

Zhao, T., Yang, J., Zhang, H., & Siu, K. W. M. (2021). Creative idea generation method based on deep learning technology. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, *31*(2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10798-019-09556-y

Zhao, W., & Sun, Y. (2024). The Exploration of Emotional Aspects of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Artistic Design. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Social Science*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.62309/bk757m16

Zhou, E., & Lee, D. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence, human creativity, and art. *PNAS Nexus*, *3*(3). https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae052