International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 11 No. 23s, 2025
https://www.theaspd.com/ijes.php

Generative AI And Techno-Creativity: A Reflection On Post-Literary Creativity In A Technoutopian Age

Renu Elizabeth Abraham[1], Dattatreya M[2]
[1]Research Scholar, Kuvempu University, Shimoga, renuabr@gmail.com, 0000-0003-2043-1919
[2]Associate Professor, PG Department of Research in English Studies, Kuvempu University, Shimoga., dattamku@gmail.com, 0000-0002-4403-2384

Abstract
With the advent of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI), the last decade saw an unprecedented transformation in the world of creative engagements with GAI-assisted creative expressions in literary and non-literary writing. This paper attempts to analyse the impact of GAI on human creativity; the implications of the coming-of-age of technocratic and technified creativity, and what it spells for human beings in this increasingly posthuman world. The study attempts to understand the nature of creative expressions that GAI makes available in terms of the treatment of the theme, figurative language, meter, rhyme scheme, imagery, (stanzaic) structure and sound devices in poetry. The study hypothesises that while technological assistance through GAI reinforces the formalistic features of poetry and fiction, it does not allow for new breakthroughs in artistic and creative expressions, like producing new structures and styles of writing. This is because AI is imitative in its output as it functions as an aggregator, synthesising already available poetry on the World Wide Web to output conditioned narratives. This qualitative research will focus on poetry produced by GAIs like ChatGPT and CoPilot to examine the nature and structures of poetry and short story and will attempt to argue that human creativity supercedes AI's creative responses in that the human mind is able to synthesise and process information to produce new forms and models, which AI is not yet capable to do. While GAI could be a good tool to reinforce age-old structures of poetry and fiction, it has yet to keep up with transformative postmodern human thinking, and it is still heavily dependent on sentiment and emotion. This study will help recognise the importance of the 'esemplastic' human imagination that can touch and transform all that it encounters in Samuel Colerdge's words, which is dynamic feature of the hunman artistic brain and reiterate that while GAI is a productive tool, it is meant to assist human creativity and cannot take over that role for the human. The study, thus, posits the possibility of a peculiar 'post-literary' that is a product of technological creativity. While it could be productive to displace the centrality of the anthropocene in many instances, like that of environmental justice, in the case of creativity, humans are important agents in literary creativity in ways a machine is not.

Keywords: *Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI), human creativity, post-literary, technological creativity, posthumanism.*

1.1. INTRODUCTION

Posthumanism and postanthropocentrism are two much-bandied-about terms that have changed the landscape of human engagement and creativity ever since they gained a foothold in the twentieth century. Ralf Remshardt, while arguing that there is no singular 'posthuman condition', states that,

"In a posthuman performance paradigm, spectator and performer both relinquish their positionally determinate (dialectical) claims to presence and reconfigure themselves as dynamic, interdependent parts of an emergent system (2010, p.135).

Various theorists and optimists have attempted to grasp the nature of the posthuman in their particular contexts. N Katherine Hayles, a pioneer in Digital Humanities, theorises the posthuman taking cues from Mark Poster's notion of the "humachine" (2003), which indicates the human and machine interface and insists that such considerations should recognise the specific materiality engendered by cyberspace technologies (2004p. 312). Remshardt borrows Hayles's optimistic view that, although it would be impossible to make logical distinctions between "the biological organism and the informational circuits in which it is enmeshed", it would not signal "the end of humanity". Hayles states,

It signals instead the end of a certain conception of the human, a conception that may have applied, at best, to that fraction of humanity who had the wealth, power, and leisure to conceptualize themselves as autonomous beings exercising their will through individual agency and choice. (qtd. in Remshardt, 2010, p. 135)

This indicates our advent into the postanthropocentric and, as Hayles posits, the posthuman that "refer(s) to twentieth-century developments in which an Enlightenment inheritance that emphasised autonomy, rationality, individuality and so forth, was being systematically challenged and disassembled" (2010, p.135). This formulation is important in our consideration of GAI and its role in creative expression and assistance, and how it reconfigures the role of the human and human creative and artistic autonomy. This is evident in the manner in which AI-generated visual effects are replacing human artistic interventions in cinema and producing a rich tapestry of visuality and creativity. The trained AI-graphics artist and the AI tools (the humachine combination) are at the centre of this innovation. While AI-generated visuality is now an uncontested norm in cinema as it is more cost-effective, and does not harm the environment or the living beings in it, like in the case of filming in sensitive ecological landscapes and using animals, the same cannot be said for humachine coordination in the creation of more individualistic creative genres like poetry and short stories. Academic writing and technical writing have been effectively deploying GAI in their endeavours, even as agencies, organisations and academic institutions are scrambling to produce new policies and copyright interventions in the use of AI within these spaces. Such a recognition or intervention is not yet in place for GAI-assisted poetry and short story writing, as these are considered human creative outputs and are mostly assumed to be done by human beings and not GAI. This could be misleading and understate the use of AI in creative engagements.

The research undertaken will attempt to analyse the impact and nature of GAI on human creativity. It will examine how technified creativity reconfigures the idea of the human and what are the implications of such a reconfiguration. The study argues that while technological assistance through GAI reinforces the formalistic features of poetry and fiction, it does not allow for new breakthroughs in artistic and creative expressions, like producing new structures and styles of writing. This is because AI is imitative in its output as it functions as an aggregator, synthesising already available poetry on the World Wide Web to output conditioned narratives.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS AND DEFINITIONS

2.1 Impact of Invasive Technification on Creativity

In his book *Invasive Technification* (2012), Gernot Böhme presents the condition of the human now in the age of what he terms 'invasive' ("that is, as intruding deeply and permanently into the body rather than merely supporting or supplementing bodily functions" (Böhme, 2012, "Introduction: Invasive technification")) technology in medical sciences which reconfigures "what one is as a human" (Böhme, 2012, "Introduction: Invasive technification"). Though Böhme contextualisesthe notion of invasive within medical sciences and the human body, this study appropriates this term to indicate a similar 'invasiveness' that operates on the level of human creativity and critical thinking, which were hitherto, within the anthropocentric world-view, considered inalienable to the human and part of their 'inherent' genius, as if they were an inviolable extension of their self/body. The intrusive violence associated with the term 'invasive' and the functioning of GAI are similar and different. Like invasive medical technology, GAI usage is based on choice and is often perceived as liberatory and democratic. However, unlike invasive medical technologies, GAI intrudes into the sacred human spaces of thinking and creativity. In his essay "The Juggler's Brain", Nicholas Carr warns the world about the problematic rewiring of our neural network due to extensive exposure to the Internet. Carr quotes neurological studies post the advent of the Internet to indicate the changes and the impact human interdependencies on the Internet have made on human society and human skills. He points to the possibilities of the Internet for the human brain as it helps strengthen neural circuits related to scanning, skimming, multi-tasking, visual-spatial skills, hand-eye coordination, locating, categorising and assessing diverse and spread-out information. Distinguishing between working memory and long-term memory, he

indicates through various studies that retaining information in our working memory has become increasingly difficult. This affects our synthesising capabilities that operate with long-term memory and leads to an increasing inability to convert working memory into long-term memory (Carr, 2010-11, p. 11). He also heralds the rapid loss of creative, deep thinking and critical thinking skills fostered through reading books and slowly mulling over them. This invasive technification affects our neural networks, affecting our creative and critical thinking skills. As our skills become increasingly technified, we see the 'postness' of the human as inevitable. This study will deploy this notion of intensive technification in a symbolic manner to postulate that GAI, while invading the sacrosanct spaces of human creativity it is not yet in a position to replace human creativity. However, like Carr argues, it does attempt to reconfigure the way we look at creative expressions and art. They can become as instrumental as a piece of technical writing if outsourced to GAI, and could hamper our ability to produce "new" things. Innovation will give way to technified or formalistic pastiche or kitsch, which Frederic Jameson rued in his *Postmodernism, or, The cultural logic of late capitalism* (1991). While pastiche and kitsch have their own beauty, the question of the artist's autonomy and individual creativity will be at stake and produce a 'terrible beauty' like Andy Warhol's pop art.

2.2 Generative AI and Creativity

Generative AI, considered to be one of the most disruptive technologies of all times, traces its history back to the 1950s and 60s and evolved significantly around 2006 and entered the field with the publication of Geoffrey Hinton et al.'s "A fast learning algorithm for deep belief nets" which reintroduced Restricted Boltzmann Machines (RBMs) in the context of deep learning which was first introduced in 1983. Another critical landmark for Generative AI was in 2014 when Ian Goodfellow and other researchers introduced Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN), and tremendous inroads have been made into generative AI models since then. (Matt White, "A Brief History of Generative AI"). In 2022, the technology entered the hands of the consumer with several text-to-image model services like MidJourney, Dall-E 2, Imagen, and the open-source release of Stability AI's Stable Diffusion, followed by OpenAI's ChatGPT version 3 (White "A Brief History of Generative AI"). With rapid game-changing advancements daily, most open-source AI platforms and software have become paid software, as with OpenAI's ChatGPT version 4. According to Robert Chandler Swallow, and Marc Chalé in "Harnessing the Momentum of Generative AI" (2023), Generative AIs like ChatGPT are Large Language Models that can efficiently encode meaning from natural language and can "combine training data from almost any source. … The model is also capable of generating original, yet plausible verbal responses to human prompts. The models seem to synthesise complex ideas drawing from a broad array of original sources" (2023, p. 53). These LLMs are well-calibrated with human-in-the-loop training (Swallow and Chalé, 2023, p. 53). As this process is automated by culling out English language content online, while useful, it could also provide misleading disinformation, have a western-centric bias due to the English language data scraped out, lead to AI hallucinations (where the GPT can make up data which are seemingly coherent and convincing), and provide unethical solutions for social or global problems (Swallow and Chalé, 2023, p. 53). According to Nina Schick, an expert and advisor on AI, Generative AI is an extension of the machine learning technology that allows "'machines' to generate or create new data or things that did not exist before" (2023, p.40). Schick adds, "AI will increasingly be used not only to create all digital content, but as an automation layer to drive forward the production of all human intelligent and creative activity" (2023, p.40). She further postulates, she paints an ambivalent picture of a "creative partner" who writes stories, composes music and designs visual art, who is an AI - a machine that collates and learns from digitised human repositories and refines them for human use. This "creative partner", she claims, can "capture the nuances of human intelligence" and create something new and "awe-inspiring or terrifying" (2023, p. 40). The inflection point was November 2022, when ChatGPT was released for public use. With this and the subsequent release of other GPTs like Microsoft's CoPilot, Grok X AI, Perplexity AI, Claude and Jenni AI, among others, internet users entered a period of unprecedented experimentation and reconfiguration, which affected all aspects of life and work. It redefined hiring patterns in most jobs, especially content writing or creating, proofreading, content editing and multiple other 'writing-based jobs,' redefining digital media and the media landscape. This prompts us to examine the nature of creativity as it has been defined in the pre-GPT age and

what it is, or could be, now, powered by GAI. And this will slowly and surely reconfigure human creativity, too, as studies have noted. Cashing in on the popularity of GAI, this study will attempt to create poems through the Bing CoPilot GPT and ChatGPT's version 4.5 to examine the nature of technified poetry and thereby creativity.

Research by Brian Porter and Edouard Machery on "AI-generated poetry is indistinguishable from human-written poetry and is rated more favorably" (2024) investigated whether non-expert readers could distinguish AI-generated poems from those by human poets. Two experiments showed participants had below-chance accuracy (46.6%) in identifying AI poems, often mistaking them for human-authored due to favourable ratings in rhythm and beauty. AI poems' simplicity led to preference and misidentification, while human poems' complexity was mistaken for AI-generated incoherence, revealing flawed heuristics in distinguishing AI from human poetry (Porter and Machery, 2024). Another study argues through a series of experiments conducted with experts and non-expert respondents that humans find it difficult to distinguish poetry written by Maya Angelou and AI, even as people are averse to the idea of AI-generated poetry if they are informed about it (Kobis and Mossink, 2021). A series of articles published Springer Nature's Scientific Reports argue that while AI-generated poems are indistinguishable from human created poems, the touch of human intelligence acts as a buffers for complete human creative annihilation, distinguishing between "posthuman agents" and "biological agents" (Torres-Martínez, 2025); other studies show human differences in distinguishing between GAI content and human content, which could have an impact on human interactions with AI and their use of the same (Chein et al., 2024). An experimental study conducted by Jack McGuire, David De Cremer and Tim Van de Cruys (2024) proved that it is important for humans to be a co-creator with AI and not function as an editor to AI-generated poetry to optimise the benefits of AI-generated creativity. The study employed two studies, where in the first study, respondents created poetry through AI and edited it by themselves and in the second study respondents co-created poetry with AI, proving that humans co-creating with AI and humans creating poetry by themselves involved high creativity indices, whereas editing techified poetry was less creative (McGuire et al, 2024). Another 2023 study by Michele Elam examines the limitations of generative AI, specifically GPT-3 or 4, in producing meaningful literary works, using a case study of a GPT-generated poem prompted by Maya Angelou's poem Still I rise. The method involves analysing GPT-3's output to highlight its predictive language generation and algorithmic ahistoricity, which prioritises form over meaning. Findings suggest that AI-generated poetry can render meaning senseless, hindering people's ability to navigate reality, not due to technological shortcomings but because of its optimisation-driven design. The coda explores AI as a creative interlocutor beyond mere optimisation. The study undertaken here concurs with the idea that form is prioritised, but differs by arguing that it is faithful to the original in terms of meaning and emotivity and what is problematic is the lack of innovation or "newness" due to the imitation model that AIs operate on over creativity. Studies of this nature underline the gap in how AI operates over human intelligence and imagination that can create "new" things from the old, as T.S. Eliot famously argues in "Traditional and Individual Talent" (1919). While AI is prone to hallucinations, its creative imagination our study argues is limited or non-existent. In another interesting article, Keith Holyoak, a Psychologist, traces a probable history of generative writing and poetry to the exquisite corpse game and found poetry movements. Examining existing poetry and AI-generated creativity, he argues that, as of now, GAI is purely imitative of traditions of poetry that already exist, and it is to be seen if it can do any better. (Holyoak, 2022). The gamut of papers on the topic follows a similar pattern of arguing for the importance of the human in the generation of creativity in content generated by AI.

Creativity has been a well-debated and philosophised idea over decades, even before the advent of Generative AI. What the study terms technocratic creativity, a creativity that emerges in the age of Generative AI, has been at the centre of plenty of studies in recent years (Schick, 2023; Somaya & Varshney, 2023; Tillander, 2011; Rafner et al., 2023). As quoted in Deepak Somaya and Lav R Varshney (2023), creativity is often defined as "the generation of a product or service that is novel and judged to be appropriate, useful, or valuable by a knowledgeable social group, and simultaneously generates a measure of surprise, beauty, or amazement" (p. 79). Though there is no singular definition of creativity, across ages from Plato, Kant and to

the present, it has been considered an inherent aspect of human nature and is often associated with genius. Features of creativity include being 'original', 'new', 'valuable' and involving 'unconscious thought' (Gaut, 2010; Paul, E. S and Stokes, D., 2023, Creativity). The question of value is often embedded in aspects of usefulness, effectiveness, and appropriateness to the task at hand (Paul, E. S. and Stokes, D., 2023, Creativity). The notion of unconscious thought can be expressed through Wordsworth's definition of poetry and creativity in his 1805 Preface to *The Lyrical Ballads* as "a spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings"... often "recollected in tranquillity".

With the advent of Generative AI and GANs, the definition of creativity has been reconsidered along with some interesting interventions and interjections into understanding creativity in the digital age and as operational in the media. This has led AI researchers to examine and engage with the field of computational creativity, which they hope will exceed human creativity. In Janet Rafner and et. al's terms, this has led to "human-AI co-creative systems" (2023, Creativity in the age of generative AI). In a moment of differentiation, Schick calls AI-generated / GPT-produced content "synthetic" over other "authentic" content (2023, p. 43). Rafner et al. point out that literature that argues for AI as creative refers to everyday contexts of creating recipes and music, while the discussions that deny the creative potential of AI point to the need for humans at some stage in the process (Rafner et al., 2023, Creativity in the age of generative AI). Examples of the first kind would be IBM's Chef Watson system, which can create recipes and Google's Magenta system, which 'creates' music (Somaya & Varshney, 2023, p. 79). Rafner et al. state that

the schism on whether AI can be creative may stem from a lack of clarity in communicating the complex concept of creativity through the lens of decades of scientific progress in understanding creativity. For instance, the 'four C' framework of creativity delineates a gradual increase from 'mini-c' (creativity for the individual), progressing to 'little-c' (everyday creativity) and on to 'pro-c' (expert-level creativity) and, lastly, 'big-C' (creative genius). (2023, Creativity in the age of generative AI)

And that algorithmic models often ignore the non-algorithmic and open-ended aspect of creativity that stems from "surprise" (Rafner et al., 2023, Creativity in the age of generative AI). This mirrors what aesthetes have defined as spontaneity in creativity. The contention of AI detractors in creativity has been that the AI cannot (as of now) be programmed to iterate or mimic human notions of beauty, truth or value, among other elements like intangible culture. Creativity is also often considered social and Generative AI, while it understands sociology is not 'social', unless you recognise its extended networked connectivity across the giant Internet as sociability. Almost all research done in this field comes to the more inclusive conclusion that human creativity and AI creativity will have to be synergised in the years to come, to develop organic and wholesome creative models that will synthesise the best of both worlds: the human and the AI, that Rafner et al., among others, call "co-creativity". (2023, Creativity in the age of generative AI). This study will employ the idea of creativity as social but at the same time non-imitative and purposive, factors which, as per the findings here, AI-generated poetry through ChatGPT and CoPilot does not fulfil.

2.3. Technological Utopias and the Postdigital Literary Media

Technological utopias or techno-utopias and technotopias are not new concepts. They have roots in age-old concepts dating back to the 14th century in Francis Bacon's New Atlantis and later 16th-18th-century French thought. We live in an 'epoch of space' and are interconnected through networks of simultaneity and diversification, which have intensified through digital technologies. Clemens Apprich, in his book Technotopia: A media genealogy of net cultures (2017), posits the term technotopia to counter the "technicistic reduction" of the Internet into "either a space of emancipation or manipulation, of freedom or control, (which) is deeply rooted in our cultural imagination, namely the assumption that (positive or negative) social change can be derived from technology" (Apprich, 2017, "Introducing technotopia"). He fashions the term technotopia, borrowing from Michel Foucault's heterotopia, to argue that technology should be considered neither utopian nor dystopian, but rather along Foucault's formulation of heterotopias as counter-sites, a "kind of effectively enacted utopia in which the real sites, all the other real sites that can be found within culture, are simultaneously represented, contested, and inverted" (qtd in Apprich, 2017, "Introducing technotopia") and uses the term technotopia to describe the digital space as such a "counter-

site, a technotopia which represents and infiltrates reality" (Apprich, 2017, "Introducing technotopia"). This study will examine AI-generated poems as located within technoutopian counter-sites, in that they refashion human-generated poems available in the technosphere - the World Wide Web, developing creations that mimic or imitate the existing genres and forms of poetry. GAIs like Copilot and ChatGPT act as "posthuman agents" (Torres-Martínez, 2025) whose imitative agency counters the nature of creativity that humanity avows in terms of newness of form, content and expression. The mimicry of the 'posthuman' GAI is not based on creative celebration but rather a mechanistic and technistic misappropriation in the name of creativity. This enables the construction of a counter-site to human creativity and self-expression. In most creative writing, an important feature that operates is the self-expression of the author. In the case of GAI as author self-expression becomes non-existent as the GAI does not provide any expression of its selfhood in the imitative poems it generates. So while it outputs poetry based on cues or keywords the human agent keys in, it functions as a generator and not a creator. Therefore, borrowing from Apprich, GAI generates a technoutopian creative universe that mirrors the creative universe of poetry and presents it to us as real, as is evidenced from studies mentioned above that AI-generated content and human-generated content are often indistinguishable from each other.

Taking their cue from Stephen Abblitt, Davies, L M et al adopt the term postdigital literary to indicate the tremendous shift in reading, textuality and pedagogy in the digital age (2020), signalling a post-literary age. This post-literary is defined by a 'postness' in multiple fronts, beginning with the posthuman AI-generated content, a post-creative model where AI stochastically creates literary creativity, and a postdigital literary literacy that is characterised by 'productive reading, distant reading and code-switching. This study also locates generative AI content like poetry, essays and short stories in this pattern of postdigital literary literacy and also recognises that all social media fits within this axis of digital textualities and medialities. This study attempts to understand the impact of technified and technocratic creativity funnelled through GAI. It attempts to analyse the impact of GAIs like ChatGPT and Bing CoPilot on human creativity; the implications of the coming-of-age of technocratic and technified creativity that has been made possible through generative AI; and what it spells for the human in this increasingly posthumanistic and transhumanistic world. The paper argues that, as society emerges into a post-literary digital media age that has created liminal technotopias (following Clement Apprich's formulation), which are neither completely dystopias nor utopias, it is essential to understand the nature of creative agency and creativity as spelt out by technistic creativity identified as poetry developed through GAI like ChatGPT and CoPilot, which creates no new paradigms but is conventional and traditional. This can be technodystopian too in that its authorship could potentially be counted within the realms of artistic plagiarism.

3. METHODOLOGY

The study analysed three diverse sets of poems:

- Set 1: Poems generated by ChatGPT and CoPilot based on Shakespeare's Sonnet 18
- Set 2: Poems generated by ChatGPT and CoPpilot through the keywords write a 21st-century poem on love and constancy
- Set 3: Poems generated by ChatGPT and CoPilot through the keywords Create a short poem on fatherhood

The study chose to examine poetry as poems would be short, which allows for analysis on the levels of rhyme, meter, theme, imagery, figures of speech and tone. Three sets of poems were generated and examined. Each set constitutes 2 poems, one each generated by ChatGPT and CoPilot. The cues or keywords love and constancy were chosen as they mirror the themes of the Shakespearean Sonnet 18, which in turn was chosen for its brevity of lines, richness of thematic content, rhyme scheme and specific form and meter. The researchers also examine a set of poems generated through the key phrase, write a 21st-century poem on love and constancy and finally a set of poems generated using the keyword fatherhood. This last set was to prompt the GAIs to create a poem of their own choice based on a concept rather than an emotion and quality like 'love' and 'constancy' to identify if the GAIs are able to generate a poem that is imitative and follows set and

established traditional styles of poetry or less conventional or modern poetry. In Set 1, CoPilot generated a poem titled "Isnpired by Shakespeare's Sonnet 18" and ChatGPT generated a poem titled "Shall I Compare Thee to the Morning Star?". In Set 4, CoPilot generated "Love in the Age of Algorithms" and ChatGPT synthesised "Still Here". In the final Set 4, both GAIs generated a poem titled "Fatherhood".

After the poems were generated, each poem by each GAI was examined through the aspects of rhyme, meter, theme, imagery, figurative language and tone. A comparison was made in the case of the first two sets of poems to Shakespeare's Sonnet 18 as well as between the two inorder to determine the levels of similarity or creativity in terms of originality in either of the two cases. Taking a point from the literature on creativity, this study has kept the definition of creativity very basic and chose as the guiding aspect to determine creativity in the case of the GAI-developed poems, originality. Originality, here, is used in terms of being able to generate or co-create a new idea from existing data available on the World Wide Web. This process only helped to subjectively determine whether there is creativity in poems generated through GAI, and immediately does not serve in the context of this study as a broader aspect. A comparison was also made between the other three sets of poems generated by the two GAI to once again examine the nature of difference and similarity between the sets of techno-generated poems. For the third set of poems, the poet GAI was asked to determine the influences that shaped the poet's style and theme, the rhyme scheme, the imagery, meter and figures of speech to determine the nature of GAI's creativity or generativity by understanding their own analysis, in a dystopically self-reflexive manner. The final set was poems generated by both GAIs on "Fatherhood".

The research has depended broadly on "objective" categories advocated by the 20th-century reading practice, "close reading", like examining the language of the texts produced by GAI through the elements of rhyme, meter, tone, theme, imagery, figures of speech and style to determine the nature of poetic creativity that's possible through GAI. Like all interpretations of poetry, such an intervention is subjective. However, the above aspects are set in order to determine the nature of the poetry GAI can develop. While, this is not an absolutely foolproof method, this is one way in which a certain evaluation rubric can be set, alongside the idea of originality mentioned above. The language of the text in this instance becomes the central object of analysis. The comparative analysis was made using Grok's X AI to develop the tables used in the study. This was done to keep human and subjective biases out and also to align the analysis through another pretrained model with respect to poems already generated through GAIs. However, the researchers examined each rationale generated by X AI through human reasoning and broadly concurred with X AI's interpretation as they almost closely fit the rationale that the researcher had. But Grok was also temperamental in its results. For the comparative analysis of Set 2, Grok added by itself a column on Comparison, which it did not do for Set 1for the same cue where the Comparison was inbuilt in the criteria for analysis under each poem. This gives us a good example of how the GAI continuously trains itself and evolves with each entry and analysis. The researchers used CoPilot, ChatGPT and Grok X Ai because these are the most commonly used GPTs over Claude, Perplexity AI, Jenni AI and others in everyday situations.

4. DISCUSSION

Set 1: Poems generated by ChatGPT and CoPilot based on Shakespeare's "Sonnet 18"

Table 1: Poems based on "Sonnet 18"

CoPilot	**ChatGPT**

Inspired by Shakespeare's Sonnet 18	**Shall I Compare Thee to the Morning Star?**
Shall I compare thee to a morning breeze, That stirs the jasmine where the sparrows nest? Thou art more constant than the change of seas, And calmer than the noonlight at its best. Rough winds may shake the songbirds from their trees, And monsoons dim the golden summer's eye; But in thy gaze no fleeting tempest flees, Nor wanes the warmth where hope and truth lie. Thy voice, a lute that tempers time's decay, Shall echo past the seasons' fleeting flight; For beauty etched in soul will never stray, Though even stars must yield to endless night. So long as words can breathe and hearts can see, This verse shall live—and give life back to thee. (Microsoft, August 1, 2025)	Shall I compare thee to the morning star? Thou art more constant, and more richly bright. Though dawn may fade as sun ascends afar, Thy glow endures beyond the reach of night. Rough winds may shake the roses from the bough, And summer's pride lies wilting in the field, Yet in thy grace, no time can wrinkle now, Nor steal the truth thy steady eyes reveal'd. No cloud may dim the music of thy voice, Nor age decay the sweetness of thy name; Each moment spent beside thee is my choice, Thy soul's warm light outlasts all worldly flame. So long as breath or memory shall stay, Thou shalt in hearts, not shadows, find thy day. (Open AI, August 1, 2025)

(Source: Microsoft, Copilot and Open AI, ChatGPT, 2025)

The above poems were compared to Sonnet 18 and to each other on the basis of the rubrics theme, content, rhyme scheme, meter, imagery, style, diction, tone and figure of speech. The table below (Table 2) does a comparison of the two poems:

Table 2: Comparison between the Poems

Criterion	**Inspired by Shakespeare's Sonnet 18**	**Shall I Compare Thee to the Morning Star?**
Theme	Immortalises the beauty of the beloved and her virtues in art - here poetry; emphasises the constancy of the lover over nature's transience; foci - hope, love and truth	Immortalises the grace and beauty of the lover through memory and poetry; emphasis is on the eternal radiance and foci - divine and radiant beauty.
Content	Beloved compared to the morning breeze and is contrasted with seas, monsoons and stars. The poem projects gaze, voice and soul and verse	Beloved is compared to the morning star contrasted with dawn, roses and also time. Projects grace, voice and soul and memory
Style	Lyrical, ornate, formal. Rich, pastoral imagery with philosophical reflections. Closely mirrors Shakespeare's rhetorical structure.	Lyrical, concise, formal. Elegant, celestial imagery with intimate devotion. Slightly less ornate, clearer focus.
Diction	Formal, archaic (thee, thou). Vivid, sensory words (jasmine, lute, tempest). Ornate, varied, evocative.	Formal, archaic (thee, thou). Clear, elegant words (glow, grace, flame). Simpler, less varied, emotionally direct.
Tone	Warm, reverent, contemplative. Serene confidence in poetry's power, meditative shift from descriptive to philosophical.	Reverent, intimate, resolute. Optimistic, defiant of time, consistently adoring with personal devotion.

Rhyme Scheme	Shakespearean sonnet: ABAB CDCD EFEF GG.	Shakespearean sonnet: ABAB CDCD EFEF GG.
Meter	Iambic pentameter, 10 syllables per line (unstressed-stressed). Minor variations for natural rhythm.	Iambic pentameter, 10 syllables per line (unstressed-stressed). Minor variations for natural rhythm.
Imagery	Natural (breeze, jasmine, monsoons), musical (lute), celestial (stars). Vivid, sensory (sight, sound, touch). Lush, varied.	Celestial (morning star, flame), natural (roses, fields), musical (voice). Visual, auditory focus. Ethereal, simpler.
Structure	Shakespearean sonnet: 3 quatrains, 1 couplet. Progresses from comparison (breeze) to contrast (tempests) to resolution (verse). Dynamic shifts.	Shakespearean sonnet: 3 quatrains, 1 couplet. Progresses from comparison (star) to contrast (time) to resolution (memory). Tighter, unified.

Source: xAI, August 1, 2025

A comparison was also made between the two poems on the levels of creativity, in terms of originality through originality in imagery, language, artistic reinterpretation, creative risk and overall originality.

Table 3: Comparison between the poems on Creativity

Aspect of Creativity	**Inspired by Shakespeare's Sonnet 18**	**Shall I Compare Thee to the Morning Star?**
Originality in Imagery	original with diverse, unconventional imagery: "morning breeze," "jasmine where the sparrows nest," "monsoons," "lute." Spans pastoral, tempestuous, and musical domains, creating a unique, immersive world. Less conventional than Shakespeare's summer's day.	Moderately original with a striking but more conventional metaphor: "morning star." Supporting imagery (roses, fields, flame) is simpler and traditional, rooted in familiar romantic motifs. Celestial focus is elegant but less varied.
Originality in Language	inventive diction with ornate phrases: "noonlight at its best," "fleeting tempest flees," "beauty etched in soul." Novel metaphors like "lute that tempers time's decay" blend music and temporality uniquely. Rich alliteration enhances originality.	Less inventive, with clear, elegant phrases: "richly bright," "steady eyes reveal'd," "soul's warm light." Relies on established poetic terms (glow, grace, flame). "Music of thy voice" is evocative but less unique than Poem 1's lute metaphor.
Reinterpretation of Sonnet 18	Expands Shakespeare's framework with a broader range of imagery (breeze to monsoons) and a focus on emotional constancy (hope, truth). Dynamic shift from external to inner virtues (gaze, soul) adds layered originality while staying true to the sonnet's theme.	Closely follows Shakespeare's template, substituting summer's day with morning star. Adds intimacy ("Each moment spent beside thee is my choice") but doesn't deviate significantly, resulting in a more traditional reinterpretation.

Creative Risk	Takes significant risks with a complex tapestry of imagery and varied metaphors, blending pastoral, musical, and celestial elements. Ambitious scope creates a lush, distinctive poem, though slightly elaborate for some readers.	Plays it safer with a single, powerful metaphor (morning star) and streamlined imagery. Restraint ensures clarity and resonance but limits adventurous exploration compared to Poem 1's broader palette.
Overall Originality	More original due to its unconventional, varied imagery, inventive language, and ambitious reinterpretation. Creates a distinctive poetic world with bold, dynamic choices.	Less original, relying on a conventional celestial metaphor and simpler, traditional imagery/language. Elegant and focused but less adventurous and innovative.

Source: xAI, August 1, 2025

Table 4: Comparison of the two poems and Sonnet 18

Rubric	**Inspired by Shakespeare's Sonnet 18**	**Shall I Compare Thee to the Morning Star?**	**Sonnet 18**
Creativity	Highly Creative: Uses original imagery (morning breeze, jasmine, lute) and inventive language ("noonlight at its best," "lute that tempers time's decay"). Diverse metaphors span pastoral, musical, and celestial realms, taking risks with a complex, immersive world. Ambitious reinterpretation of Sonnet 18 with fresh emotional focus (hope, truth).	Moderately Creative: Employs a striking but conventional metaphor (morning star) with simpler imagery (roses, flame). Elegant language ("richly bright," "soul's warm light") but less inventive. Intimate touch ("my choice") adds some originality, but safer, less adventurous than Poem 1.	Highly Creative (for its time): Pioneered the comparison of a beloved to a summer's day, with vivid imagery (darling buds, gold complexion) and iconic language ("eye of heaven"). Set the standard for love sonnets, blending natural and celestial metaphors with timeless innovation.
Theme	Immortalising the beloved's beauty and virtues (constancy, hope, truth) through poetry, contrasting their permanence with nature's transience (seas, monsoons, stars). Emphasises inner qualities (gaze, soul) over external beauty, echoing Shakespeare's idea of poetry's enduring power.	Immortalising the beloved's grace and radiance through poetry/memory, contrasting their endurance with nature's decay (dawn, roses, time). Focuses on celestial, divine beauty, with a personal, intimate defiance of time. Closely mirrors Sonnet 18's theme.	Immortalising the beloved's beauty through poetry, contrasting it with the impermanence of a summer's day (rough winds, dimmed complexion). Balances external beauty with poetry's ability to preserve it eternally, establishing a timeless meditation on love and art.

Structure	Shakespearean sonnet: 14 lines, three quatrains, one couplet (ABAB CDCD EFEF GG). Progresses from comparison (breeze) to contrast (tempests) to resolution (verse). Dynamic shifts in imagery create a broad, layered arc.	Shakespearean sonnet: 14 lines, three quatrains, one couplet (ABAB CDCD EFEF GG). Progresses from comparison (morning star) to contrast (time) to resolution (memory). Tighter, unified arc centered on a single metaphor.	Shakespearean sonnet: 14 lines, three quatrains, one couplet (ABAB CDCD EFEF GG). Progresses from comparison (summer's day) to flaws of nature (too hot, too short) to resolution (poetry's immortality). Clear, balanced arc that set the sonnet standard.

Source: xAI, August 1, 2025

From the comparison between the two poems and between the two poems and Sonnet 18, it is evident that while the GAIs are capable of creativity, it is only to a relative degree. The GAIs, as per the nature of their training, evolves a vocabulary, syntax, rhyme scheme, imagery, figurative language, tone, style, diction and structure which is imitative of established and traditional poetry available on the internet. The techno-generated poem mirrors, as is seen above, "Sonnet 18" without much divergence in its imagery, figures of speech, structure and theme. While in the distant past William Shakespeare and Edmund Spencer were able to innovate the established Petrarchan sonnets of the times and establish their own Spencerian and Shakespearean sonnets, CoPilot and ChatGPT are able only to aggregate and synthesise what is available to them in the internet repositories and replicate similar structures.

Set 2: 21st-century Poems on Love and Constancy Generated by ChatGPT and CoPpilot

Table 5: 21st-century Poems on Love and Constancy

CoPilot	**ChatGPT**
Love in the Age of Algorithms Our thumbs are always moving— left, right, typing hearts in pixel bursts— but mine stop when I see you flicker into my inbox like a soft signal of everything that doesn't glitch. We don't promise eternity in ink, but send read receipts as quiet vows. In calendars packed with meetings, your name becomes the pause, the breath between the buzz. This is not candlelight and parchment, but power outages and shared chargers, your voice on speaker while I stir the dal, the way we hold space even when Wi-Fi doesn't. Constancy, in this century,	**Still Here** We've seen Wi-Fi drop, phones die mid-call, Watched plans glitch out and seasons scroll— But through slow texts and faster lives, You're still the one who makes me whole. I've watched the world swipe left and run, Chase shiny things and newer thrills, But your quiet hand in mine still feels Like gravity—like time that stills. The apps may crash, the maps may lie, Our timelines fade into the blue, But every update in my heart Still boots up home, and that is you. The world rewrites itself each year— But you, my love, are still right here. (OpenAI, August 2, 2025)

is showing up— to the chaos, to the question marks, to the everyday narrative that never goes viral but always matters. And I'll keep showing up, not because I must, but because in a universe full of options, I choose your signal every single time. (Microsoft, August 2, 2025)	

Source: Microsoft, Copilot and OpenAI, ChatGPT, 2025

Table 6: Comparison between "Love in the Age of Algorithms" and "Still Here"

Criterion	**"Love in the Age of Algorithms"**	**"Still Here**	**Comparison**
Theme	Love as an active choice in a world of digital options and distractions.	Enduring love as a grounding force in a fast-paced, tech-driven world.	Both explore love's resilience in a digital age, but "Still Here" emphasizes permanence, while "Love" focuses on deliberate choice.
Content	Depicts love through tech-infused daily acts (e.g., read receipts, shared chargers). Love is sustained by small, intentional choices.	Reflects on love as a constant amid tech failures (e.g., Wi-Fi drops) and societal shifts (e.g., "swipe left"). Uses tech metaphors to frame love as "home."	Both use tech as a backdrop for love, but "Still Here" is reflective and timeless, while "Love" is action-oriented and present-focused.
Style	Free verse, conversational, narrative-like with a looser, stream-of-consciousness flow.	Lyrical, concise, conversational with a polished, poetic tone. Four quatrains.	Both are conversational and accessible, but "Still Here" is more structured, while "Love" is freer and more modern.
Diction	Mixes tech terms (e.g., "pixel bursts," "signal") with everyday language (e.g., "stir the dal") and abstract words (e.g., "constancy").	Blends tech jargon (e.g., "Wi-Fi drop," "boots up") with romantic terms (e.g., "gravity," "heart"). Poetic yet modern.	Both fuse tech and emotional diction, but "Still Here" leans poetic, while "Love" is grounded in mundane details.
Tone	Intimate, earnest, gently defiant. Celebrates love as a deliberate choice.	Tender, reflective, quietly confident. Conveys gratitude for love's endurance.	Both are warm and affectionate, but "Still Here" is serene, while "Love" is dynamic and resolute.

Rhyme Scheme	Free verse with no consistent rhyme scheme. Relies on rhythm and repetition.	Loose rhyme scheme (e.g., ABAB or AABB, "scroll"/"whole," "blue"/"you"). Subtle rhymes enhance lyricism.	Both are warm and affectionate, but "Still Here" is serene, while "Love" is dynamic and resolute.
Meter	Free verse with no consistent rhyme scheme. Relies on rhythm and repetition.	Loose rhyme scheme (e.g., ABAB or AABB, "scroll"/"whole," "blue"/"you"). Subtle rhymes enhance lyricism.	Both prioritize meaning over rhyme, but "Still Here" uses occasional rhymes for musicality, while "Love" avoids rhyme for modernity.
Imagery	Specific, snapshot-like (e.g., "typing hearts," "stir the dal"). Focuses on daily tech and routine moments..	Tech-centric (e.g., "apps may crash," "timelines fade") and tactile (e.g., "hand in mine"). Balances digital and grounding images	Both contrast digital and human imagery, but "Still Here" is broader and metaphorical, while "Love" is specific and relatable.
Structure	Free verse with varied line lengths and no fixed stanzas. Loose and modern.	Four quatrains with consistent stanza length. Structured and traditional.	Both are accessible, but "Still Here" is conventional and tight, while "Love" is flexible and experimental.

Source: xAI, August 2, 2025

Table 7: Comparison between the poems on Creativity

Aspect of Creativity	**"Love in the Age of Algorithms"**	**"Still Here"**	**Comparison**
Originality in Imagery	Specific, snapshot-like imagery of modern life (e.g., "typing hearts in pixel bursts," "your voice on speaker while I stir the dal"). Elevates mundane details like "shared chargers" into poetic symbols of intimacy, offering fresh, relatable visuals unique to the digital age.	Vivid, tech-centric imagery (e.g., "Wi-Fi drop," "timelines fade into the blue") juxtaposed with tactile, universal images (e.g., "quiet hand in mine," "gravity"). The image of "timelines fade into the blue" creatively captures social media's ephemerality, but the grounding imagery (e.g., "hand in mine") is familiar in love poetry.	Both poems use tech-inspired imagery creatively, but "Love" is more original with its specific, everyday snapshots (e.g., "stir the dal") that transform routine moments into poetic imagery, while "Still Here" relies on broader, slightly more conventional images (e.g., "gravity").
Originality in Language	Combines tech terms (e.g., "pixel bursts," "soft signal") with everyday language (e.g., "stir the dal") and abstract concepts (e.g., "constancy"). Phrases like	Blends tech jargon (e.g., "swipe left," "boots up") with romantic diction (e.g., "gravity," "time that stills"). The metaphor of a heart "booting up" is highly original, merging digital and	Both poems innovate by fusing tech and emotional language, but "Love" is more original with phrases like "read receipts as quiet vows," which uniquely reframe digital ephemera, while "Still

	"read receipts as quiet vows" are strikingly original, reimagining digital actions as emotional commitments.	emotional realms concisely. However, some phrases (e.g., "makes me whole") are common in love poetry.	Here"'s "boots up" is inventive but paired with some familiar romantic tropes.
Creative Risk	Takes greater risks with free verse, varied line lengths, and a focus on love as an active choice in a world of options. The lack of rhyme and meter, combined with elevating mundane acts (e.g., "shared chargers"), feels bold and experimental, aligning with the poem's modern theme	Takes moderate risks with loose rhymes (e.g., "scroll"/"whole") and tech metaphors in a structured quatrain form. The traditional structure and familiar theme of enduring love limit its boldness, as it stays within a lyrical, conventional framework.	"Love" is riskier with its free verse structure and focus on specific, understated moments, pushing against traditional poetic forms. "Still Here" is creative but safer, relying on a structured form and a more familiar theme of love's permanence.
Overall Originality	Highly creative in its concept of love as a deliberate choice, specific imagery (e.g., "stir the dal"), and inventive language (e.g., "read receipts as quiet vows"). The free verse form and focus on mundane acts as poetic subjects make it more daring and original.	Creative in its concise metaphors (e.g., "boots up," "gravity") and tech-romance blend, but the theme of enduring love and structured form are less adventurous. The imagery and language are striking but include some conventional elements.	"Love" is more creative overall due to its bold structure, unique imagery, and innovative language that reframe daily digital and routine moments. "Still Here" is creative but less risky, with a more traditional approach to theme and form.

Source: xAI, August 2, 2025

This set of examples helps us understand, similar to the earlier findings, that techno-poetry, in this instance, poetry created by technology and on technology, while original to a certain and relative degree, still relies on existing poetry both traditional and contemporary, to generate creative outputs mirroring them. The GAIs are able to clearly synthesise information and develop structured comparisons, seen in the comparison tables, it is unable to independently innovate fresh themes, styles, structures, imagery, figurative language and rhyme schemes.

Table 8: Comparison of both Poems on Influences on the Poet (Techno-poet)

Criterion	**"Love in the Age of Algorithms"**	**"Still Here"**	**Comparison**
Literary Movements	Likely influenced by Contemporary Free Verse Poetry, as seen in poets like Ocean Vuong or Ada Limón, who use conversational, image-driven styles to explore intimacy in everyday moments. The focus on digital interactions reflects Digital Poetry or Cyberpoetry, a modern movement incorporating technology's language and rhythms (e.g., works by poets like Stephanie Strickland). Postmodernism also shapes its playful use of tech terms (e.g., "read receipts") as emotional symbols.	Likely influenced by Romanticism for its emphasis on enduring love as a transcendent force (e.g., love as "gravity") and Confessional Poetry for its personal, introspective tone. The lyrical structure and occasional rhymes suggest inspiration from traditional lyric poetry, such as the works of Elizabeth Barrett Browning or Robert Frost, adapted to a modern context. The tech metaphors align with Postmodernism, which often blends high and low culture (e.g., tech jargon with romantic ideals).	Both poems are influenced by Postmodernism's blending of tech and emotion, but "Still Here" draws more from traditional Romantic and lyric poetry, while "Love" aligns with contemporary free verse and digital poetry, reflecting a more experimental, modern literary context.
Cultural Context	Deeply rooted in the Digital Age, particularly the culture of instant communication (e.g., texting, read receipts) and choice overload in online dating. The focus on mundane acts (e.g., "stir the dal") suggests influence from Multiculturalism, possibly South Asian or diaspora experiences, where daily rituals gain emotional weight. The poem's emphasis on agency reflects	Shaped by the Digital Age and its impact on relationships, where technology (e.g., Wi-Fi, social media) creates both connection and disruption. The theme of love enduring societal shifts suggests influence from Globalization and rapid cultural change, where traditional values (e.g., lasting love) are tested by modernity. The poem's universal tone may reflect a Western cultural emphasis on romantic individualism, akin to pop culture love narratives in films or songs.	Both are shaped by the Digital Age's impact on intimacy, but "Still Here" engages more with universal, Western romantic ideals, while "Love" incorporates multicultural details and modern values of agency, reflecting a broader, more diverse cultural lens.

	contemporary Feminist or Postmodern values, prioritizing choice over fate in relationships.		
Poetic Traditions	Rooted in the Free Verse tradition of 20th- and 21st-century poetry (e.g., Walt Whitman, Adrienne Rich), prioritizing natural speech rhythms over formal constraints. The snapshot-like imagery and conversational tone draw from Imagism (e.g., William Carlos Williams), emphasizing precise, everyday details. The tech-infused language aligns with experimental traditions in Spoken Word or Performance Poetry, which often engage contemporary issues.	Draws from the Lyric Poetry tradition, with its structured stanzas, loose rhymes, and focus on personal emotion, as seen in sonnets or odes (e.g., Shakespeare, Keats). The iambic meter echoes English poetic forms, updated with tech diction. The theme of timeless love suggests influence from Pastoral Poetry, where love transcends worldly chaos, reimagined in a digital landscape.	Both poems modernize poetic traditions, but "Still Here" leans on structured, lyric forms with pastoral undertones, while "Love" embraces free verse, Imagist precision, and experimental spoken word influences, reflecting a less conventional approach.
Social and technological Influences	Shaped by the ubiquity of smartphones and instant messaging, where digital acts (e.g., "read receipts") carry emotional weight. The focus on choice reflects the online dating culture (e.g., Tinder, Bumble) and its paradox of endless options. The poem's intimate, grounded details suggest influence from social media micro-narratives, where small moments gain significance (e.g., Instagram stories).	Influenced by the rise of social media (e.g., "swipe left," "timelines") and the anxiety of digital disconnection (e.g., "Wi-Fi drop"). The theme of love as a "home" may reflect a societal yearning for stability amid technological acceleration and consumer culture, where fleeting trends dominate (e.g., "chase shiny things"). Likely inspired by mainstream media's romantic narratives (e.g., rom-coms) that valorize enduring love.	Both reflect the Digital Age's social and technological shifts, but "Still Here" addresses broader anxieties about disconnection and transience, while "Love" engages specific digital practices (e.g., texting) and online dating culture, offering a more granular perspective.

Philosophical or Ideological Influences	Influenced by Postmodern Relativism, where love is a chosen narrative rather than a fated truth, reflecting agency in a world of options. The emphasis on small acts aligns with Phenomenology, valuing lived experience (e.g., Husserl, Merleau-Ponty). The defiant tone may draw from Feminist ideals of intentional relationships, rejecting passive romantic tropes. Contemporary Literary Influences **Ocean Vuong**: For his lyrical vulnerability and intersection of memory, identity, and digital traces. **Ada Limón**: For grounding poetry in the everyday—with metaphors pulled from groceries, errands, and small emotional gestures. **Tracy K. Smith**: For philosophical meditations on human connection against the backdrop of a cosmic and technological world. **Eavan Boland**: Possibly, for turning domestic moments into sites of emotional and political meaning.	Likely influenced by Existentialism or Romantic Idealism, framing love as a stabilizing force in a chaotic, tech-driven world. The poem's focus on permanence suggests a belief in universal human connections, possibly inspired by philosophical ideas of love as a counter to alienation (e.g., Plato's Symposium). The serene tone may reflect Stoicism, accepting change while valuing constancy. Contemporary Literary Influences **Warsan Shire** – For her lyrical, emotionally raw, and accessible poetry rooted in modern relationships. **Rupi Kaur** – For the brevity, modern themes, and visual simplicity. **Ocean Vuong** – For the blending of tech-era details with poetic sensitivity and longing. **Ada Limón** – For conversational tone and profound insight into daily emotional life. (As self-analysed by ChatGPT - OpenAI, August 1, 2025).	Both poems address love's role in a modern world, but "Still Here" leans on traditional, universalist philosophies of love's permanence, while "Love" embraces postmodern and feminist ideologies, emphasizing choice and lived moments.

	(As self-analysed by CoPilot - Microsoft, August 1, 2025))		

Source: xAI, August 2, 2025

The researchers had concluded that due to the allusions and style of the poems that the CoPilot generated, "Love in the Age of Algorithms" was more contemporary and experimentally postmodern, beginning from its title, the allusions, the metaphors and the nature of the writing style. Grok X AI's analysis aligned along the same lines, and it could meticulously point out the various themes, tones, rhymes, figures of speech, imagery and creative influences deployed by both GAIs in the poems and effectively make a comparison between both of them. It is also interesting that CoPilot and ChatGPT both claimed similar literary influences and stylistic influences in the composition of the poems.

Set 3: Poems on "Fatherhood"

Here are the poems generated by CoPilot and ChatGPT on "Fatherhood". No additional prompts were given to the pre-trained generators and they were allowed free rein in developing what they deemed appropriate.

Table 9: Poems on "Fatherhood"

"Fatherhood" by CoPilot	**"Fatherhood" by ChatGPT**
In quiet strength, he stands each day, A steady hand to guide the way. Not loud with words, but rich in grace, A shelter time cannot erase. He lifts with laughter, calms with care, A silent vow in every stare. Through sleepless nights and morning light, He shapes the world with love and might. Not just a name, but heart and soul— In fatherhood, he finds his role. (Microsoft, August 4, 2025)	A silent strength, a steady guide, With love that watches, arms spread wide. He builds the world with calloused hands, And dreams for us where hope still stands. He speaks in deeds, not always word, His quiet care, though rarely heard. A rock through storms, a gentle flame— In every heart, a father's name. (OpenAI, August 4, 2025)

Source: Microsoft, CoPilot and Open AI, ChatGPT, 2025

The above poems, as can be seen, are very conventional in their themes and treatment of "Fatherhood". There is no recognition of contemporary or modern day interventions. They present an eternal and immortal cliched idea of 'fatherhood' as recognised by both pre-trained generators. Without adequate prompts to specify such interventions, the GAIs simply go with probably the majority of poems accessible to them through the World Wide Web, resulting in this hash of sentiment and morality without much of a realistic touch to the sentimental rendition. Below is an analysis of the poems through Grok's xAI, which underlines these findings.

Table 10: Comparison of the Poems on "Fatherhood"

Criterion	**"Fatherhood" by CoPilot**	**"Fatherhood" by ChatGPT**
Tone	Warm, reverent, lyrical, emotive. Emphasizes grace and tenderness alongside strength.	Warm, reverent, understated, stoic. Conveys quiet admiration for a father's strength.
Effect	Expansive, emotionally immersive, creates a detailed portrait of a father's presence.	Concise, poignant, evokes quiet awe with a focused image of a steadfast protector.
Theme	Fatherhood as strength, grace, and emotional depth; a fulfilling, multifaceted role.	Fatherhood as quiet, enduring strength and unspoken love; a selfless, foundational role.
Content	Describes father's daily presence, emotional support (e.g., "lifts with laughter"), and personal fulfillment.	Focuses on father's role as guide and protector with symbolic actions (e.g., "calloused hands").
Figures of Speech	Metaphor ("steady hand," "shelter"), alliteration ("quiet strength"), personification ("time cannot erase").	Metaphor ("silent strength," "rock through storms"), alliteration ("silent strength").
Imagery	Varied, dynamic: tactile ("steady hand"), auditory ("laughter"), temporal ("sleepless nights").	Vivid, concise: tactile ("calloused hands"), visual ("arms spread wide"), symbolic ("rock").
Rhyme Scheme	AABB (couplet rhyme: "day/way," "grace/erase," etc.).	AABB (couplet rhyme: "guide/wide," "hands/stands," etc.).
Meter	Predominantly iambic tetrameter (e.g., "In QUI-et STRENGTH, he STANDS each DAY").	Iambic tetrameter (e.g., "A SI-lent STRENGTH, a STEAD-y GUIDE").

Source: xAI, August 4, 2025)

Table 11: Comparison of Creativity in the Poems on "Fatherhood"

Aspect of Creativity	**"Fatherhood" by CoPilot**	**"Fatherhood" by ChatGPT**
Originality in Imagery	Highly Original: Incorporates a broader range of imagery, blending tactile ("steady hand"), auditory ("lifts with laughter"), and temporal ("sleepless nights and morning light") elements. The combination of everyday moments (e.g., laughter) with abstract concepts (e.g.,	Moderately Original: Uses vivid but familiar imagery like "calloused hands," "rock through storms," and "gentle flame." These are evocative but conventional symbols of strength and nurturing, rooted in traditional depictions of fatherhood. The imagery is

	"shelter time cannot erase") creates a more distinctive and layered visual landscape.	concise and effective but relies on archetypal metaphors, limiting its uniqueness.
Originality in Language	Highly Original: Uses more varied and emotive language, such as "rich in grace," "silent vow in every stare," and "heart and soul." These phrases blend emotional depth with subtle lyricism, offering a fresh take on fatherhood. The personification of time ("cannot erase") and the emphasis on "laughter" introduce less conventional word choices for the theme.	Moderately Original: Employs concise, direct language with phrases like "silent strength" and "speaks in deeds." The language is clear and resonant but draws on familiar descriptors of stoic masculinity, which are effective yet not particularly innovative. Alliteration ("silent strength," "steady guide") adds polish but is a common poetic device.
Creative Risk	Low Risk: The poem takes a safe approach, using a compact structure (four lines) and traditional imagery to convey a universally relatable portrait of fatherhood. It avoids experimental forms or unconventional perspectives, prioritizing accessibility over bold innovation. The risk lies in its brevity, which could limit emotional depth, but it succeeds in its focused intent.	Moderate Risk: The poem takes greater risks by expanding its scope to include emotional and daily aspects of fatherhood (e.g., "sleepless nights," "lifts with laughter"). Its longer structure (ten lines) and inclusion of personification ("time cannot erase") push beyond typical fatherhood tropes. However, it remains within a conventional rhyme and meter, tempering its risk with accessibility.

Source: xAI, August 4, 2025

From the above comparisons, done by xAI, it is evident that pretrained mechanisms will produce output in tandem with the majority of the material available to them in the World Wide Web, conforming to the dominant logic of homogeneity, heteronormativity and conventionality, which closely mirrors and mimics the content available online creating algorithmic products that align with what is already there. This indicates that all GPTs are good in aggregating information, some better than others, like in this example CoPilot produced more contemporary and relatable poems, while ChatGPT was more creating bad imitations of poems already available while trying to be original. Grok's xAI was very good in providing a relatively good comparaison of the poems they generated. What was also evident was that if humans were to imitate and create poems, it would take a lot more time and effort than the seconds the GAIs took. In circumstances where only faithfulness to the original models are important, using GAI will be greatly effective and timesaving. However, in situations where creativity and originality is important and desirable, the human midn is more efficient and potent in this creative process, rather than the generated process GAIs indulge in.

Both generators recognise two to four stanzas as standard for poetry; they follow the conventions of poetry in terms of verse writing and an abundant use of figurative language like comparisons: similes, metaphors, and symbols. For example, comparing father's love to a "beacon shining bright" is a recurring motif in both poems generated by the two GAI. The gist of both the poems, in the case of the poems on "fatherhood" is similar, praising the dad as priceless and a beacon of light, among others. There is nothing surprising in all the poems generated by the generators. The perspectives are no different from existing ones and they do not forge new or alternative perspectives for the readers other than the clichéd and typical. Each poem is full of emotive elements, and there is a generous use of positive reinforcements especially again in teh case of the poem based on an idea, like "fatherhood" such as "quiet strength, "a steady hand that guides".

What is apparent is that both GAIs are unable to synthesise and replicate subtler and more nuanced human emotions like irony or satire. They reproduce a stereotypical emotional response towards both qualities and concepts. They are not creative or original but imitative and replicable and therefore, replaceable unlike human creativity

5. RESULTS

5.1 Creativity in Post-Literary Content Generated through AI

Janet Rafner, Roger E. Beaty, James C. Kaufman, Todd Lubart and Jacob Sherson, in their comment "Creativity in the age of generative AI", talk about AI-generated work that can surpass human creativity (2023). This could happen soon in a fast-changing digital age. As the above examples show, both AI-generated works were repetitive in content and theme. While AI-generated works lack creativity regarding newness or originality, they do well in formalist elements of tropes and structures. However, AI-assisted productivity lacks diversity in that they iterate and mimic structures too blindly and produce similar structures, metaphors and symbols. They lack interactivity regarding cultural or individual sensitivity when it comes to identifying features of creativity. The poems generated by the Generative AI lack value as they do not contribute anything significant to the discipline or craft of literature. Therefore, it is evident that these AI tools lack critical thinking and individual responsiveness. In their repetitive, common, and often clichéd content, they fail to generate value in that their usefulness is severely limited in most cases; their responses were basic and, therefore, lacked "effectiveness and appropriateness", which are aspects of creativity suggested by Paul and Stokes in Creativity (2023). According to Nicholas Carr,

The Net's interactivity gives us powerful new tools for finding information, expressing ourselves, and conversing with others. It also turns us into lab rats constantly pressing levers to get tiny pellets of social or intellectual nourishment. ... What you see is a mind consumed with a medium. (2010-11, p. 10)

Carr finds the advent of the Internet fundamentally rewiring operations of the human brain and how it navigates reality. This leads, as he sees it, to a shift to "working memory" from "long-term memory" and "a scattering of our attention". Deciphering hypertexts leads to a heavier cognitive load, affecting our retention and comprehension skills (2010, pp. 10-12). While these spell doom for humanity, they have also improved human motor and visual-spatial skills, culling out information in seconds using generative AI models like AI Reviewer and other GPTs. However, the nature of summarising and paraphrasing could be problematic because it could give us information we do not want over what we want. Carr, quoting Patricia M Greenfield (2009) in Technology and informal education: What is taught, what is learned (2009) states that this realigned visual-spatial intelligence weakens our capabilities for "deep processing" that supports and strengthens "mindful knowledge acquisition, inductive analysis, critical thinking, imagination, and reflection" (2010, pp. 13). This indicates that the way forward could be a human-AI-co-creation nexus, where the human touch will be required to synthesise ideas, bring in fresh perspectives based on lived experiences and possibilities of the situations, and technology could be used to provide us with all the information that is needed. The human brain can reorganise itself to develop its critical thinking and creative and cognitive skills, which are facing the dire possibility of extinction guided by the techno-capitalist instrumentality of AI-generated content.

6. CONCLUSION

Studying the various narratives that emerged from the two Generative AIs, it is evident that creativity in terms of an abounding genius, which is "esemplastic" in Coleridgian terms, is absent in the Generative AI. It responds in a set and robotic (which it is, in a manner of speaking) fashion using preprogrammed data (ChatGPT) or dynamic information available on the web (CoPilot). But we do not see creative synthesis. A human's dependence on these systems may serve an instinctual and immediate gratification but will not fulfil basic creative or critical engagements. Overt reliance on these mechanisms will inhibit critical and reflective thinking, which fosters creativity and an in-depth understanding of life or knowledge. Dependence on Generative AI to develop research and foster creativity will be almost impossible as they stand currently.

However, it can be used to collate information from various sources quickly and effectively. While fostering research skills like keyword searches and knowing where and how to garner information, it will severely restrict critical, reflective, interpretive and creative thinking. The "postness" of the human, though invoked in this Generative AI-led technotopia, still provides us with much hope for the human and human agency in the foreseeable future. What is required is a re-engagement and relearning of the age-old and often-termed "primitive" skills to bring back and reinvoke and reinstate the human in the postanthropocentric and posthuman world.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors acknowledge the use of ChatGPT and CoPilot generated poems for the purpose of the study as primary texts and Grok xAI's analysis as secondary material in the study in the form of comparison tables. The basic arguments for this paper was presented at an International Seminar on *Posthumanism: Towards a U/(Dy)stopia?* on 14 and 15 November 2023 at the University of Calicut, Calicut, India, in a paper titled 'Generative AI and the postanthropocentric': A posthumanist reading of creativity in technotopias'.

Author Contributions:

Both authors contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation, data collection and analysis were performed by [Renu Elizabeth Abraham]; Dattatreya M performed analysis. The first draft of the manuscript was written by [Renu Elizabeth Abraham] and edited by Dattatreya M and commented on previous versions of the manuscript. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Apprich, Clemens. (2017). "Introducing technotopia". In A. Derieg (trans.), Technotopia: A media genealogy of net cultures, Rowman and Littlefield.
2. Böhme, Gernot. (2012). "Introduction: Invasive technification". In *Invasive technification: Critical essays in the philosophy of technology*. Bloomsbury Academic.
3. Carr, Nicholas. (2010, Dec. -2011, Jan.) "The juggler's brain". *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(4), 8-14. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2792247
4. Chein, J.M., Martinez, S.A. & Barone, A.R. (2024). Human intelligence can safeguard against artificial intelligence: individual differences in the discernment of human from AI texts. Sci Rep 14, 25989. Accessed July 31, 2025. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-76218-y
5. Elam, Michelle. (2023)."Poetry Will Not Optimize; or, What Is Literature to AI?" *American Literature*. 95 (2): 281–303. Accessed July 30, 2025. https://doi.org/10.1215/00029831-10575077
6. Gaut, B., 2010. The philosophy of creativity. Philosophy Compass, [e-journal] 5(12), pp. 1034–1046. Accessed on Nov. 22, 2024. doi. 10.1111/j.1747-9991.2010.0035.x
7. Grok (xAI). (2025). Comparison table: Influences shaping style and themes in "Still Here" vs. "Love in the Age of Algorithms" [Artifact ID: c4615ff5-0612-4aa0-bb28-bae59566b592; Artifact Version ID: a365608b-f0ad-4f7c-8a1a-d112e99268a3]. xAI. https://x.ai/artifacts/c4615ff5-0612-4aa0-bb28-bae59566b592
8. Grok Grok (xAI). (2025). Comparison table: Creativity in "Still Here" vs. "Love in the Age of Algorithms" [Artifact ID: a8472b1c-e1b6-42a2-9d20-2737b7f07397; Artifact Version ID: 18bc84e4-75f3-47e7-810b-b4e2e28907a6]. xAI. https://x.ai/artifacts/a8472b1c-e1b6-42a2-9d20-2737b7f07397
9. Grok (xAI). (2025). Poem comparison chart: Sonnet 18, Poem 1, and Poem 2 [Markdown table, Artifact ID: 6a7c942f-ec2e-42e3-9e24-31d1ce02735f]. Grok 3 response artifact. https://grok.x.ai/artifacts/6a7c942f-ec2e-42e3-9e24-31d1ce02735f
10. Grok (xAI). (2025). Poem comparison table: Poem 1 and Poem 2 [Markdown table, Artifact ID: 8b1de10d-6435-4b18-9e2d-e4f7c08f4694]. Grok 3 response artifact. https://grok.x.ai/artifacts/8b1de10d-6435-4b18-9e2d-e4f7c08f4694.
11. Grok (xAI). (2025). Creativity comparison table: Poem 1 and Poem 2 [Markdown table, Artifact ID: f2049751-de88-42a6-a1a6-483d084ff707]. Grok 3 response artifact. https://grok.x.ai/artifacts/f2049751-de88-42a6-a1a6-483d084ff707
12. Grok (xAI). (2025). Comparison table: "Still Here" vs. "Love in the Age of Algorithms" [Artifact ID: ce6b5376-8d42-4df6-8101-74315755d3f7; Artifact Version ID: 01da207c-e7b8-4c95-b466-a9c0a5a33a29]. xAI. https://x.ai/artifacts/ce6b5376-8d42-4df6-8101-74315755d3f7
13. McGuire, J., De Cremer, D. & Van de Cruys, T. (2024). Establishing the importance of co-creation and self-efficacy in creative collaboration with artificial intelligence. Sci Rep 14, 18525. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-69423-2

14. Mei, Pedong, et al. (April 19, 2025). "If ChatGPT Can Do It, Where Is My Creativity? Generative AI Boosts Performance but Diminishes Experience in Creative Writing." *Computers in Human Behaviour: Artificial Humans*, vol. 4, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbah.2025.100140
15. Microsoft. (August 1, 2025). "Inspired by Shakespeare's Sonnet 18". Poem generated by Microoft CoPilot. [Large language model]. https://copilot.microsoft.com/.
16. Microsoft. (August 2, 2025). "Love in the Age of Algorithms". Poem generated by Microsoft CoPilot. [Large language model]. https://copilot.microsoft.com/.
17. Microsoft. (August 4, 2025). "Fatherhood". Poem generated by Microsoft CoPilot. [Large language model]. https://copilot.microsoft.com/.
18. Hayles, N. Katherine. (2004). "Refiguring the posthuman." *Comparative literature studies*, 41(3), pp. 311–16. Accessed 21 December 2024. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40247415
19. _____. (2010). "How we became posthuman: Ten years on an interview with N. Katherine Hayles." *Paragraph*, 33(3), 318–30. Accessed December 21, 2025. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43151854.
20. Holyoak, Keith. (December 7, 2022). "Can AI Write Authentic Poetry?" The MIT Press Reader. Accessed 29 July, 2025. https://thereader.mitpress.mit.edu/can-ai-write-authentic-poetry/
21. Köbis, N., & Mossink, L. D. (2021). Artificial intelligence versus Maya Angelou: Experimental evidence that people cannot differentiate AI-generated from human-written poetry. Computers in Human Behavior, 114, Article 106553. Accessed December 17, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106553
22. OpenAI. (August 1, 2025). *Shall I compare thee to the morning star?* Poem generated by ChatGPT 4. [Large language model]. https://chat.openai.com/.
23. OpenAI. (August 2, 2025). "Still Here". Poem generated by ChatGPT 4. [Large language model]. https://chat.openai.com/.
24. OpenAI. (August 4, 2025). "Fatherhood". Poem generated by ChatGPT 4. [Large language model]. https://chat.openai.com/.
25. Paul, E. S.and Stokes, D. (2023). Creativity. The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy. Edward N. Zalta & Uri Nodelman (eds.). Available through: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2023/entries/creativity/. Accessed on 28 Dec. 2024.
26. Porter, B., Machery, & E. (2024). AI-generated poetry is indistinguishable from human-written poetry and is rated more favorably. Scientific Reports 14, 26133. Accessed on November 30, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-76900-1.
27. Rafner, J., Beaty, R.E., Kaufman, J.C. et al. (2023). Creativity in the age of generative AI. Nature human behaviour, [online] 7, pp. 1836–1838. Accessed on Dec 4, 2024. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-023-01751-1.
28. Remshardt, Ralf. (2010). "Posthumanism." In S Bay-cheng et al., (Eds.), *Mapping Intermediality in Performance* (pp. 135–39). Amsterdam University Press. Accessed on Dec 15, 2024. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt46mwjd.24
29. Schick, N. (2023). Faking it: Navigating the new era of generative AI may be the most critical challenge to democracy yet. *RSA Journal*, *169*(2(5593)), 40–43. Accessed on Dec 20, 2024. https://www.thersa.org/rsa-journal/faking-it/
30. Swallow, R C., & Chalé, M. (2023). Harnessing the momentum of generative AI. *Phalanx*, *56*(2), 52–54. Accessed on Dec. 17, 2024. https://www.jstor.org/stable/27227084
31. Tillander, M., 2011. Creativity, technology, art, and pedagogical practices. Art education, [online] 64(1), pp. 40–46. Accessed on 7 Dec 2024. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23033951
32. Torres-Martínez, S. (2025). Dehumanizing the human, humanizing the machine: organic consciousness as a hallmark of the persistence of the human against the backdrop of artificial intelligence. AI & Society. Accessed on July 26, 2025. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-024-02165-x
33. Somaya, D., and Varshney, L. R., 2020. Ownership Dilemmas in an age of creative machines. Issues in science and technology, 36(2), pp. 79–85. Accessed on 7 Dec 2024. Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/26949112
34. White, Matt. (Jan. 8, 2023). "A Brief History of Generative AI". Medium. Accessed Nov. 20, 2024. https://matthewdwhite.medium.com/a-brief-history-of-generative-ai-cb1837e67106

Author Details

Author 1 and Corresponding Author
Ms Renu Elizabeth Abraham,

Renu Elizabeth Abraham is an Assistant Professor of English and Head of the Department of English and Cultural Studies, CHRIST (Deemed to be University), Bannerghatta Road Campus, Bengaluru, India. Her academic interests lie in Children's Literatures in India, Digital Humanities, Fandom, and Popular Culture Studies in India. She has published a monograph titled "Children's Edutainment Magazines in English in India: An Overview" and research articles on fan writing as agential based on fan engagements on Hindi television serials. Her research engages with questions of piracy, ethics and knowledge concerning streamed television content.

Author 2
Dr Dattatreya M,

Dr. Dattatreya. M is an Associate Professor in the Department of P.G Studies and Research in English, Kuvempu University. He has been a permanent faculty in the department since 15-05-1998, teaching various courses in English literature, Cultural Theory, Subaltern Literature, Indian Literature, etc. He specializes in modernity and modernism with special reference to 19 th and 20th-century literature on which he has a doctoral degree. He has been part of various academic bodies of Kuvempu University and other Universities in Karnataka, wherein he has contributed to multiple academic endeavours, including curriculum designs and innovation in evaluation systems.