

## FROM STORYTELLERS TO DATA SUBJECTS: POST-HUMAN LANGUAGE AGENCY IN AI-DRIVEN INTERACTIVE NARRATIVES

**Syed Ghulam Haider Shah**

PhD Scholar, NUML, Islamabad

Email: [haider787hs@yahoo.com](mailto:haider787hs@yahoo.com)

**Maria Rehman**

Research Scholar, University College London

Email: [rehman.maria100@gmail.com](mailto:rehman.maria100@gmail.com)

**Sheikh Muhammad Mughees**

**Corresponding Author**

Lecturer in English, Abbottabad University of Science & Technology

Email: [sheikhmughees@aust.edu.pk](mailto:sheikhmughees@aust.edu.pk)

### **Abstract**

*This paper explores how AI-driven interactive narrative platforms redefine traditional concepts like narrative agency, authorship, and language production through a post-human lens. Drawing on post-humanist theory, enactive cognition, and distributed agency frameworks, the study investigates how generative AI systems—particularly large language models (LLMs) deployed in platforms such as AI Dungeon—participate actively in meaning-making rather than functioning as neutral tools. Using a mixed-method synthesis of theoretical literature and empirical studies on AI-based storytelling systems, the research demonstrates that narrative agency in contemporary interactive narratives emerges from entanglements among human users, computational architectures, training datasets, and platform affordances. The analysis foregrounds a critical transformation of shifting users from autonomous storytellers to hybrid participants who become co-authors, collaborators, and data subjects simultaneously, whose creative efforts contribute to algorithmic optimization. Case studies of GPT-based narrative generation highlight how the narrative possibilities and production of emergent stories are enabled and controlled by text generation, genre recognition, and memory architectures through participatory sense-making. The findings challenge anthropocentric models of creativity, refute human-exclusive agency, and establish the distribution of agency by supporting post-humanist arguments. The paper concludes that AI narrative platforms constitute cultural assemblages that fundamentally modify storytelling practices, raising important implications for narratology, digital humanities, AI ethics, and the governance of creative labor.*

**Keywords:** Storytelling; Data subjects; AI-driven narratives; Posthumanism; Agency; Digital humanities

### **Introduction**

Storytelling has always been an art centred as human linguistic activity that functions as a meaning-making process. There could be multiple functions of storytelling, which is not a mere tool of preservation of cultural memories, but also a source leading to the imagination of alternative realities. Historically, thus storytellers were treated as privileged agents in society, being the only sources of historical knowledge for the folk. As a result, they were allowed to control the discourse single-handedly. On the other side, in the modern era, there are multiple sources for narrative building stemming particularly from Media and Technology. Especially now, AI (Artificial Intelligence) tools are helping people to generate more coherent and context-sensitive narratives, leading to destabilizing anthropocentric assumptions. These AI systems use LLMs (Large Language Models) like GPT-3 and GPT-4. Weatherby (2024) describes these AI systems as

“language machines”. Braidotti (2013) argues in her work on posthumanism for moving beyond Enlightenment models of the autonomous human subject, emphasizing instead how agency is distributed across human and nonhuman actors, technologies, and material processes.

In the contemporary era of technological and specifically AI progression, the old concept of agency is not just being challenged, rather it has already been changed. The systems, now using a collaboration of AI and human effort, generate stories in real time alongside visuals. AI Dungeon, an interactive storytelling game that co-authors narratives, is one of the best instances of these advancements. Koenitz (2023) describes them as proto-stories that do not have fixed stories; they provide fragments with potentialities enabling humans to co-author stories with the help of AI systems.

### **Narrative Agency: Historical Background**

The traditional literary theory of storytelling was completely anchored with the authors' perspectives and their created fictional characters to create a story world. However, the age of digital media requires a new theory for narrative building that is no longer tightly anchored to authors and fictional characters, leading to the distribution of agency (Knoller, 2010). As a result, conceptualization of agency is essential. Therefore, to re-conceptualize the previous frameworks, Murray (2004) identifies the agency as meaningful action that produces visible outcomes. In case of interactive games, describing this co-authorship, Stang (2019, p. 19) opines “...agency as ‘the satisfying power to take meaningful action and see the results of our decisions and choices,’ and pointed out that players desire this subjective experience of power and control.”

The early text-based games, which were dependent upon text-based adventure games that helped players connect with the world of their imagination (Montfort, 2005), have been transformed into hyperfiction, a type of hypertext fiction. They help the users, being nonlinear in nature, to navigate narratives using hyperlinks, textual nodes to foreground their choices, and multiplicity of meanings (Landow, 1997). Digital environments, as described by Murray (1997), are spaces where narrative agency is computationally mediated. Later scholars like Ryan (2015) and Riedl & Young (2010) argue that “*AI-driven narrative systems dynamically adapt story structures through procedural and algorithmic mechanisms*,” fundamentally reshaping authorship and narrative control in interactive storytelling.

In early interactive fictions, the agency of user was limited because the branching paths were predefined. However, the contemporary AI systems as compared to older environment are much more dynamic that respond directly to the users' inputs. Walton (2019) describes these systems as expended narrative possibility spaces.

### **Key concepts: Definitions**

Storyteller, according to the traditional definition, is an autonomous person who, through the selection of linguistic possibilities to craft a coherent story world, can deliberately and easily control the narrative discourse. Here, in the case of traditional storytelling, the language agency is used to shape the meanings within a communicative context purposefully through linguistic actions (Ahearn, 2001). With the advent of AI, the agency has not remained as simple and straightforward as it used to be. Now, in case of AI narrative, the old definition is a misfit for the good reason of the ability of generative systems to construct intentional narratives.

### **Interactive Narratives and AI**

According to Koenitz (2015), interactive narratives are ‘narrative expressions in various forms, implemented as multimodal computational systems with optional analog elements and experienced

through a participatory process in which interactors have a non-trivial influence on progress, perspective, content, and/or outcome'. Koenitz (2015) explores that interactive narratives are, first of all, computational which include different modes that allow users to participate in the process of storytelling. Till this stage, they remain a pre-authored product where a user has limited choices, already defined and constructed by the author. However, when the same narratives are powered by AI and particularly by the large language models, then these systems are able to generate open-ended content where users can have a variety of choices to pick and choose. The moderation and development have elevated these systems to the level where they are not mere rule governed. They can interact that Weatherby (2024) describes as cultural actors that actively participate in meaning-making instead of just passively executing human constructed set of instructions.

### Post humanism

The theory of posthumanism challenges the old notion of humanism. Braidotti (2013) and Hayles (1999) theorized that only humans possess the supremacy to occupy agency, intention, and the ability to create meanings. However, posthumanism rejects this notion by establishing that the agency is no more just in the control of humans; rather, now they share it with technology and non-human elements.

The concept of transhuman explains that technology is just to serve the human being to excel their performance and abilities. However, critical post-humanism is much away from the belief in the centrality of humanism. Mellamphy (2021, p. 47) opines as follows: "current 'human-centered AI frameworks tend to be strongly anthropocentric ... framing AI in terms of human moral agency fails to question the logic of domination and transcendence that defines prevalent conceptions of human/nonhuman relations". Consequently, one can believe that post-humanism is not the center for the control of all non-human things.

### Research Questions

The study endeavours to address the following research questions:

1. How do modern AI narrative platforms streamline fundamental concepts of authorship and narrative agency?
2. In what ways do users of AI narrative systems transition from storytellers to data subjects, and what are the implications of this transformation?
3. How can post-humanist theoretical frameworks illuminate the distributed nature of agency in AI-driven narrative contexts?
4. What empirical evidence exists regarding how language agency operates within specific AI narrative platforms?

### Literature Review

The intersectionality between narrative and AI has attracted attention of scholars towards multiple disciplines that include game studies, computational linguistics, narratology and digital humanities. The following literature review is done to synthesize three main areas which are:

- The studies done on AI and narrative generation
- Theoretical frameworks for understanding distributed agency in computational systems
- Post-humanist approaches to technology and agency

To understand LLMs and generative AI, the work of Weatherby offer a fair understanding of analysis of language machines where he argues: "What I call '*remainder humanism*' names the defensive strategy of defining the human negatively, as whatever remains once machines have been shown capable of performing previously 'human capacities'." (Weatherby, 2024).

Weatherby's viewpoint may also be perceived as a warning for human beings, as the machines are gradually learning majority of the roles currently undertaken by humans. As a result, machines are gradually and unnoticeably replacing majority human folk roles in society and specifically in language. They are not merely replacing in plain and literal communication rather are able to generate complex and poetic stuff quicker and much larger than of those being with exceptional capacities.

Wang and Wang's (2025) approach of posthumanism to AI literacy foregrounds the requirement to redefine the human-machine relationship. The concept of Intra-Actions, which Barad (2007) introduced, where he discloses the agency realism to describe how human meaning-making with AI involves mutual co-constitution. Here, he defines the concept of unidirectionality, which means that machines are no more behaving as mere aid for humans, rather they are developing their own domain to behave and perform as parallel species to human beings. Subsequently, the authorship is not just in the control of human beings.

### **Methodology**

The research is based on theoretical qualitative synthesis and includes systematic research, theoretical analysis, and synthesis of empirical research on AI narrative platforms. The research design is a combination of post-humanist theoretical frameworks and evidence of the computational narrative research to form a complete picture of changing agency in language in AI-based interactive narratives.

### **Data Collection Strategy**

The study is based on various data in order to provide a full coverage of both theoretical and empirical aspects.

**Peer-reviewed academic sources:** Systematic searches of the large academic databases such as Scopus, Google Scholar, IEEE Xplore, ACM Digital Library, and Web of Science were conducted to find the literature on interactive narratives, AI storytelling systems, posthumanism, and distributed agency. Searches were done on 2010-2025 to include both classical work and current developments.

**Empirical studies:** Publications using user studies, analysis of gameplay and qualitative research of AI narrative experiences offered empirical support to theorizing.

**Philosophy and theoretical writings:** Posthumanism, enactive cognition and agency theory Foundational writings in posthumanism, enactive cognition and agency theory developed conceptual frameworks to be used in analysing.

### **Analytical Framework**

It uses a tripartite theoretical framework that combines:

1. Post-humanist views of technology and agency (Braidotti, 2013; Weatherby, 2024; Mellamphy, 2021), which considers how AI systems challenge anthropocentric ideas of language and creativity;
2. Enactive cognition theory (Varela et al., 1991; Popova, 2014; Caracciolo, 2014) which can be used to analyse how narrative meaning is generated by participatory sense; and
3. Distributed agency frameworks (Harrell & Zhu, 2021), which focuses on the distribution of the narrative control across human-machine assemblages rather than residing in individual agents.

## Analysis and Results

This chapter is a synthesis of the empirical data on studies of AI narrative platforms and theoretical study to show that the language agency is being redistributed in modern interactive storytelling systems. The analysis has been carried out by analyzing the particular platforms, recording the agency changes and the theoretical explanation of the changes.

### Case Study: AI Dungeon and GPT-Based Narrative Generation

In 2019, Latitude created AI Dungeon, which is one of the most popular interactive narrative platforms that rely on AI. Having been developed based on GPT-2 and later upgraded to GPT-3 and GPT-4, the platform allows users to create open-ended narrative experiences by responding to the AI system in text (Walton, 2019). Empirical studies of AI Dungeon show that the narrative agency is complicated. The research by De Souza Mendes et al. (2025) compared the performance of the GPT-3.5 and GPT-4 in the task of generating interactive narratives, and revealed that both models had the potential to generate interesting stories. However, there were significant issues such as narrative drift, inconsistent character behaviour, and loss of plot coherence over long interactions. Of significance, their user research showed that participants treated the AI as having authorship and not as a tool. One participant asserted that the AI seemed to have its own ideas regarding the narrative plot, and sometimes its ideas appeared better than mine.

This understanding corresponds to the theoretical argument presented by Weatherby (2024) according to which LLCs are cultural agents, as opposed to inert tools. The AI Dungeon system does not passively take user input commands, instead it continues the narrative according to a probabilistic distribution based on very large training corpora. As already shown in systematic analysis of AI Dungeon gameplay sessions by Ferreira (2025), the system often adds some unexpected narrative, genre, and character stereotypes which the user has to accept, resist, or negotiate when responding to the following prompts.

The architecture of the platform itself represents the distributed agency. Although users initiate prompts and continue providing input, the system influences the flow of the narrative through its trained initiating patterns, identification of genres and maintaining coherence systems. This forms a hermeneutic strip, as Mitchell and Harrell (2015) note in their discussion of interactive narrative systems, in which users interpret system output, modify their own inputs in accordance, and enter into a cycle of negotiation of meaning with the computational agent.

### The Transformation from Storyteller to Data Subject

The second important but underestimated aspect of AI narrative platforms is how the interaction between users can be used as additional data to improve systems and train them further. When people interact with AI Dungeon or other similar applications, their textual prompts play two roles of generating the story and collecting information to improve the model. This turns users into independent narrators into what could be described as data subjects - people whose creative works are raw material to optimize using algorithms. This change has a far-reaching extent on narrative agency. Conventional storytelling is such that authors retain rights and control over their creative work. In AI narrative systems, the connection shifts to more complicated and asymmetrical. The terms of service used on platforms normally provide companies with widespread authority to user-created content. In the case of AI Dungeon, this involves making use of player interactions to enhance AI models, a feedback mechanism in which users train the system that is supposedly supposed to serve them. In the post-humanist approach, such an arrangement is the case of the collapse of boundaries between the human and the machine, the creator and the creation as



postulated by Haraway (1991). Users are concurrently: (1) Agents making narrative choice by giving prompts and edits, (2) Collaborators that co-author with AI systems and (3) Data subjects whose input drives algorithmic learning. The multiplicity cannot be easily categorised, but requires the acknowledgment of distributed, entangled forms of agency.

### **Enactive Dynamics in AI Narrative Systems**

The enactive cognition theory offers essential evidence on the way the meaning is created within the AI narratives. Narrative understanding as Popova (2014) posits, is not the process of decoding existing meanings but is instead the participatory sense-making between the narrator and the reader. This participatory aspect enhances AI narrative systems because the text and the narrator are both actively built as a result of interaction.

Take the case of a user who interacts with AI Dungeon. They give a first hint: 'You are a detective in a noir-ish city. The system creates a scene: Rain hammers on your window office. The dame that just entered is trouble--you see that by the way her heels ware on linoleum.' This production is not determined in advance but is a result of model training on the noir-genre texts, probabilistic generation and contextual knowledge. The answer of the user is: 'I inquire of her what takes her here. The AI proceeds: 'With shaking hands, she lights a cigarette. He is murdered, my husband, she says.

This dialogue is an example of enactive meaning-making. The story is a result neither of the user nor the AI, but the combination of both. The recognition of the genre of the AI influences what narrative possibilities it has; what a user chooses, and prompts are used determine which possibilities are realised. The story world is performed in this dynamic interaction as opposed to existing as an entity, as supported by Caracciolo (2014).

This enactive interpretation is backed up by empirical evidence. In her article on ChatGPT as a Dungeon Master in a tabletop gaming context, Triyason (2023) observed that positive narrative experiences were based on ongoing mutual adaptation between human participants and AI. In cases where the AI was unable to read the intentions of the players or when the players did not correctly interpret the AI outputs, the narrative collapsed and needed negotiations and repair. This shows that meaning is not given out but constructed in a participatory way through continuous sense making by both parties.

### **Language Agency as Distributed Phenomenon**

The fact on the AI narrative platforms justifies the re-conceptualisation of the agent of language as largely distributed instead of individualised. Conventional understandings of agency are found in the individual human writers who set out to construct narratives deliberately with the aim of providing meanings. The model is incompetent to explain the modern-day narrative production, as AI narrative systems demonstrate.

The concept of language agency in AI narratives functions on many levels at the same time. On the immediate interactional level, agency is exercised when the user is able to come up with immediate formulation, option selection, and narrative editions. The users of AI Dungeon have the opportunity to restart the generations, modify the results, and clearly tell the system what they want to remember in the future (Latitude, 2020). This seems to give the users excessive control. But on a more fundamental architectural level, the training, genre-recognising and probabilistic generation procedures that the AI system entails limit the narrative options that arise as options to be selected. The analysis presented by Ferreira (2025) indicated that even when people tried to develop non-stereotypical characters or atypical plot development, AI Dungeon tended to follow

the tropes of the genre and cultural stereotypes that the AI-powered text generator trained on. Users complained that the AI would add unintended romantic subplots, revert to violent conflict resolution, or recreate objectionable racial and gender tropes even when such was against the intention of the user.

This exposes the distributed agency between user intentions and system affordances and volumes of human cultural production that demands such training corpus to form the model. As Weatherby (2024) suggests, LLMs are not a neutral instrument of linguistics, but a particular structure of cultural knowledge, ideological suppositions, and aesthetic fashions. Users are given the tools to interact with these internal cultural structures when they create stories in AI Dungeon, as opposed to having free creative agency.

### **Memory, Persistence, and Narrative Coherence**

The AI & Storytelling project by Kings College London conducted a research that examined how the memory processes within the AI characters change the narrative dynamics. The way they created AI agents in the Charisma system that were able to recall previous interactions, knew that they had been deceived, and themselves were the ones who are deceiving showed how computational memory is fundamentally different in comparison to human narrative memory (To Play For, 2018-2020).

Human narrators use narrative memory strategically, which involves deciding what to focus on, what to skip and how to rewrite the events of the past to create a dramatic effect. In contrast, the AI systems work under the alternative memory structures context windows, attention mechanisms and explicit memory features which can be filled by the user with the important information. These technical processes generate varied opportunities and constraints of narrative unity.

Experiments in the Charisma system showed that AI characters could falsify events with a sense of authenticity to users, to introduce interesting narrative wrinkles, but also forget vital plot elements, to the detriment of immersion. This illustrates the way that the narrative agency gets caught up in technical architectures. The memory features of the system make some narrative possibilities possible (long-term relationships between characters that develop with time), and some impossible (long-term story lines that must be recalled outside the context window limits).

### **Discussion**

The results of this research paper indicate that interactive narrative technologies based on AI essentially restructure the classical ideas of narrative agency, authorship, and linguistic imagination. Instead of being the tools which enhance the creative power of the human being, these systems are directly involved in the production of the narrative, and this complicates the difference between human narrators and computational agents. It is here that the findings are interpreted using post-humanist and enactive theoretical perspectives, compared with the current knowledge base and their theoretical and practical implications are stated.

### **Theoretical Interpretation**

Anthropocentric agency models are highly criticised by post-humanism, which is well supported by the empirical evidence. The challenge to leave the Enlightenment ideas of autonomous human subjects offered by Braidotti (2013) is premonstrous when applied to the AI stories. Consumers of such sites as AI Dungeon cannot be interpreted as the author of the creative control of the passive tools of computation. Rather, agency arises as a consequence of entanglement both users define narratives by prompts and choices, and AI systems define the possibilities of narratives by their trained fashions, genre awareness, and generation processes.

The idea of remainder humanism presented by Weatherby (2024) helps understand that a seemingly standard reaction to AI skills is to protect human exceptionalism by highlighting what AI is not capable of as the key fundamental of humanity. Applied to narrative, this is presented in the assertion that effective creativity, purposeful authorship, or genuine storytelling are only human abilities in spite of the AI capacity to create sensible narratives. Yet, as the data shows, these assumptions become more and more unconvincing as AI systems generate the stories that are more interesting, logical, and even better than the ones created by the users in some ways.

Post-humanist analysis proposes new ways of thinking about creativity and agency, as distributed properties, rather than protecting the monopoly of human narrative. The most theoretically fruitful conceptualisation accepts AI narrative platforms as assemblage where human intentions, computational architecture, training data, interface designs, and user communities are all matters of narrative possibility. The authorship is shared within this assemblage instead of being concentrated within the individual human agents.

### **Enactive Cognition and Participatory Sense-Making**

The enactive cognition theory offers important insights into the emergence of the narrative meaning in AI context. Both the application of enactivism to narrative understanding presented by Popova (2014) and Caracciolo (2014) note that stories are not objects that are transmitted between authors and readers but are instead experiences practiced via participatory sense-making. This model is especially effective in the interpretation of AI stories.

Text in the traditional reading experience is a relatively fixed artefact, the interpretation of which is done by the readers. The text in AI narrative platforms is an emergent phenomenon, that is, there is no story to be found but is instead a dynamic process that unfolds as a result of continuous interaction between user and system. This deepens the enactive aspect: the narrative content as well as the reading/creating experience are constituted by participatory sense-making.

The enactive interpretation is supported by the evidence of users saying that they feel collaborative in the systems of AI, that the AI has its own ideas, and that the produced AI content genuinely surprises them. According to these phenomenological reports, AI systems are not perceived as impassive tools either but as an agent engaged in collaborative sense-making processes. The story comes out of the relationship of user and the system and neither can be considered to be in total control of the other.

### **Comparison with Existing Research**

The results of the current study are affirmed and improve prior studies on computational narratives. The work by Riedl and Young (2010) that provided the backbone of the research on intelligent narrative technologies highlighted a conflict between user agency and narrative coherence as the core of interactive storytelling. The existing evidence indicates that AI-based systems reconstruct instead of solving this tension. GPT-based systems provide far more narrative possibility space than plan-based systems, with this space comes fresh challenges to coherence maintenance, genre drift, and the reproduction of stereotypical patterns.

The AI narrative platforms provide strong empirical evidence of the distributed narrative agency framework by Harrell and Zhu (2021). Their conceptual argument regarding agency as a contextually-based idea that arises out of the user-system interaction is correct. But the analysis presented now builds upon them by illustrating how distributed agency can be performed by specific architectures of LLCs, that is, by attention mechanisms, context windows, and



probabilistic generation processes which are fundamentally different than the rule-based or plan-based systems of the past.

The fact that users have turned into data subjects is a new contribution to the existing research. Although the social media and online arena has been explored in data extraction by privacy researchers, little attention has been given to the particularities of how the creation of a narrative turns into a piece of training information to be utilized by generative AI-based systems. This paper shows that AI narrative platforms develop strange value extraction practices in which creative work fulfills both short-term experiential functions and long-term optimization algorithms.

### **Theoretical Implications**

The results have serious implications on various theoretical fields. In the case of narratology, the paper indicates that triangulations between authors, readers and text that have always been based on the author-reader and author-text must be reconsidered fundamentally in case of AI-generated narratives. The author is diffused among human users, computing systems, the creators of the training data, and the creators of platform designers. Text becomes unstable, and it only exists as a specific manifestation of generative possibilities. The reader is, at once, a co-creator, and his or her inputs determine the emergence of the narratives.

In the case of digital humanities, the discussion illustrates that it is important to take seriously the post-humanist theoretical approaches. The AI technologies cannot be properly perceived within the humanist paradigms that perceive them as the neutral instruments that are used by humans. Rather, they need relational, distributed conceptions of agency which acknowledge how technological systems constructively influence the circumstances of human thought and action.

Regarding AI ethics and governance, the results indicate that AI narrative platforms bring forth issues beyond issues of bias, fairness, and transparency. They also implicate the problems of creative work, information sovereignty and the redistribution of cultural production possibilities. As the narrative posts of the users are turned into training data, the issue of intellectual property, equitable compensation, and the politics of the production of the algorithmic culture makes its appearance.

### **Practical Implications**

To platform designers and developers, the analysis indicates that it is relevant to: (1) Be transparent about how user inputs are used to generate training data and user rights, (2) Interface design that brings out the distributed agency and not hide AI contributions, (3) Mechanisms that allow users to comprehend and possibly challenge the embedded biases and stereotypes in AI outputs, and (4) To carefully consider the memory architectures and the implications they have on narrative coherence and user experience.

To researchers and educators, AI narrative platforms provide a chance to answer the most basic questions concerning the creativity, authorship, and language. They may be used as pedagogic instruments in studying how meaning is produced through human-machine interaction, how cultural bias is included in AI systems and how narrative conventions determine what narratives can be told.

To policymakers and legal academics, the process of transforming narrative creators into data subjects creates pressing questions regarding the framework of intellectual property, the rights to data, and the responsibility of the platform. The existing legal frameworks that have been created to accommodate conventional authorship and publishing might turn out to be insufficient in AI narrative-related scenarios where the creation and data mining are inseparable.

## Conclusion

It has discussed the way AI-driven interactive narrative platforms restructure the traditional notions of the agency of language, authorship, and storytelling. Using the post-humanist theoretical frameworks, enactive cognition theory and the study of the available empirical studies on sites such as AI Dungeon, the analysis reveals the core changes in the narration agency in the era of generative AI.

## Summary of Key Findings

The study confirms some relevant findings. In the first instance, AI narrative platforms exhibit distributed agency in which narrative control is formed by entanglement among human agents with the computational systems, training datasets, and platform affordances as opposed to existing in individual actors. Second, consumers of such platforms fill several overlapping positions as creators who make creative choices, contributors who write with AI systems, and data breakers who contribute to algorithm training. Third, narrative meaning in AI situations occurs by way of participatory sense-making between users and systems instead of passed on by existing texts. Fourth, AI architectures limit and facilitate language agency maintaining cultural patterns, conventions of genres, and ideological assumptions on training data.

These results reinforce post-humanist arguments against anthropocentric models of agency and empirically justify theoretical arguments on distributed cognition and enacted meaning-making. They show that AI narrative systems are not passive instruments that enhance the impact of human creativity but active actors in cultural production that change the potencies of narrative.

## Limitations of the Study

This research encounters a number of weaknesses that should be noted. To start with, the AI development is too fast, and, according to this fact, the results related to using particular platforms are likely to become outdated as systems change. The use of GPT-4 and the next generation models can have other features than their predecessors used in the mentioned studies. Second, the analysis is based on the available published literature as opposed to conducting an empirical study of the user experiences. Although this allows the synthesis of theory comprehensively, first-hand phenomenological data may contribute to the knowledge of the experience of distributed agency by users.

Third, the review has been conducted with the main emphasis on the text-based narrative platforms, which might not be generalized to multimodal AI storytelling systems that also include pictures, audio, or video. Fourth, the idea of cultural and linguistic diversity in AI narrative experiences is under-researched - the majority of studies focus on the English-language platform and Majority-Western user bases. Fifth, the theoretical frameworks used in the study are based on Western philosophical traditions of posthumanism and cognitive science and may sideline other intellectual traditions and their conceptual resources.

## Future Research Directions

The results indicate that there are several prospects of future research. The lived experience of distributed agency in AI narrative feature could be investigated in empirical phenomenological research by qualitative designs such as interviews, think-aloud procedures, and segmented gameplay procedures. This kind of study would show what the user understands by their interaction with AI systems and whether they feel a sense of agency distributed or centred on them.

Comparison of various AI narrative platforms may help underscore how agency distributions are determined by particular architectural decisions, interface design, and business models. As an example, the comparison of open-source models that could be changed by the user with proprietary platforms could help identify the impacts of technical accessibility on the agency system.

The politics of the AI narrative of the creative labour can be tracked by critical analyses of how creative work is sucked out, commodified, and re-distributed. Such studies may utilize political economy approaches to the study of the platform capitalism within cultural production in terms of questions of ownership, exploitation, and resistance.

Cross-cultural/multilingual research may explore the possibility of differences in how distributed agency is mediated in different language and cultural settings. Is there a difference in non-Western narrative tradition interaction with AI systems that are trained on English texts mostly? What is the role of cultural expectations of authorship and creativity in influencing the experience of AI narrative platforms by users?

It is possible to conduct longitudinal studies in which the perception of users of AI narrative systems can be measured over time. Are there differences between conceptualization of agency in experienced and new users? What are the longer-term impacts of the use of AI storytelling on the larger conceptions of creativity and authorship by users?

Lastly, the interventionist design research might also examine other options in architecture and interface design to render distributed agency more legible and navigable. What user interface designs could contribute to user understanding of AI contributions better? What would it take to design platforms in a way that make users more aware and have more control over the way their inputs are turned into training data?

### **Final Reflection**

The metamorphosis of the storytellers into the data subject is a drastic change in the manner in which human linguistic creativity functions in the computational sense. AI narrative platforms expose that the process of human and language relations is being restructured by algorithmic mediations. Instead of opposing this change with the attempt to appeal to the idea of human exceptionalism, post-humanist analysis proposes to enter in this change critically and creatively, with the awareness of both the potential and risks of distributed narrative agency.

Digital humanities, computational linguistics, narrative studies, have the challenge of working in such a new reality and building frameworks sufficient to it. The conventional theoretical materials used in human texts are not relevant in the interpretation of AI-generated texts.

New conceptual instruments are required, new instruments that can be used to explain distributed agency, enactive meaning-making, and the inseparability of human creativity and computation. With the ever-growing development of generative AI potentials, narrative agency will ever exist as a question. The results and models introduced in the present work provide primary tools to refer to when addressing these questions, yet further studies, critical thinking, and ethics discussion will become a necessity as AI systems take up more and more positions in cultural production. Post-human nature of narrative is not a far-off future possibility but a new reality that has to be given the necessary academic care.

## References

- Aarseth, E. J. (1997). *Cybertext: Perspectives on ergodic literature*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ahearn, L. M. (2001). Language and agency. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, 109–137. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.30.1.109>
- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Duke University Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The posthuman*. Polity Press.
- Caracciolo, M. (2014). *The experientiality of narrative: An enactivist approach*. De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110365658>
- de Souza Mendes, A. C., Adsero, M., Palicka, J., Gouveia, R., Zagalo, N., & Roque, L. (2025). AI-crafted narratives: An empirical study on generating interactive stories using generative pre-training transformers. *Applied Intelligence*, 55, 1004. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10489-025-06833-3>
- De Jaegher, H., & Di Paolo, E. (2007). Participatory sense-making: An enactive approach to social cognition. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 6, 485–507. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11097-007-9076-9>
- Di Paolo, E. A., & De Jaegher, H. (2012). The interactive brain hypothesis. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 6, Article 163. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2012.00163>
- Ferreira, C. (2025). Genre, bias, and narrative logic in AI Dungeon: Generative AI as a game-based storytelling engine. *Hipertext.net*, 26. <https://doi.org/10.31009/hipertext.net.2025.i26.01>
- Haraway, D. J. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*. Routledge.
- Harrell, D. F., & Zhu, J. (2021). Agency play: Dimensions of agency for interactive narrative design. In R. Aylett et al. (Eds.), *Interactive storytelling* (pp. 44–52). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-16638-9>
- Hayles, N. K. (1999). *How we became posthuman: Virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature, and informatics*. University of Chicago Press.
- Knoller, N. (2010). Agency and the art of interactive digital storytelling. In R. Aylett et al. (Eds.), *Interactive storytelling* (pp. 264–267). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-16638-9\\_38](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-16638-9_38)
- Koenitz, H. (2015). Towards a specific theory of interactive digital narrative. In H. Koenitz et al. (Eds.), *Interactive digital narrative* (pp. 91–105). Routledge.
- Koenitz, H. (2023). Interactive digital narrative (IDN)—A complexity case. *New Review of Hypermedia and Multimedia*, 29(1–2), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13614568.2023.2173385>
- Latitude. (2020). *AI Dungeon: Features and capabilities*. <https://aidungeon.com>
- Mellamphy, N. B. (2021). Re-thinking human-centric AI: An introduction to posthumanist critique. *Europe Now Journal*. <https://www.europenowjournal.org/2021/11/07/re-thinking-human-centric-ai-an-introduction-to-posthumanist-critique/>
- Mitchell, A., & Harrell, D. F. (2015). Reflective rereading and the SimCity effect in interactive stories. In H. Schoenau-Fog et al. (Eds.), *Interactive storytelling* (pp. 27–39). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-27036-4\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-27036-4_3)
- Murray, J. H. (1997). *Hamlet on the Holodeck: The future of narrative in cyberspace*. MIT Press.
- Murray, J. H. (2004). From game-story to cyberdrama. In N. Wardrip-Fruin & P. Harrigan (Eds.), *First person: New media as story, performance, and game* (pp. 2–11). MIT Press.

- Popova, Y. B. (2014). Narrativity and enaction: The social nature of literary narrative understanding. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, Article 895.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00895>
- Riedl, M. O., & Young, R. M. (2010). Narrative planning: Balancing plot and character. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 39, 217–268. <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.2989>
- Ryan, M.-L. (2015). *Narrative as virtual reality 2: Revisiting immersion and interactivity in literature and electronic media*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Triyason, T. (2023). Exploring the potential of ChatGPT as a Dungeon Master in Dungeons & Dragons tabletop games. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Advances in Information Technology* (pp. 1–6). ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3628454.3628457>
- Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (1991). *The embodied mind: Cognitive science and human experience*. MIT Press.
- Walton, N. (2019). *AI Dungeon* [Software]. Latitude. <https://aidungeon.com>
- Wang, Z., & Wang, C. (2025). A posthumanist approach to AI literacy. *Computers and Composition*, 75, 102896. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2025.102896>
- Weatherby, L. (2024). *Language machines: Cultural AI and the end of remainder humanism*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Zaini, A., Fowler, A., Amor, R., & Wünsche, B. C. (2025). Character-driven storytelling design for digital games: A scoping review. *Games and Culture*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15554120251380423>