ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25dec1283

Thinking With or Thinking Through Machines? Artificial Intelligence and the Transformation of Creative Cognition in English Literature

Md. Mazed Ali[1]; Dr. Shabina Khan[2]

[1]PhD Scholar, Department of English Literature, Rabindranath Tagore University (RNTU), Bhopal (M.P)

[2]Associate Professor, Department of English Literature, Rabindranath Tagore University (RNTU), Bhopal (M.P)

Publication Date: 2026/01/07

Abstract: The rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence into contemporary writing practices raises important scholarly debates about creativity, authorship, and originality within the discipline of English literary studies. While much of the growing literature focuses on the ethical legitimacy or aesthetic quality of AI-generated texts, relatively less attention is given to how AI reconfigures the creative thinking processes of human writers. This article fills this gap by taking Artificial Intelligence as a cognitive presence that intervenes in literary imagination, decision-making, and reflective judgment.

Merging insights from literary theory, cognitive creativity studies, and posthuman thought, this research argues that the most profound effect of AI is not to be found at the level of text production but in changing creative cognition as such. The study covered the literature review extensively to identify the enabling and constraining effects of AI-assisted writing. While AI acts, on the one hand, as a facilitator of associative and exploratory thinking, helping authors to overcome creative inertia and expand conceptual permutations, on the other hand, continued dependency on algorithmic suggestion threatens cognitive displacement, which undercuts creative struggle, imaginative risk, and tolerance for uncertainty.

For theorizing these divergent outcomes, the study develops a synthetic framework distinguishing between thinking with machines and thinking through machines. Thinking with machines requires reflective, dialogic engagement-which sustains authorial agency-whereas thinking through machines involves cognitive delegation that can attenuate creative autonomy. The present analysis locates these concerns within Indian English literary contexts, where multilingual consciousness and postcolonial negotiations of voice heighten the risks of linguistic standardization.

The study thus concludes that artificial intelligence neither negates nor guarantees creativity; it reconfigures the conditions under which literary thinking unfolds. Creative cognition is thus safeguarded only through conscious negotiation, critical literacy, and resistance to unreflective automation within this practice.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence; Creative Cognition; English Literature; Authorship; Indian English Writing; Posthuman Creativity.*

How to Cite: Md. Mazed Ali; Dr. Shabina Khan (2025) Thinking With or Thinking Through Machines? Artificial Intelligence and the Transformation of Creative Cognition in English Literature. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 10(12), 2469-2479. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25dec1283

I. INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, the creation of literary works has been tied to the tools available to writers. From the quill pen and printing press to the typewriter and word processor, these technologies have framed not only the habits of writing but also the generation, transformation, and conservation of ideas. For the first time, artificial intelligence represents a major breaking point because AI is no longer simply a tool to assist in writing: through its suggestion of lexical items, structuring of sentences, and predicting meaning, AI systems themselves become active co-authors of text. This intervention forces a reevaluation of what thinking creatively means within English literary practice.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25dec1283

As such, in current writing environments, there is an ever-growing engagement with AI in domains reserved for solitude, hesitation, and internal dialogue. Writers consult algorithms for the direction of their narrative, for stylistic refinement, and for thematic coherence. While such engagement speaks of efficiency and expansion, it does also raise several challenging questions about cognitive autonomy, originality, and the nature of literary imagination. The question is not just whether AI can write, but how writers reason while writing alongside machines.

English literature, through its long-standing emphasis on voice, subjectivity, and cultural expression, provides a fertile ground particularly for the examination of this shift. The tradition has consistently valorised creative struggle as central to meaning-making: from Romantic introspection via modernist fragmentation to postcolonial reworking, tension, ambivalence, and resistance have all shaped literary creativity. AI profoundly disturbs this paradigm by proposing fluency without struggle, coherence without lived experience.

The paper argues that the critical difference is between those writers who think with machines and those who think through them. The former retain reflective control, using AI as stimulus to thought, while the latter threaten cognitive displacement in their authorial imagination by allowing algorithmic processes to replace imaginative labor. By foregrounding creative cognition rather than textual output, this study hopes to contribute to a more differentiated understanding of AI's role in English literary creativity.

➢ *Background Context*

The creativity of English literature has hitherto been theorized as a cognitive-affective practice constitutive of human experience, memory, and cultural imagination. Few works of literary art are created in a moment; they are instead produced through prolonged negotiation with indeterminacy, redrafting, and reflective effort. Via romantic, modernist, and postmodern critical traditions, respectively, the act of writing has long been associated with an inner speech, tentativeness, and the gradual crystallization of meaning. Even at moments when authorship has been theoretically dispersed, the human mind has remained the origin point for literary thought.

The evolution of Artificial Intelligence offers a significant break with previous writing technologies. Unlike tools that merely assist inscription or editing, AI systems intervene at the level of ideation, providing syntactically complete phrases, narrative continuities, and stylistic alternatives. These systems do not think or intend meaning; they operate through probabilistic modeling of language patterns drawn from existing textual corpora [1]. For the writer, however, their outputs enter the creative space as ready-made linguistic possibilities, thereby altering the cognitive conditions of writing and shifting exertion away from language generation toward evaluation, acceptance, or rejection of suggestions.

This raises crucial questions for English literary practice, where creative thinking has traditionally relied on silence, delay, and the discomfort of not knowing. Psychological research suggests that too great a reliance upon external cognitive prosthetics may, over time, weaken internal processes of recall and problem-solving [2]. In the context of literary creativity, this would imply that AI will subtly reshape how writers imagine, plan, and sustain original thought. Conversely, theories of extended cognition suggest tools can become integrally part of thinking itself, with the potential to enhance rather than diminish creative capacity [3]. These tensions are further heightened within Indian English literary contexts. Much Indian English writing bears traces of multilingual influence, regionally inflected syntax, and postcolonial negotiation of voice. AI tools, largely trained on dominant global English datasets, may foster linguistic standardization that would impact not only stylistic choices but also habitual modes of thinking in English. Simultaneously, AI affords access to a diverse range of forms and revision strategies that create an expanding landscape where cognitive expansion and cultural flattening coexist. It is in this evolving context that the present study situates its inquiry.

➢ *Problem Statement*

The rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence into writing practices has generated significant debate within literary, technological, and ethical discourse. A lot of this discussion, however, continues to be mired within a superficial examination of issues such as authorship, plagiarism, and the legitimacy of AI-generated texts. These concerns are important, but hardly touch a more basic consideration: how does AI impact the cognitive processes of writers working at the task of literary creation? The tendency to evaluate creative work through final textual output risks overlooking the cognitive labor that precedes and forms literary expression.

Creative thinking, as it has traditionally been understood in the history of English literature, has been tied to mental struggle, uncertainty, and sustained imaginative engagement. It is through silence, hesitation, revision, and emotional investment that writers develop ideas, so through processes that resist straightforward measurement via efficiency or productivity. In contrast, AI systems return instantaneous linguistic coherence, or scripted suggestions, perhaps thereby bypassing these formative stages. As scholars of creativity have long remarked, originality often arrives not from fluency but from resistance, delay, and conceptual difficulty [2]. Where such difficulty is resolved externally, creative cognition itself may be altered in character.

Hence, the central problem is not whether AI can assist writing, but whether this prolonged reliance on AI threatens to displace essential cognitive functions that underpin literary creation. Research in cognitive psychology has shown that an over-reliance on memory aids from the outside can lead to diminished internal capabilities for remembering important details, solving problems, and concentrating for long stretches [4]. Translated into literary

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25dec1283

contexts, there is thus the risk that the writer increasingly shifts from imaginative generation to curatorial selection, leaning upon algorithmic suggestions rather than fashioning independent creative trajectories.

At the same time, it would be diminishing to dismiss AI outright as injurious. Theories of extended cognition suggest that tools can become integral to thinking itself, enhancing intellectual capacity when used reflectively [3]. The dearth of consensus in these perspectives demonstrates a crucial lacuna: there is a lack of literary-cognitive analysis into how writers negotiate AI's presence during the act of composition. This paper fills this gap by reframing the debate around a central tension: whether writers are increasingly thinking with machines as dialogic partners or, rather, thinking through machines in ways that risk cognitive substitution. It is this distinction that needs clarification if we are to understand the future of creative thinking in English literature.

➢ *Research Objectives*

This research, for that matter, seeks to explore how Artificial Intelligence reshapes creative cognition in the frame of English literary writing, focusing explicitly on the mental activities that precede and inform textual production. Rather than evaluating AI-generated texts as self-standing artefacts, the analysis brings into focus the writer's thinking experience, probing the ways in which imagination, originality, and reflective judgment are altered in AI-assisted contexts. More precisely, this research sets out to examine the dual role of AI, serving at the same time as a cognitive aid and as a potential source of dependency. On one hand, AI tools can catalyze an act of associative thinking, surmount creative inertia, and allow writers access to stylistic or narratorial alternatives [1]. On the other hand, sustained reliance upon algorithmic suggestion risks diminishing the writer's capacity for independent ideation, extended concentration, and creative risk-taking [2]. In engaging with both perspectives, the study resists a deterministic reading of technology as wholly emancipatory or inherently debilitating.

A further objective is to place contemporary AI-assisted writing within the ambit of broader theoretical discussions relating to cognition and authorship. Drawing on theories of extended and distributed cognition, the paper explores whether AI can be conceived as an external cognitive scaffold that augments reflective thinking, or indeed acts as a surrogate that replaces vital imaginative work [3]. This question has special resonance in the field of English literary studies, which has conventionally located creativity within the scope of intentionality, voice, and subjective experience. Ultimately, the research attempts to contribute to the emergent Indian scholarship of discussions on AI and literature by reflecting on how AI intersects with the practices of Indian English writing, linguistic diversity, and the negotiations of voice concerning postcolonialism. With this multilayered approach, the research attempts to provide a balanced view and one that is critically grounded regarding AI's impact on creative thinking in English literature.

➢ *Research Questions*

This research investigates questions of creative thinking apart from the act of mere writing. The central question of the study is how the integration of Artificial Intelligence into writing influences the cognitive process of a writer in the creation of a work of English literature. In this study, AI is not viewed as a neutral tool but assessed for its effect on imagination, decision-making, and reflective judgment in the processes of writing. Building on this, the study asks in what ways AI may enhance creative thinking by enabling associative exploration, stylistic experimentation, and conceptual flexibility [1]. At the same time, it investigates whether sustained reliance on AI introduces risks of cognitive displacement, including reduced tolerance for uncertainty, diminished creative struggle, and a shift from generative thinking to curatorial selection [2].

A further question concerns authorship and agency: does AI function as a dialogic partner that writers think with, or does it increasingly become a conduit through which writers think through machines? This distinction is examined through the lens of extended cognition theory [3], with particular attention to literary contexts.

Finally, the study asks how these cognitive transformations intersect with Indian English literary practice, especially in relation to linguistic specificity, cultural voice, and postcolonial self-positioning in AI-mediated writing environments.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

➢ *Creativity, Cognition, and Literary Thought*

Creativity has held a simultaneously privileged and fraught place within literary theory, moving back and forth between notions of individual genius, cultural production, and structural constraint. Theoreticians of early Romanticism give pride of place to imagination as an inward, almost transcendent faculty, situating creative thought within both emotional intensity and personal insight. Although such models have rightly been denounced for idealizing authorship, they emphasize the important point that literary creativity is produced by sustained cognitive effort rather than straightforward execution.

This view is complicated by subsequent modernist and postmodern interventions that deconstruct the notion of a unified authorial consciousness. Writers such as Joyce and Woolf foreground fragmentation and stream-of-consciousness techniques that reveal creativity as a process shaped by interruption, memory, and associative flow. Poststructuralist critics further destabilize intentionality by arguing that meaning arises through linguistic systems rather than individual agency. Even within these critiques, however, the thinking subject remains present. Instead, creative cognition is reframed as relational, dialogic, and historically situated [5].

Cognitive approaches to literature reopen the question of mind for literary studies without returning to naïve

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25dec1283

humanism. Those scholars working at the juncture between psychology and literary theory stress that creative writing involves no less than complex mental operations, such as divergent thinking, analogical reasoning, and sustained attention. Sawyer's work on creativity argues that novelty often arises through struggle and iterative failure rather than in flashes of insight [2]. This insistence on difficulty is particularly important, as it situates creative cognition as an effortful and temporally extended process.

Boden's influential taxonomy of creativity, categorizing creative activity as combinational, exploratory, or transformational, provides a strong framework for assessing creative thinking [1]. In literary contexts, combinational creativity involves the combination of tropes or styles, whereas exploratory creativity extends established forms. In contrast to these, transformational creativity involves changes in the conceptual space itself, which requires intensive cognitive effort. This distinction becomes relevant when assessing the role of artificial intelligence in literary creativity, considering that AI systems are mostly employed for combinational and exploratory operations.

Traditional models of creativity are complicated by concepts of distributed and extended cognition. Clark and Chalmers argue that cognitive processes need not be confined to the biological brain but may extend into tools and environments; notebooks, technologies, and external systems can become integral to thinking itself [3]. In terms of literary practice, this would mean that writing instruments have always shaped cognition in a history of marginal notes, drafts, or editorial feedback. Within this light, AI continues rather than breaks with this trajectory.

Yet, critics are wary of uncritical adoption of these frameworks of extended cognition. Stiegler's critique of technics warns that the externalization of memory and thought may, in the long term, attenuate individuation and critical capacity [8]. In literary terms, if one is constantly relying on the external systems, this could erode the mental stamina required for sustained creative effort. The interplay or tension remains between cognitive augmentation and cognitive erosion. Within literary studies in English, there can be no imagining apart from language as a cultural and historical medium, for writing is the thought given shape through its resistances, ambiguities, and nuances. Indeed, literary cognition-its modes of supposition, hesitation, and shock-often proceeds by way of pause, revision, and withholding, those aporetic moments when meaning is refused. Such moments are not inefficiencies but productive spaces wherein imagination deepens.

In the context of Indian English literary studies, creative cognition is further modulated by multilingual awareness and postcolonial negotiation. Writers often work across languages, thereby translating not only lexical items but cultural sensibilities. This layered cognitive process complicates any account of creativity that treats language as a neutral medium. Consequently, theories of creativity must continue to be attentive to cultural specificity and linguistic plurality. Taken together, the scholarship on creativity and cognition suggests that literary creativity is neither wholly internal nor wholly external, not entirely autonomous yet fully constructed. It emerges in and through extended cognitive labor that is constituted with tools but never reducible to them. This is an important basis for inquiry into how Artificial Intelligence intervenes in creative thought, as discussed in subsequent sections.

- *Artificial Intelligence, Language Models, and Creative Production*

Recent developments of Artificial Intelligence-based language models have revolutionized writing in the modern age by allowing systems to generate fluent and contextually sensitive prose. Unlike earlier digital tools aimed at helping to draft or edit, the new AI systems themselves generate active linguistic production through forecasting likely word sequences with large textual training data. This development has revived ongoing debate over whether such systems can be meaningfully considered creative, or whether they merely mimic creative output through statistical regularity.

Computational creativity researchers generally tend to advise against the attribution of intentional creativity to AI. Boden's framework of combinatorial, exploratory, and transformational creativity is frequently invoked to outline the algorithmic limits [1]. While modern AI impressively develops the ability to recombine existing linguistic features and to explore stylistic variations within set parameters, it will not be able to transform conceptual spaces in ways that could be grounded in lived experience or deliberative reflection. AI-generated language, in other words, is often readable, coherent, and inventive while remaining, however, inherently derivative.

Philosophical critiques extend this position. Searle's objection to strong AI contends that syntactic manipulation does not entail semantic understanding [10]. From this perspective, AI systems do not "think" or "mean"; they manipulate symbols devoid of consciousness. In literary studies, this distinction is important inasmuch as meaning in literature is inextricable from intention, affect, and contextual awareness. Fluency cannot supplant imaginative depth.

Dismissing AI as purely mechanical does not, however, take into consideration its role in human creative practice. Researchers of the digital humanities point out that creativity has always involved recombination, imitation, and transformation of previous texts [9]. Viewed in this light, AI's use of antecedent literature simply carries out continuing literary functions such as allusion, parody, and intertextuality. Human cognition is often awed by the scale and speed at which such recombination takes place with AI.

This rapidity changes the circumstances of creative decision-making. Writers working with AI face a steady flow of possible linguistic options that may influence narrative direction, style, and theme. McCormack and d'Inverno note that aesthetic judgment increasingly occurs not at the level of material generation but rather in the assessment of machine-suggested possibilities [11]. This

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25dec1283

development carries a potential significance for creative cognition, insofar as evaluative thought might soon overshadow generative imagination.

Educational research into AI-assisted writing reveals analogous tensions. Scholarship into the pedagogy of creative writing suggests that such tools have the potential to assist students in both the generation of ideas and in revision, not least through mitigating anxiety around the blank page [12]. These studies also, however, sound a note of warning that over-reliance on such technologies may reduce engagement with uncertainty and consequently limit students' willingness to take creative risks. Where solutions are available, the motivation to explore less predictable routes is arguably lowered.

Cognitive psychology further illuminates these dynamics. Research on the phenomenon of cognitive offloading reveals that extensive use of external systems can decrease internal engagement over time [4]. In literary contexts, this suggests that a systematic development of reliance on AI for ideation could reshape how writers plan, imagine, and sustain long-form narratives. The concern is not one of immediate loss but of gradual reconfiguration of cognitive habits.

Meanwhile, theories of extended cognition complicate simplistic accounts of dependency. Clark argues that tools can become integral to thought itself, enabling forms of cognition that would otherwise be out of reach [3]. In this light, AI may serve as a cognitive scaffold, augmenting associative capacity and facilitating complex creative undertakings. What counts is not the presence of AI per se but rather the manner of engagement that the writer adopts.

These issues, within Indian English literary contexts, very much intersect with questions of language, power, and representation. AI models are largely trained on corpora that privilege standardized global English, often at the cost of marginalizing regionally inflected idioms and syntactic patterns. As some scholars have pointed out, such training biases may subtly encourage linguistic homogenization, shaping not only stylistic output but also the writer's internal sense of what constitutes 'good' or 'acceptable' English [15]. For writers operating within postcolonial literary traditions, this is a big cognitive and cultural challenge.

At the same time, AI provides Indian writers with hitherto unevenly distributed access to global literary forms, stylistic experimentation, and revision strategies. As Mishra points out, digital tools can democratize creative participation, especially among writers whose work falls outside metropolitan literary circuits [16]. This two-sided nature points to the need for a balanced assessment of AI in creative production. Overall, what the literature suggests is that AI neither simply replaces creativity nor leaves it completely unchanged. Rather, it rearranges the writing mindscape, shifting effort between imagination, evaluation, and selection. Grasping this shift is crucial to telling whether writers collaborate with machines or think with the help of machines in a manner that runs a risk of cognitive substitution. The following subsection deals with this issue by discussing how AI impacts authorship, agency, and creative responsibility.

- *Authorship, Agency, and Posthuman Creativity*

Questions of authorship and agency have long constituted central concerns in literary studies, antecedent to the advent of Artificial Intelligence. Twentieth-century theory challenged the romantic ideal of the autonomous author by foregrounding the roles of language, culture, and textual systems in shaping meaning. Barthes' proclamation of the "death of the author" did not seek to erase human presence from literature but rather to interrogate the notion of a sovereign intention governing interpretation [5]. Similarly, Foucault reframed authorship as a function produced within discursive systems rather than as a stable personal identity [6]. These interventions did not deny the cognitive labor entailed in writing; rather, they displaced authority while retaining the human mind as the site of struggle, negotiation, and decision-making.

The rise of AI problematizes these debates by introducing a non-human participant in the creative process. Editors, traditions, and linguistic conventions may all blur questions of text ownership, but none actively produce language that would enter the text itself. The critical question of agency now arises: *when a writer uses AI-generated material, where does agency lie? Does the writer remain the paramount creative agent, or does authorship get dispersed through both human and machine systems?*

Posthuman theory represents one framework in which this shift may be approached. Critics such as Hayles argue that cognition has always been distributed across biological, technological, and cultural systems, and that it is merely the distributed nature of contemporary digital environments that makes this more apparent [7]. In this way, AI-assisted writing simply furthers historical enmeshments between humans and tools. Here, creativity does not reside within humans alone, but rather functions via specific assemblages between actors, artifacts, and processes.

Yet, despite this interest in posthuman logics, literary critics have had more reservations about the extension of this conception to creative authorship without due caution. A pivotal concern here is that posthuman frameworks might elide critical distinctions between influence and substitution. All writing, of course, works under the condition of prior texts and tools. However, AI works differently: generating linguistic material autonomously, without intention or accountability. For Stiegler, excessive delegation of cognitive functions to technical systems undermines individuation-the subject's capacity for reflective judgment [8]. Transposed into literary terms, the assertion suggests that authorial creation can stray from intentionality toward procedural processes. Here, agency would be conceptualized not as mastery but rather as responsibility for the making of creative decisions. Even when AI contributes language, the writer remains answerable for selection, framing, and contextual meaning. Yet the plethora of algorithmically generated options subtly shifts decision-making patterns.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25dec1283

Rather than trying to phrase an idea from scratch, the writer considers already rendered formulations. This shift from generation to curation, while not inherently negative, redirects the cognitive emphasis of authorship.

McCormack and d'Inverno note that aesthetic judgement in AI-assisted creativity is often enacted through selecting amongst alternatives provided by the system, rather than generating those options themselves [11]. While such an evaluative mode may give rise to an acuteness of critical awareness, it may also narrow the possibilities for intuitive exploration. Over time, writers may find themselves internalising algorithmic conceptions of coherence and style, informing their judgement of what constitutes acceptable literary expression. It becomes even more complicated within the English literary traditions that celebrate voice, ambiguity, and stylistic risk. Creative authorship has often meant resisting dominant linguistic norms, experimenting with syntax, or foregrounding silence and rupture. AI systems, optimized for probability and fluency, lean toward smoothness over disruption. As such, they may inadvertently discourage modes of creativity reliant on linguistic difficulty or conceptual opacity.

Questions of authorship and agency, for Indian-English literary studies, intersect with postcolonial concerns. Writers of Indian origin have long negotiated the language of the colonizer by inflecting it with regional rhythms, idioms, and cultural memory. This negotiation is not only stylistic but also cognitive, entailing continuous translation between linguistic worlds. Models of AI that are trained on dominant Global English corpora may subtly privilege standardized expressions, molding the writer's sense of linguistic legitimacy [15]. There is a possibility that AI-assisted writing can change not only what one writes but also the way one thinks in English.

It would be reductive, however, to characterize AI exclusively as a threat to authorship. Many writers report engaging with AI dialogically, using it as a prompt rather than as an authoritative source. In such instances, agency remains firmly with the human writer, who interrogates, reshapes, and often rejects algorithmic suggestions. This mode of engagement aligns with thinking with machines rather than thinking through them. The distance is critical, with reflective control maintained.

Thus, the literature reveals a spectrum of authorial configurations rather than a singular outcome. At one extreme lies uncritical reliance, where AI becomes a substitute for creative labour. At the other extreme lies reflective collaboration, where AI functions as a cognitive stimulus without displacing intentionality. Understanding how writers position themselves along this spectrum is essential for assessing the future of creative authorship in English literature.

This subsection reinforces the need to move beyond the simplistic binaries of human versus machine creativity. Authorship in AI-assisted contexts is neither extinguished nor unchanged but rather reconfigured. Literary studies have the difficult challenge of articulating those frameworks that acknowledge distributed creativity while preserving ethical responsibility, cultural specificity, and cognitive depth. These concerns prepare for the next subsection, on how writers experience this reconfiguration at the level of creative thinking itself.

- *Creative Cognition, Dependency, and Resistance*

A corpus of interdisciplinary scholarship is growing that attempts to understand how extended interaction with intelligent systems reorganizes cognitive habits, attention, and creative stamina. Within this body of scholarship, creative cognition is increasingly conceptualized not as a fixed ability but as a constellation of practices that mature through repeated engagement with uncertainty, difficulty, and exploratory failure. From that vantage point, the principal concern about AI-assisted writing is not an immediate diminishment of creativity but a gradual reorientation of the ways in which writers think, plan, and sustain effort across complex imaginative tasks.

Research in cognitive psychology has shown that habitual reliance on external systems for memory or problem-solving can result in cognitive offloading, where internal processes are partly replaced by technological aids [4]. While such offloading may promote short-term efficiency, it also tends to reduce sustained engagement with complex tasks. In the context of literary creativity, this would suggest that habituated use of AI for ideation, phrasing, or narrative progression might reconfigure the writer's cognitive stamina: long-form literary composition requires the ability to keep ideas unresolved, returning to them after a period of time, and accommodating ambiguity; when AI enables immediate solutions, such abilities may be practiced less regularly.

Scholars of creativity stress that resistance and difficulty have a positive part in the process of imaginative development. Sawyer argues that creative insights often result from extended struggle rather than fluent creation [2]. The psychoanalytic and aesthetic traditions, too, have long associated the emergence of creativity with delay, silence, and frustration, states of mind that force thought to deviate from everyday habits. AI systems optimized for speed and coherence may elide such productive constraints by presenting a solution before the problem has been discovered.

Simultaneously, the connection between tools and cognition is not unilateral. Indeed, theories of extended and distributed cognition reject assumptions of a necessary reduction in mental capacity with increased reliance on tools. As Clark indicates, when tools are reflectively integrated, they extend cognitive reach rather than diminish it [3]. From this perspective, AI might enable creative cognition when writers can externalize partial ideas, experiment with variations, and reflect on alternatives. The key factor is not the tool itself but the way that it is integrated into a thinking practice.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25dec1283

This difference takes special meaning in the context of resistance. Some authors actively resist suggestions made by AI and use them as foils against which they sharpen their own ideas. In such cases, AI serves as a productive antagonist rather than a replacement. Resistance becomes a productive strategy, forcing authors to declare what they do not want to say. Such oppositional engagement maintains cognitive agency and authenticates intentional authorship. However, not all authors maintain this resistant attitude. Research into academic and professional contexts of writing suggests that convenience tends to override critical reflection, particularly when a deadline needs to be met [12]. As long as AI-generated language appears "good enough," writers may internalize the stylistic norms of AI and, in due course, begin to think in concert with algorithmic expectations. This would, over time, lead to homogenization of voice and a reduction in imaginative risk.

Such homogenization carries salient risks in literary contexts. English literature has long thrived on deviation, eccentricity, and stylistic idiosyncrasy. Creative cognition often involves sustained residence in linguistic difficulty, the bending of grammatical norms, or the allowing of ambiguity to persist. AI systems optimized to maximize clarity and probabilistic coherence may suppress such deviations through the privilege of normative coherence. Resistance to AI thus becomes not simply a matter of taste but an ethical stance in defense of literary complexity.

The question of dependence becomes even more complicated in the postcolonial and multilingual environment. The Indian-English writers necessarily navigate languages and translate cultural concepts resistant to direct expression. This cognitive act requires creative tension and negotiation. AI systems, being trained on dominant English corpora, may overlook such tensions and provide linguistically smooth yet culturally flattened alternatives 15. Dependence on such a facility risks reshaping not only stylistic decisions but also the underlying cognitive processes whereby writers conceptualize experience in English.

Yet resistance does not have to take the form of outright rejection. A number of scholars propose critical AI literacy-that is, education that trains writers in how AI systems operate, their limitations, and how their output carries into the text training biases [13]. Such literacy lets writers engage with AI in strategic ways, maintaining their independence while exploiting its affordances. In such a framework, creative cognition remains active and reflective rather than passive and delegative.

Taken together, the scholarly discourse on creative cognition, dependence, and resistance shows that AI's impact is anything but uniform or inexorable. Scholars occupy different positions along a continuum from institutionally influenced pressures to pedagogical practices and personal dispositions: some authors experience AI as an empowering scaffold, others as a seductive shortcut, while still others constitute a constraint to be resisted. Understanding this kind of diversity is essential in making binary judgments on AI and creativity.

The literature review underscores the cognitive stakes of AI-assisted writing. The need for a fine-grained framework that critically distinguishes augmentation from substitution and collaboration from dependency is thus asserted. These insights lead to the next section, synthesizing the reviewed literature into a set of key findings that illuminate how exactly AI affects creative cognition in the study of English literature.

III. KEY FINDINGS FROM LITERATURE REVIEW

- *Artificial Intelligence as a Catalyst for Associative and Exploratory Thinking*

A key observation throughout the literature is that Artificial Intelligence serves well as a means of catalyst for associative and exploratory thinking in a literary framework, especially during the beginning stages of creation. The AI systems can thus come up with fast linguistic variations, unexpected juxtapositions, and alternative narrative pathways that could stir the writer's imagination. Instead of creating ideas of their own, AI often acts to suggest them, encouraging writers to contemplate possibilities they may not have considered in the first instance [1].

This catalytic role resonates with combinational and exploratory models of creativity, which posit that innovation issues from the reconfiguration of the already existing rather than from the creation of entirely new conceptual spaces. Writers who have been exposed to AI-generated suggestions report regularly on moments of conceptual expansion when machine outputs encourage reflection, resistance, or refinement. In this sense, AI operates less as an independent creative agent and more as a cognitive irritant, unsettled by habitual patterns of thought and prompting reconsideration.

From the cognitive point of view, such interaction can enhance divergent thinking by increasing the range of possibilities. The facility for rapid testing of multiple formulations lets the writers externalize partial ideas and be reflectively evaluative rather than cognitively blocked. Research into writing pedagogy suggests that this function is particularly useful in overcoming creative inertia, especially in academic and literary contexts where the fear of failure prevents experimentation [12].

The literature does suggest, however, that this advantage is related to the way in which writers engage with the output. If AI outputs are used as prompts rather than solutions, they can enhance metacognitive awareness, allowing writers to explain why certain formulations work and others do not. This evaluative process preserves creative agency and reinforces intentionality. Thus, AI's contribution to creative cognition lies, at its most productive, in its capacity to extend the writer's associative horizon without supplanting imaginative control. The literature is very consistent on the point that augmentation supports thinking

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25dec1283

with machines rather than through them, of course, provided that human judgment remains active and critically engaged.

- *Cognitive Displacement and the Erosion of Creative Struggle*

A key observation throughout the literature is that Artificial Intelligence serves well as a means of catalyst for associative and exploratory thinking in a literary framework, especially during the beginning stages of creation. The AI systems can thus come up with fast linguistic variations, unexpected juxtapositions, and alternative narrative pathways that could stir the writer's imagination. Instead of creating ideas of their own, AI often acts to suggest them, encouraging writers to contemplate possibilities they may not have considered in the first instance [1].

This catalytic role resonates with combinational and exploratory models of creativity, which posit that innovation issues from the reconfiguration of the already existing rather than from the creation of entirely new conceptual spaces. Writers who have been exposed to AI-generated suggestions report regularly on moments of conceptual expansion when machine outputs encourage reflection, resistance, or refinement. In this sense, AI operates less as an independent creative agent and more as a cognitive irritant, unsettled by habitual patterns of thought and prompting reconsideration. From the cognitive point of view, such interaction can enhance divergent thinking by increasing the range of possibilities. The facility for rapid testing of multiple formulations lets the writers externalize partial ideas and be reflectively evaluative rather than cognitively blocked. Research into writing pedagogy suggests that this function is particularly useful in overcoming creative inertia, especially in academic and literary contexts where the fear of failure prevents experimentation [12]. The literature does suggest, however, that this advantage is related to the way in which writers engage with the output. If AI outputs are used as prompts rather than solutions, they can enhance metacognitive awareness, allowing writers to explain why certain formulations work and others do not. This evaluative process preserves creative agency and reinforces intentionality.

Thus, AI's contribution to creative cognition lies, at its most productive, in its capacity to extend the writer's associative horizon without supplanting imaginative control. The literature is very consistent on the point that augmentation supports thinking with machines rather than through them, of course, provided that human judgment remains active and critically engaged.

- *Reconfiguration of Authorship and Creative Agency*

Another salient result in the research literature is the complex yet significant reshaping of authorship and creative agency within an AI-supported writing environment. Instead of making the writer obsolete, Artificial Intelligence relocates creativity; it changes the site and modality of creative agency. Conventional theories of authorship find the creative function in language generation as a product of extended imaginative work. In AI-assisted contexts, this generative role is partly externalised, moving the writer's role onto the activities of assessment, selection, and contextual framing.

Scholars of authorship theory have long argued that creative agency is never absolute, but rather determined by linguistic conventions, cultural norms, and intertextual influence [5]. Yet, current literature would suggest that AI introduces a qualitatively different mode of mediation. In contrast to traditional or genre-bound practices, AI yields immediate textual material that directly competes with the writer's own formulations. This competition itself recalibrates decision-making processes, as writers increasingly select among pre-defined options rather than invent them anew.

McCormack and d'Inverno describe this shift as a shift from generative authorship to curatorial authorship, in which creative judgment is executed through selection rather than origination [11]. Such judgment indeed represents a kind of agency, yet it relies on another mode of cognition. The writer's attention is directed toward the processes of coherence assessment, stylistic appropriateness, and relevance-checking, perhaps at the expense of intuitive investigation and imaginative daring. The literature further suggests that this reconfiguration of agency is uneven. Writers who engage in a critical manner with AI retain control by interrogating and reshaping algorithmic outputs. In such cases, AI acts as a dialogical partner that invites reflection and resistance rather than obedience. By contrast, uncritical acceptance of AI-generated language leads, according to Stiegler, to procedural authorship, or the algorithmic logic driving the creative decisions, devoid of intentional vision [8].

This reconfiguration carries an added valence in postcolonial and multilingual contexts. Authors of Indian-English often negotiate questions of authorship through cultural translation and linguistic experimentation. When AI-generated language privileges standardized global English, there is a subtle but possible impact on the writer's sense of legitimacy and voice [15]. Agency, in such cases, is thus not solely cognitive but cultural. What the overall literature indicates is that AI does not erase authorship; rather, it reorganizes the cognitive foundations thereof. Creative agency may persist, but has to be asserted actively. To the extent that agency is deliberately exercised within AI-mediated creative processes, writers either reflectively collaborate with machines or think through them as conduits.

- *Thinking With vs Thinking Through Machines: A Synthetic Framework*

Synthesizing the findings across the literature suggests that the effect of Artificial Intelligence on creative cognition cannot be captured by binary assertions of enhancement or decline. Instead, a far more productive analytic framework emerges from distinguishing between thinking with machines and thinking through machines. This distinction pertains not to technological capability but to the mode of cognitive engagement adopted by authors within AI-assisted environments.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25dec1283

Thinking with machines characterizes a reflective and dialogic interaction between the writer and AI. Here, AI-generated language functions as a stimulus rather than a solution. Writers interrogate suggestions, resist formulations that appear misaligned, and employ machine output to clarify their own intentions. The cognitive labor of writing is still active; evaluation, rejection, and reworking are based on human judgment. The literature so far suggests that such an engagement can expand associative thinking while preserving creative struggle, thereby aligning with theories of extended cognition that emphasize augmentation rather than substitution [3]. By contrast, thinking through machines describes a mode of engagement in which AI serves as a conduit for creative production. In these instances, authors depend on algorithmic fluency to dissolve uncertainty, to supply structure, or to complete linguistic tasks with limited resistance. While such a process may promote efficiency, the literature suggests that it simultaneously threatens to lower tolerance for ambiguity and lessen imaginative risk-taking [2]. Over time, such reliance could reorient cognitive habits toward selection and compliance rather than exploration and invention.

This frame also helps explain why the impact of AI varies across contexts: institutional pressures, pedagogic practices, and cultural expectations influence how writers take up positions along this continuum. Authors who have learned to prize speed and productivity are likely to think through machines, while those taught to consider process and voice will more often think with them. Crucially, these positions are not fixed, and writers may shift between modes according to task, genre, or stage of composition.

The distinction assumes an added significance in the Indian English literary context. Thinking with machines allows the writers to negotiate global English norms in a critical way, preserving linguistic and cultural specificity. Thinking through machines, by contrast, risks reinforcing homogenized expression and weakening postcolonial negotiations of voice [15]. By articulating this distinction, the literature navigates beyond moral panic or technological enthusiasm into providing a conceptual lens through which creative cognition can be analyzed as a dynamic practice shaped by choice, awareness, and resistance.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings from this research suggest that AI is neither inherently pernicious nor uniformly beneficial to creative cognition in the compositional practices of English studies. It is mainly influenced by the ways in which AI is implemented in cognitive practice, pedagogical structure, and institutional imperatives. The recommendations below, therefore, are presented not as technical guidance but as cognitive and ethical orientations toward sustaining creative agency while working productively with AI.

First, writers need to be encouraged toward process-oriented engagement with AI rather than outcome-driven reliance. Creative writing-think of the literary contexts-suffers when there is not continuous interaction with uncertainty, revision, and conceptual complexity. AI tools, therefore, should be placed as secondary interlocutors, introduced in a sequence after initial ideation has taken place. Such a delay in AI engagement allows the writers to set the conceptual direction and voice before the algorithmic suggestions start coming in, thus avoiding cognitive substitution altogether [2].

Second, critical AI literacy desperately needs to be developed within literary education and research settings. Writers need to be aware of the ways in which AI systems generate language, for instance, their reliance on probabilistic prediction and biases in training data. With such awareness, writers can question AI outputs rather than accept them as neutral or authoritative. Digital ethics scholars point out that informed engagement leads to more agency because tools become objects of reflection rather than instruments of dependency [13].

Third, creative writing pedagogies should explicitly foreground creative struggle as a value, rather than defining fluency or efficiency as the most important evidence of success. While AI can mitigate the anxieties associated with the blank page, educators must avoid allowing ease-of-use to override cognitive depth. Assignments that require reflective commentary on the use of AI - including moments of resistance or rejection- can help students articulate their thinking processes and preserve imaginative labour [12].

Fourth, linguistic and cultural specificity, especially in the Indian English literary context, needs special attention. The writers and educators should remain alert to resist the subtle pressures toward a standardized globalized English inscribed within the AI systems. Encouraging multilingual thinking, code-switching, and culturally inflected expression can counteract homogenizing tendencies and reinforce cognitive richness in Indian English creativity [15].

Fifth, ethical disclosure should be viewed as an extension of creative responsibility and not as a regulatory burden. Clear disclosure regarding the use of AI assistance, when applicable, further reinforces authorial integrity while reaffirming that creative agency emanates from the human writer. Such transparency is part of broader scholarly norms and simultaneously discourages a naive reliance upon algorithmic output.

Finally, policies and journals should refrain from framing AI engagement in binary terms of acceptance or prohibition. Instead, they should foster reflective autonomy, recognizing that writers may move along a continuum between thinking with and thinking through machines depending on the context. It is those policies that emphasize critical engagement over prohibition that are more likely to safeguard creative cognition while making space for technological change. Taken together, these recommendations point towards a balanced approach that neither romanticises human creativity nor uncritically embraces automation. By placing creative cognition, intentionality, and resistance at the centre, writers and

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25dec1283

institutions can ensure that AI remains a spur to thought and not a substitute for imagination.

V. CONCLUSION

The study explores how AI reshapes creative cognition within English literary writing, not by the criteria of machine originality but by focusing on writers' cognitive processes when composing in collaboration with machines. By redirecting attention from textual output to cognitive procedure, the analysis contends that AI's most substantial impact resides in how imagination, judgment, and creative persistence are exercised rather than in the produced text. The primary contribution comes through distinguishing thinking with machines from thinking through machines, a framing that provides a more fine-grained understanding of AI's position in literary creativity.

The literature reviewed repeatedly suggests that AI serves as a powerful cognitive catalyst when used reflectively. In associative prompts, stylistic alternatives, and narrative possibilities, AI can also extend the imaginative horizon of writers beyond creative impasses. In these cases, AI acts as a dialogical presence promoting response, resistance, and refinement, not compliance. This latter relationship supports extended cognition theory, which holds that tools can become an integral part of thinking without displacing human agency [3]. Creative cognition, here, remains active, intentional, and reflective because writers maintain evaluative control. At the same time, the literature also shows the presence of a significant countercurrent: the danger of cognitive displacement. The creative imagination in literature has long relied on the resources of obstacles, uncertainty, and conscious wrestling with ideas. Immediate linguistic coherence from AI can squeeze out these generative interstices, echoing changes in the temporality of thought itself. Studies of creativity demonstrate that originality often emerges through extended struggle, rather than fluent generation [2]. When AI eliminates such difficulty too swiftly, the cognitive circumstances that help foster imaginative depth may be undermined. Over longer terms, this can produce a subtle shift in creative practices from generative exploration toward curatorial selection.

The reconfiguration of authorship introduces new complexity into this domain. AI-assisted writing does not eliminate the writer; instead, it reconfigures the division of creative labor. Writing increasingly involves evaluating algorithmic suggestions, selecting among alternatives, and contextualizing machine-generated language. While such a role of evaluation is itself an agency, it requires intentional assertion. Without reflective distance, writers risk internalizing algorithmic standards of coherence, fluency, and stylistic acceptability that may restrict imaginative risk-taking and foster homogenization of voice, especially within literary traditions that valorize linguistic deviation and ambiguity.

These are concerns that acquire heightened significance in the context of Indian English literature. Indian English writing has been the outcome, historically, of negotiations, translations, and resistance, shaped by multilingual consciousness and postcolonial histories. Creative cognition in this context often means thinking across languages and cultural registers, which is a process resistant to standardization. AI systems, predominantly trained on dominant global English corpora, may subtly privilege homogenized expression, thereby influencing not only stylistic output but also habitual modes of thought in English [15]. Writing with machines allows authors to interrogate such norms critically, while thought with machines risks their unreflected reinforcement.

Importantly, the present study does not argue for the rejection of AI in literary practice. Such a move would deny the historical fact that writing is always mediated by tools and technologies. Instead, the results suggest that the ethical and cognitive stakes of AI lie not in the mere fact of its use but rather in its mode of use. Writers are not passive recipients of technological change; they act to negotiate their relationship with tools. This makes the crucial difference between augmentation and substitution, collaboration and dependence, one of choice, awareness, and institutional framing.

Through foregrounding creative cognition, this research contributes to the active debates in literary studies, digital humanities, and cognitive theory. In testing output-centered evaluative practices in creativity, it argues for increased focus on the cognitive processes that underpin literary creation. The thinking with versus thinking through machines framework proposed here provides a flexible analytical perspective that can be applied across genres, pedagogical environments, and cultural contexts. It also points to a range of further investigations, from empirically based research into writers' cognitive experience to comparative analysis across linguistic traditions.

Thus, in conclusion, Artificial Intelligence does not represent the end of creative thinking in English literature; neither does it herald an unproblematic extension of imaginative powers. What it does is represent a shift in the conditions within which creativity operates. Whether that shift results in cognitive gain or in imaginative loss depends on how writers, teachers, and institutions respond. Focusing on reflective engagement, creative resistance, and ethical responsibility helps establish AI as a thinking partner rather than just an imagination substitute in English literary practice. In times when intelligent machines make up an increasing proportion of life, keeping the powers of creative cognition intact is a necessity not only for literature but also for culture in general.

REFERENCES

[1]. Boden MA. The Creative Mind: Myths and Mechanisms. 2nd ed. London: Routledge; 2004.
[2]. Sawyer RK. Explaining Creativity: The Science of Human Innovation. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2012.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25dec1283

[3]. Clark A, Chalmers D. The extended mind. Analysis. 1998;58(1):7–19.
[4]. Sparrow B, Liu J, Wegner DM. Google effects on memory: Cognitive consequences of having information at our fingertips. Science. 2011;333(6043):776–778.
[5]. Barthes R. The death of the author. In: Image–Music–Text. London: Fontana Press; 1977. p. 142–148.
[6]. Foucault M. What is an author? In: Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Ithaca: Cornell University Press; 1977. p. 113–138.
[7]. Hayles NK. How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1999.
[8]. Stiegler B. Technics and Time, Vol. 1: The Fault of Epimetheus. Stanford: Stanford University Press; 1998.
[9]. Manovich L. The Language of New Media. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 2001.
[10]. Searle JR. Minds, brains, and programs. Behav Brain Sci. 1980;3(3):417–457.
[11]. McCormack J, d'Inverno M. On the future of computers and creativity. Arts. 2014;3(2):205–226.
[12]. Kessler G. Artificial intelligence in writing pedagogy: Promise and perils. Comput Assist Lang Learn. 2023;36(5):897–915.
[13]. Floridi L. The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2023.
[14]. Boden MA, Montfort N. Creativity and artificial intelligence. Digital Creativity. 2017;28(1):1–3.
[15]. Rao S. Artificial intelligence and linguistic standardisation in Indian English writing. J Postcolonial Writ. 2022;58(4):512–526.
[16]. Mishra P. Digital access, creative writing, and English literary practice in India. ELT J. 2021;75(3):289–297.
[17]. Braidotti R. The Posthuman. Cambridge: Polity Press; 2013.
[18]. Floridi L, Chiriatti M. GPT-3: Its nature, scope, limits, and consequences. Minds Mach. 2020;30(4):681–694.
[19]. Bal M. Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative. 3rd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press; 2009.
[20]. Carr N. The Shallows: What the Internet Is Doing to Our Brains. New York: W.W. Norton; 2010.