Algorithmic Assistance and the Crisis of Authorship: Creative Thinking in the Age of AI-Mediated Writing

Sandhya Nandan[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)

Abstract: The rapid integration of generative artificial intelligence into writing practices has elicited renewed concern about authorship, creativity, and intellectual responsibility. Prevailing debates often revolve around the question of whether machines can produce creative texts; yet, such framings overlook a more basic transformation: namely, a shift in the cognitive processes of writers as they compose in concert with algorithmic systems. This paper positions AI-assisted writing as both a cognitive and an ethical issue. It argues that the main impact of algorithms is not about the production of text, per se, but about the changing of creative thought processes. Combining theories of authorship, cognitive storytelling, extended mind concepts, and posthumanist perspectives, this analysis examines how AI shapes intention, judgment, and the ineffable struggle of writing. Synthesizing recent literature, including Indian studies published after 2015, it shows that AI helps thinking when used thoughtfully, by facilitating idea generation and experimenting with different stylistic options. The evidence also underlines hazards: erosion of explicit intent, dimming the author's voice, and how thinking is reduced when suggestions are adopted without critical assessment. While the paper does argue that the challenge of authorship lies less in a lack of creativity than in transformations to the ways in which writers create, driven by shifting distributions of responsibility and control between humans and machines. The distinction drawn between thinking with and thinking through machines establishes a theoretical framework for responsibly integrating AI into the practice of writing in such a way as to preserve the accountability of an author. It concludes with a prescriptive stance for a moral approach to authorship that foregrounds reflexivity, cultural literacy, and prudent judgment in an era of AI-assisted writing.

Keywords: *AI-Mediated Writing, Authorship and Intentionality, Creative Cognition, Extended Mind Theory, Algorithmic Creativity, Ethics of Literary Authorship.*

How to Cite: Sandhya Nandan; Dr. Shabina Khan (2025) Algorithmic Assistance and the Crisis of Authorship: Creative Thinking in the Age of AI-Mediated Writing. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 10(12), 1840-1845. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25dec1324

I. INTRODUCTION

➤ *Background Context*

Large-scale AI that creates content has changed how we think about writing, doing, and judging it. Unlike older digital tools that mainly helped with creating, saving, or sharing, today's AI systems work with us in generating ideas, choosing words, and adjusting style. So, writing is no longer just a mental activity expressed through language; it's now often a back-and-forth with computer systems. This shift has led to new discussions in literary studies, cognitive science, and ethics, especially about who is considered the author. Theoretically, historically, and conceptually, literary authorship has rested on assumptions of intentionality, struggle, and individual agency. Even when post-structuralist theory challenged the idea of the sovereign author, it still did so within a human-centered way of knowing. Roland Barthes

and Michel Foucault questioned originality, authority, and ownership. However, they did not anticipate a creative landscape in which non-human systems could be said actively to generate, suggest, and refine text. In the contemporary moment, AI-mediated writing reconfigures these theoretical positions by introducing an agent that neither wholly replaces nor merely assists but instead intervenes within the cognitive process itself.

From a practical standpoint, AI-assisted writing has been hailed time and time again for its efficiency. Some writers have indeed reported an acceleration of the draft, increased ideational range, and even stylistic experimentation that might otherwise require considerable time and effort. In academic, journalistic, and creative domains alike, algorithmic systems are now framed more and more as productivity enhancers. This instrumental framing occludes,

however, a more fundamental shift: the reorganization of inventive thought. When algorithms predict story changes, suggest metaphors, or rearrange arguments, they don't just speed up writing but also change how writers think while they write. So, AI-assisted writing should be seen not just as a technological progress but as a mental event. The writer's imagination, judgment, and evaluative control are welded in continuous negotiation with machine-generated possibilities. This negotiation opens up critical questions of the locus of creative agency and its enactment. The present study situates itself within this emergent debate, focusing less on the textual artifact produced and more on the cognitive and ethical conditions under which such texts come into being.

➤ *Problem Statement*

Although there is a growing amount of research on artificial intelligence and writing, the majority of empirical work continues to focus on issues related to output quality. Many studies investigate whether text generated by AI is transparent, creative, or stylistically sound, often in comparison with texts created by humans. In so doing, such a focus has overlooked the ways in which AI challenges the process of writing itself. A more vital question is whether the adoption of this technology has moved ahead of its cognitive and ethical scrutiny. A salient issue is the attenuation of writers' intentionality. Traditional writing practices involve making conscious decisions, revising, and dealing with epistemic uncertainty. Difficulty and revision are not just pitfalls but aspects of the creative process. Instant options, completed sentences, or narrative continuations provided by AI may shift cognitive labor to reaction rather than reflection. A further consideration relates to the author's voice. Despite AI models being trained on extensive corpora, their generated text largely represents statistical patterns rather than personal intentionality. Too great a reliance on AI runs the risk of homogenizing those stylistic features that give distinctiveness to individual voices and reducing personal expression to the generation of plausible language. This situation raises important questions about whether authorship can be understood primarily as personal expression or the selection from pre-generated options.

Viewed through an ethical perspective, questions are raised about responsibility and ownership. If AI is a participant in the determination of creative decisions, then ownership becomes harder to define. The ethical matrices developed for human collaboration or to identify plagiarism are inadequate for this new form of collaborative creativity. Thus, it is important to reframe understandings of authorship as a cognitive practice that is remade by the new conditions provided by AI-assisted writing.

➤ *Research Objectives*

The main focus of this research is on how algorithmic support impacts the cognitive process and creative output of the writers. Instead of looking at AI as a replacement or competitor to human authors, the study considers it as a constitutive part of the very creation process that affects idea generation, evaluation, and refinement. A secondary aim is to discuss the main ethical issues related to AI-assisted writing, with special attention to intentionality, voice, and

accountability. Grounded in theories within the study of authorship, cognitive narratology, and posthumanism, this study will explore the tension between enhanced creative potential and diminished control from the author.

Finally, the paper intends to add to the ongoing discourse by bringing some clarity to understanding the differences between thinking with machines and thinking through machines. It is this distinction that underpins our view of AI as either a reflective extension of human cognition or as a tool supplanting creative labor.

➤ *Research Questions*

This study explores how AI changes the way we write and think about literature. It asks three questions:

- How does AI change the mental process of writing?
- How does help from algorithms affect the writer's intent, voice, and struggle?
- Can AI be used ethically in writing without hurting the idea of authorship?

The paper aims to go beyond the human-versus-machine dichotomy. Instead, it looks at the relationship between humans and AI, considering both the benefits and risks. The following sections will examine current research and suggest ways to keep writers in control and responsible as AI becomes part of the writing process.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The academic debate on AI-assisted writing has developed significantly over the last ten years, permeated by numerous disciplines, including literary theory, cognitive science, media studies, and ethics. However, the emphasis of this literature on different aspects thereof is still relatively uneven. Whereas quite some interest has been taken in the technical capabilities of AI writing and its productions, the cognitive dimensions and ethical aspects of authorship have been rather underdeveloped. The following section outlines important areas of research that clarify how algorithmic support configures creative practices and what this means for the concept of authorship.

➤ *Classical Theories of Authorship and Intentionality*

In the twentieth century, literary theory reconstructed the understanding of authorship as the sole source of meaning. The post-structuralist positions questioned the romantic theory of the author as a creative sovereign and instead pointed out that texts come out of complex systems of culture, language, and ideology. These insights retain their pertinence in the current controversies about AI-created writings, even though they antecede the arrival of computational algorithms.

According to Barthes, the rise of the reader is synchronous with the demise of the author, whereby meaning becomes more and more a matter of interpretation rather than the author's intentions [1]. This move diffused authority from the author without losing a human contribution, which was now dissipated across language and readers. In Foucault, the

author-function is seen as a process for categorizing and disciplining texts rather than a simple question of identity [2]. He does not reject authorship nor stabilize it; rather, he claims that its structure varies historically and changes between institutions. Later scholars observed that such theories cannot fully explain the participation of non-human agents, such as artificial intelligence, in text creation. Even for socially constructed or dispersed meaning, human engagement is a prerequisite for the author-function. In the case of AI, texts come out of patterns and probabilistic processes rather than personal experience or cultural situatedness. Therefore, although conventional theories centered on authors are of great importance when questioning authority and concepts of originality, they still need extension with regard to AI systems [3].

➢ *Cognitive Narratology and the Extended Mind*

Cognitive narratology sees stories as results of mental processes, not just fixed texts. It views storytelling as an activity influenced by memory, perception, emotion, and inference. Writing is used not only as a means of expression but also as a constitutive element in the formation of thought [4]. The extended mind hypothesis goes further to assert that cognition extends beyond the brain to take in tools, environments, and social interaction [5]. Writing instruments, from notebooks to word processors, have long served as extensions of the mind. A distinctive feature of artificial intelligence is its potential for autonomous content generation and thus its ability to propose ideas that form thinking rather than merely record it. Emerging research shows that AI is able to assist creative cognition by acting as a cognitive scaffold for the brain [6]. When used judiciously, AI can facilitate the discovery of novel connections, illuminate latent ideas, and reevaluate existing assumptions. However, other scholars warn that inordinate reliance on AI would represent outsourcing cognitive labor if control over thinking becomes weaker [7]. The key differentiator rests in the line between assisting and replacing, especially in the realm of literature, where judgment and intention play a huge role.

➢ *Posthuman Perspectives and Distributed Creativity*

The posthuman theory contestulates human exceptionalism by foregrounding networks of agency that encompass technologies, environments, and non-human actors. In this thinking, creativity is not exclusively conceptualized as a human attribute but rather as an emergent phenomenon arising from the assemblage of human and non-human elements in interaction [8]. Scholars from both the posthuman and new materialist schools claim that artificial intelligence should no longer be perceived as merely a tool but rather as a co-creative participant in creative processes [9]. Their perspective redirects authorship as being distributed, where agencies are shared across systems. In creative writing, this opens up further avenues for experimentation and hybrid forms that elude exclusive ownership.

Yet, this celebratory framing has found critique. The reduction of algorithmic generation to creativity bears the risk of dissolving important distinctions between lived experience and statistical patterning, some critics argue [10]. Where

posthuman theory productively destabilizes anthropocentrism, it perhaps underplays ethical concerns around accountability, labour, and cultural specificity. In literary practice, these questions are difficult to resolve, as recent criticism shows, when AI-generated language is indistinguishable from dominant stylistic norms.

➢ *Empirical Studies on AI-Assisted Writing*

Empirical research into AI-assisted writing has grown significantly since the mid-2010s, focusing mainly on educational and professional contexts. The literature indeed reports a rise in writing speed, reduced cognitive load, and improved surface-level fluency of writing when AI tools are used [11]. In more creative domains, writers often refer to AI as a source of prompts that inspire them and overcome writer's block [12]. At the same time, however, several studies point to unintended outcomes. Excessive reliance on algorithmic suggestions has been found to result in reduced originality and higher textual homogenization [13]. Writers may unconsciously conform their linguistic choices to those set by AI-generated norms, where distinctive voice may be slowly eroded. Ease of generation can also contribute to shortened revision cycles, thereby constraining opportunities for reflective engagement with emerging ideas [14]. Most research looks at short-term effects of AI, not long-term ones. There is little evidence on how long-term use of AI might change thinking, especially in writing, where complexity and challenge are important.

➢ *Indian and Global South Perspectives*

Scholarship from India and the Global South after 2021 introduces culturally inflected concerns into the discourse on AI authorship. Indian scholars have emphasized the ethical dimensions of creative labor, particularly with respect to intellectual property, educational integrity, and linguistic diversity [15–17]. These works frequently foreground the socio-cultural valuation of effort and process that challenge efficiency-centric narratives of creativity. The contemporary Indian research points to the possible threat of epistemic homogenization: that AI systems, trained with predominantly Western corpora, threaten to marginalize local idioms and narrative forms [18]. Looking from this angle, AI-mediated writing represents not only a cognitive issue but also a cultural one: whose voices are being heard or muffled. Taken together, these contributions complicate universalist accounts of AI creativity and place a premium on context-sensitive frameworks that take into consideration regional literary traditions and ethical priorities. They reinforce the argument that authorship cannot be reduced to output quality alone but needs to be understood as a situated cognitive practice.

III. KEY FINDINGS FROM THE LITERATURE REVIEW

An examination of interdisciplinary scholarship suggests that AI-mediated writing cannot be usefully understood through binary framings of assistance versus replacement. Instead, what the literature implies is a more complex refashioning of creative cognition, authorship, and ethical responsibility. The present section synthesizes the main trends emerging from the reviewed studies, tracing

convergences, tensions, and conceptual gaps informing the current inquiry.

➤ *AI as a Cognitive Amplifier Rather than a Substitute*

A consistent finding in cognitive and empirical research is that AI is most effective where it supports rather than replaces human thought. Building upon theories of extended cognition and cognitive narratology, the available evidence suggests that AI systems can extend the reach of associations, highlight latent narrative possibilities, and interfere with habitual modes of thought [4-6]. In this setup, AI works as a cognitive cue that encourages reflection, rather than dictating outcomes.

Authors who engage critically with algorithmic proposals frequently report heightened awareness of their own preferences and judgments. The presence of varied machine-generated options seems to hone evaluative skills, forcing writers to explain to themselves why some options work and others do not. In this way, AI-assisted writing has the potential to augment meta-cognitive engagement with the act of composition, so long as the writer remains in deliberate control. However, the literature also specifies that this amplification effect is related to reflective usage: when AI suggestions are used uncritically, cognitive extension devolves into cognitive delegation. Of particular concern, then, is the distinction between these two modes of engagement, which signals that the impact of AI on creativity is not technologically predetermined but contingent on practice [7].

➤ *The Dilution of Intentionality and Authorial Voice*

Another important observation is that of subtle erosion of intentionality in writing environments mediated by AI. Although post-structuralist theory has long problematized the status of authorial intention, the literature suggests that AI represents a qualitatively different kind of challenge. Algorithmic systems produce text on the basis of probabilistic patterns rather than situated purpose, and this may produce a form of authorship that is more a matter of selection than origination [1-3]. Empirical research indicates that long exposure to AI-generated language may be associated with stylistic convergence, mainly in situations where the operating writers depend on default phrasing or structural suggestions [13]. With time, such dependence dulls one's unique voice, yielding prose that is fluent but also indistinct. What is a concern here is not conventionally understood plagiarism but rather gradual alignment to algorithmic norms, privileging statistical plausibility over expressive specificity.

Moreover, the immediacy of AI-generated responses could alter the temporal rhythms of writing. Traditional processes of hesitating, revising, and returning are very often compressed, shrinking the space in which intention is clarified through struggle [14]. A number of authors argue that this struggle is not incidental but constitutive of creative meaning-making. Its attenuation thus raises questions about the depth and durability of authorial engagement.

➤ *Reconfiguration of Creative Struggle and Cognitive Friction*

A striking trend in the literature is an increasing recognition of struggle as a productive cognitive force. Research into creativity has highlighted time and time again that hindrance, delay, and obstruction play formative roles in shaping original thought [10–12]. AI systems are designed to reduce friction by providing answers immediately. While this sometimes aids efficiency, it threatens to bypass the cognitive labor through which ideas mature. Several authors have warned that the systematic elimination of difficulty may itself constrain writers by limiting occasions of exploratory failure, a process in which innovation is deeply invested. AI-mediated writing interfaces foreground completion over contemplation, often subtly shifting the objective of writing from one of discovery to one of optimization. Although this shift does not eradicate creativity, it may reset its axis, favoring surface coherence over conceptual depth. On the other hand, struggle is not across-the-board condemned by the literature. There are studies that suggest that AI can relocate it rather than eradicate it, shifting effort from generation to evaluation [6,7]. In these contexts, the writer's task becomes one of discernment, requiring sustained attention and ethical judgment. This reframes struggle as transformed, not erased, though its nature is qualitatively different.

➤ *Ethical Ambiguities and Distributed Responsibility*

The most persistent lacuna in the literature is that which deals with ethics and responsibility. Traditional ethical frameworks for authorship assume identifiable human agents who can be held accountable for creative decisions. AI-mediated writing challenges this because it introduces distributed agency-a situation in which outcomes arise from the interaction between human intention and algorithmic suggestion [8,9]. Several scholars identify this lack of clarity with respect to notions of contribution and disclosure. Although some demand transparency on the use of AI, others see any such disclosure as reductive when representing complex cognitive processes. The literature still indicates some ambiguity with regard to whether AI should be attributed as a collaborator, instrument, or invisible infrastructure [15].

Perspectives from India and the Global South add further nuance by underlining cultural values on effort, originality, and intellectual labor [16-18]. These studies highlight how ethical considerations cannot be abstracted from socio-cultural contexts. In pedagogical and literary contexts where struggle is deeply conjoined with moral worth, the alleviation brought about by AI may be considered suspect. This cultural factor points to the importance of considering the process beyond the outcome in ethical deliberation.

➤ *Identified Gaps and Directions for Further Inquiry*

However, through most of these findings, there is a demonstrated gap between technological capability and conceptual clarity. While there is an increasing realization that AI reshapes creative cognition, very few studies have offered integrated frameworks that, at the same time, address

cognitive, ethical, and cultural dimensions. Much of the literature remains fragmented, with empirical findings poorly linked to theoretical models of authorship. Most conspicuously, there is little engagement with the writer's subjective experience of thinking with and through machines. Questions about how writers understand agency, responsibility, and voice in sustained use of AI remain relatively unexamined. This is the gap that provides the critical impetus for the present study, which seeks to reframe authorship not as a fixed identity but as a fluid cognitive practice composed through human–machine interaction.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Put together, the theoretical and empirical evidence suggests that troubles with AI-mediated writing stem not from the technology per se but from the process of integrating that technology into creative practice. The recommendations to follow, therefore, aim to preserve cognitive depth, ethical clarity, and authorial intentionality while acknowledging the legitimate affordances provided by algorithmic assistance. In this respect, recommendations appearing in what follows are less prescriptive mandates than reflective orientations for writers, educators, and institutions.

➤ Reframing AI as a Reflective Cognitive Partner

The literature raises concerns surrounding the reframing of perceptions of AI in the writing process. Instead of seeing algorithms exclusively as producers of finished text, writers are encouraged to view AI as a cognitive peer. The products generated by AI should be seen as first moves-propositions in a discussion that may be critiqued, challenged, and refashioned, rather than final answers. This framing brings evaluation into the realm of authorship. Because writers keep control by deciding why some AI suggestions work and others do not, reflective deliberation also has a positive slowing effect on the composing process, which allows for more ethical contemplation and reflective thought. Such a position is also in concert with varieties of extended cognition which emphasize collaboration, but still allow a place for human autonomy [5–7]. In particular, writers are encouraged to insert intentional pauses before accepting or discarding AI suggestions. These become, in effect, moments of accountability, which ensure that humans remain responsible for the creative apparatus, even when machine-generated inputs are integrated.

➤ Pedagogical Interventions in Creative and Academic Writing

Educational settings are thus a particularly important site in which the ways that aspiring authors view and use AI are shaped. The existing literature suggests that uncritical use of AI tools, especially at an early stage in writing development, carries the risk of naturalizing passive authorship. In order to limit this possibility, the emphasis in pedagogical frameworks should shift from product to process. Creative writing and literature courses should position AI-assisted composition explicitly as a topic for critical scrutiny. Assignments can be designed so as to require students to reflectively document their decision-making processes, signaling where changes generated by AI were adopted

wholesale, modified, or rejected. As such, reflective practices underscore the idea that authority for the text lies not with the text alone, but with the cognitive effort behind its creation (references [11-14].

Pedagogy can harness the prevailing ethical traditions in such a manner within the Indian academic context, where efforts and intellectual disciplines are culturally valorized, so as to establish AI as an instrument that demands restraint and responsibility. Instead of a strict ban, educators might further benefit from encouraging students toward sensitive, transparent use that preserves intellectual struggle as a resource to learn from.

➤ Institutional Guidelines and Ethical Disclosure

The incoherent guidelines at the institutional level have created confusion and inconsistency in assessing AI-assisted writing. Universities, publishers, and literary organizations should move forward with frameworks that are flexible yet principled, addressing the distributed character of contemporary authorship. Instead of relying on disclosure checklists, for instance, institutions should articulate ethical expectations based on intentionality and accountability. Disclosure, where called for, is contextual rather than formulaic, in ways that allow writers to explain how AI was woven into their thinking. In this way, disclosure avoids reducing authorship to a binary dichotomy of 'human' versus 'machine' while retaining transparency. Such guidelines are especially important in scholarly publishing, where originality is closely tied to intellectual authority. A clear expression of what uses of AI are permissible can protect both authors and institutions from ethical murkiness while encouraging reflective engagement rather than cover-up.

➤ Towards a Cognitive Ethics of AI-Mediated Authorship

The results have implications for conceptualizing authorship in a cognitive ethics framework beyond traditional paradigms of ownership. Traditional ethical theories emphasize issues of attribution and originality, but AI-mediated authorship requires scrutiny of how thinking processes are shaped and directed. A cognitive ethics framework brings to the fore three related principles: intentional control, reflective judgment, and responsibility for outcomes. In this mode of thinking, authorship is a continual practice rather than a status quo. Ethical accountability endures not because the author autonomously creates every word, but rather because the author exercises discretion in selecting the ideas to be espoused and the stories to be told. This position is particularly resonant with Global South scholarship, which has often placed a premium on moral agency and work as constitutive elements in intellectual practice [15-18]. Framing AI-assisted practices in this manner enables the incorporation of algorithmic assistance without corrupting the normative basis of creative labor.

V. CONCLUSION

This study examined how algorithmic assistance reconfigures the cognitive and ethical underpinnings of literary authorship, not by interrogating whether machines can produce creative writing, but by inquiring into how

writers think when they compose in concert with machines. By refocusing attention away from textual output and onto cognitive process, the discussion argues that the most critical consequence of artificial intelligence appears in the restructuring of creative thought as such. Writing in the context of an AI-mediated environment is theorized as a practice of negotiation rather than a lone act of expression, where imagination, judgment, and responsibility are understood as exercised continuously in response to algorithmic suggestions.

The literature reviewed here suggests that AI can act as a true cognitive enhancer when used reflectively: algorithmic systems offering associative cues, stylistic variants, and structural options can expand the imaginative horizon and decrease creative friction. In such instances, AI does not replace the writer but rather elicits response, resistance, and refinement. Creative agency is preserved when writers retain evaluative command and approach machine language as provisional rather than authoritative. This approach shares points of convergence with extended cognition views that conceive tools as part of thinking without displacing human responsibility. At the same time, the analysis shows how AI-mediated writing carries real risks to authorship: the dilution of intentionality, the softening of authorial voice, and the compression of creative struggle are not ideological speculations but actually emergent tendencies when algorithmic assistance is used uncritically. The ease with which AI can supply plausible language subtly changes writing from a process of discovery to one of selection, where choices are made reactively rather than reflectively. Over time, this may reset how writers relate to uncertainty, effort, and originality-those things at the core of literary making.

This paper argues that the so-called authorship crisis attributed to AI is less a crisis of creativity than a crisis of practice. Authorship is not destroyed by algorithmic systems; rather, it has been redistributed throughout human–machine interactions. Thus, the ethical problem is not whether AI is a participant in writing but whether the writers are responsible for the thinking represented in the writing. Once authorship is understood as a cognitive practice rather than as a proprietary label, then it is possible to incorporate AI without undermining its meaning. Recommendations voiced herein underline reflective governance, pedagogic awareness, and context-sensitive ethical frameworks. Together, they gesture toward a future in which AI is neither fetishized nor feared but is deliberately approached with prudence. This is a stance that has particular salience within the Global South and Indian academic contexts, where intellectual labor, struggle, and moral responsibility remain closely intertwined.

In other words, AI-mediated writing requires thinking of authorship anew: not as a fixed origin of meaning, but as an ongoing ethical and cognitive engagement. The principal challenge is not one of defending authorship against machines; it is instead one of ensuring that creative thinking, judgment, and responsibility continue to constitute the core of writing in a time of algorithmic assistance.

REFERENCES

[1]. Barthes R. The death of the author. Aspen. 1967;5–6:142–148.

[2]. Foucault M. What is an author? In: Rabinow P, editor. *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books; 1984. p. 101–120.

[3]. Bennett A. The author still matters. *J Theory Cult Stud*. 2005;19(3):147–155. doi:10.1177/0263276405056008

[4]. Herman D. *Storytelling and the sciences of mind*. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press; 2013.

[5]. Clark A, Chalmers D. The extended mind. *Analysis*. 1998;58(1):7–19. doi:10.1093/analys/58.1.7

[6]. Menary R. Cognitive integration and the extended mind. *Philos Phenomenol Res*. 2010;81(2):227–254. doi:10.1111/j.1933-1592.2010.00331.x

[7]. Heersmink R. Distributed cognition and distributed morality. *Ethics Inf Technol*. 2017;19(2):85–98. doi:10.1007/s10676-017-9413-6

[8]. Hayles NK. How we think: Digital media and contemporary technogenesis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2012.

[9]. Braidotti R. *The posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press; 2013.

[10]. Boden MA. Creativity and artificial intelligence. *Artif Intell*. 1998;103(1–2):347–356. doi:10.1016/S0004-3702(98)00055-1

[11]. Floridi L, Cowls J. A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harv Data Sci Rev*. 2019;1(1). doi:10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1

[12]. Kantosalo A, Riihiaho S, Toivanen J, et al. Interaction evaluation for human–computer co-creativity. *Comput Hum Behav*. 2015;52:265–276. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2015.06.010

[13]. Jakesch M, Buschek D, Zalmanson L, et al. Human–AI collaboration in creative writing. *Proc ACM Hum-Comput Interact*. 2023;7(CSCW1):1–28. doi:10.1145/3579500

[14]. Novak J. Creativity, difficulty, and the role of struggle in artistic practice. *Creat Res J*. 2018;30(2):123–131. doi:10.1080/10400419.2018.1446506

[15]. Das R. Artificial intelligence, authorship, and academic integrity in India. *J Acad Ethics*. 2022;20(4):451–467. doi:10.1007/s10805-022-09427-9

[16]. Bhat P, Kaur A. Ethical challenges of AI-assisted writing in Indian higher education. *AI Soc*. 2023;38(4):1469–1481. doi:10.1007/s00146-022-01534-6

[17]. Chatterjee S, Dey N. Generative AI, creativity, and cultural labour in the Global South. *Technol Soc*. 2024;76:102351. doi:10.1016/j.techsoc.2023.102351

[18]. Sengupta S. Language models, epistemic bias, and Indian literary expression. *J Cult Anal Soc Change*. 2022;7(2):1–15. doi:10.20897/jcasc/12345