

---

# A Sociological Inquiry into Literature in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

Boris Latinović

University “Union – Nikola Tesla”, Belgrade, Serbia

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10200261>

Received: 14 February 2026; Accepted: 20 February 2026; Published: 05 March 2026

## ABSTRACT

This article explores literature in the age of artificial intelligence as a site where technology, power, and human imagination converge and quietly collide. It advances a sociological inquiry into how algorithmic systems reshape authorship, authority, and the production of meaning. Artificial intelligence is not treated merely as a tool but as a structural actor within the literary field, reconfiguring symbolic capital, institutional hierarchies, and the boundaries between creator and creation. Drawing on theories of cultural production and social systems, the study examines how machine learning models alter narrative form, aesthetic evaluation, and the circulation of texts. It argues that literature is entering a phase in which authorship becomes distributed, creativity hybridized, and interpretation increasingly mediated by computational infrastructures. Beneath the surface of efficiency and innovation lies a deeper transformation of epistemic power. Who speaks when a text is generated by an algorithm trained on collective memory. Who owns imagination when data becomes the raw material of culture. The article situates these questions within broader trajectories of digital modernity, considering both emancipatory potentials and new regimes of control. It proposes that literature remains a critical arena for negotiating human agency in technologically saturated societies. Rather than announcing the end of the human author, the analysis suggests a redefinition of literary subjectivity, one that reflects shifting configurations of knowledge, authority, and social legitimacy. In this emerging epoch, literature becomes a diagnostic instrument of civilizational change, revealing not only what we create with machines, but what we are becoming through them.

**Keywords:** Sociology of Literature, Cultural Production, Artificial Intelligence, Digital Society, Digital Modernity

## INTRODUCTION

More than just a form of storytelling, literature is also a cultural institution, a way for societies to keep their pasts, a battleground for how to express their dreams of the future. All the different eras have formed their own views of themselves through their literature. The most profound push to recast what “author” means is underway right now, courtesy of AI. In addition to supporting writers, AI generates new materials both by prediction and by combining small bits of language to create a larger working concept. For instance, AI writing exists and operates in the literary community as an active participant in creating a culture, rather than as something that only helps people create culture. The emergence of algorithms that can produce poetry, fiction, and essays is shaking up how we categorize sociological concepts like authorship, creativity, authority, and legitimacy.

This article takes a sociological perspective of artificial intelligence as a set of structures in relation to the conditions of late modern society. AI technologies provide a window into the larger social structures that are defining the nature of how we understand one another economically, politically, and socially. AI will also cause the literary community to go through a metamorphosis. By redistributing the ability for authors and the agency that comes with the ability to create new ideas through the use of the written language, AI will greatly alter how authorities are established to define how we produce and use written language. The transformation of the way that we understand the emergence of literature will not, however, mean that people will no longer be authors. The writer will continue to exist and will continue to claim authorship;

however, the way that we think about being a writer and the idea of authority will be redefined through hybrid creative systems. This approach will move from a technological perspective to a sociological point of view. By looking at the structures and relationships between institutions rather than at technology as a source of wonder, we will gain greater insight into the power relationships and the nature of relationships in society.

Methodologically, this article employs a critical sociological analysis of the contemporary literary field, integrating structural theories of cultural production with digital sociology. To ground the theoretical propositions, the study utilizes a comparative case-study approach, analysing specific instances of AI-assisted literary production. By contrasting traditional institutional responses with decentralized digital publishing environments, this methodology bridges the gap between abstract structural shifts and observable empirical phenomena, ensuring that the theoretical framework is strictly anchored in actual literary practices.

### **Theoretical Foundations of the Sociology of Literature**

Just as sociologists have long viewed literary production as being part of social structure, sociologists have long understood that texts are not simply autonomous art objects. Rather, literary works are shaped by broader structures (such as institutions, markets, educational systems, and symbolic hierarchies) within which they take place. Sociologists have documented the proliferation of quantitative measures in different fields and industries (Chun, 2025). Most cultural sociologists still accept the well-established boundaries between the literary and the sociological, thus leaving literature stripped of its aesthetic qualities (Vána, *Theorizing the social through literary fiction: For a new sociology of literature*, 2020). Authors undertake their work from positions of power and recognition in fields defined by their respective contexts. Readers, in turn, interpret literary texts from historical perspectives of meaning.

Sociology and literature have influenced each other deeply since the foundation of the social sciences (Vána, Sally Rooney and *Cultural Sociology of Literature: Towards Epistemological Symmetry within Literature-and-Society Research*, 2025). Sociological theorists of literature argue that literature and social change are interconnected. That is, literature often crystallizes collective experiences before political discussions have been fully developed through various forms of literature (e.g., realism, modernism, and postmodernism) that were reflective of significant societal transformations associated with industrialization, urbanization, and globalization. Thus, literature reflects or refracts respective shifts from a structural standpoint but, at times, anticipates those eventual shifts.

However, contemporary sociological theory has broadened this view to include systems theory, cultural materialism and field analysis. A sociologist of culture recently referred to "such a conceptual framework not only as unsociological or incompatible with scientific sociology," but also comparable to "a parasitic plant" that "draws off the healthy sap of a tree" (Lowenthal, 2020). Thus, field theory allows one to view the literary field as both relatively autonomous from other fields and as having an internal logic, or system, of recognition based upon prestige, aesthetic value, and institutional recognition, while being conditioned by political and economic forces. In addition, symbolic capital is often viewed as existing alongside financial capital. Therefore, canon formation, prize-giving systems, and academic curricula may also serve to legitimize literary works.

Sociology, as the science of society, is tasked with analysing these transformations, while ethics raises questions about the moral boundaries of technology (Latinović B. K., 2025). With the introduction of AI into this field, various levels of structure are experienced as a result of texts being produced, distributed, evaluated and received. Furthermore, the entry of AI into the literary field also blurs the boundaries between "professional" and "amateur" authorship and removes some of the barriers to access and entry into the literary field. The introduction of AI also complicates existing forms of intellectual property, introduces algorithmic curation processes into the publishing ecosystem, and thus presents challenges for existing theoretical models. Drawing from a systems perspective, literature has traditionally been seen as a part of the larger social system as a subsystem that processes meaning through narrative codes. However, artificial intelligence has changed the communicative structure of literature as a subsystem of society by speeding

---

up the loops of feedback that exist between production and reception as literature is produced and through which data is transformed into forms of cultural raw materials. It intensifies reflexivity, as literature becomes increasingly aware of its own technological mediation.

At the same time, critical political economy reminds us that AI systems are not neutral. They are embedded within corporate infrastructures, trained on vast repositories of human expression, and governed by proprietary algorithms. Thus, the sociological analysis must account for asymmetries of power embedded within technological design. Theoretical integration is therefore essential. The sociology of literature in the age of artificial intelligence must synthesize cultural theory, digital sociology, and political economy. Only through such synthesis can we grasp the full magnitude of the transformation underway.

### **Sociology of Literature as Analytical Framework**

The sociology of literature does not inquire whether a text possesses aesthetic qualities, but it examines how aesthetic qualities are created and come to be perceived as such. In addition, sociology does not start with inspiration; instead, it begins with structure. Literature is not just written; it is created, mediated, legitimized, circulated, canonized, and often forgotten. All these aspects of the literary process are social.

Sociology has traditionally studied literature as a reflection of society. The Sociology also provides an important lens for understanding the widening of inequality in the creative industries (Gregory, 2025). However, the notion of 'reflection' became inadequate to sufficiently explain the relationship between literature and society, for literature does not merely reflect society; instead, it symbolically organizes society. Most 1980s and 1990s sociological discussions of AI treat it as a system of scientific knowledge and expertise which seeks to make machines do things that humans can do (Liu, 2021). Furthermore, literature enhances, enhances, dramatizes, and codifies the collective experiences of individuals. In doing this, literature becomes part of the structure of society.

Literature exists as an independent sphere, which has its own hierarchies, power struggles, and mechanisms to distinguish literary works. Authors compete for readers, recognition, and publishers shape the visibility of writers and their works. Reviewers assess the worth of literary works, colleges stabilise canons, and awards provide status. Each of these relationships holds a particular type of power, creating a network of power relationships where the currency of legitimacy is represented by symbolic capital.

Under this theoretical framework, authorship is never simply the result of a single author. Even the author working alone is still building upon existing literary forms, language conventions, educational pathways, and institutional constraints. Therefore, from the sociological perspective, ingenuity is a socially conditioned form of originality, which may appear unique, but is shaped by the social history.

Thus, the incorporation of artificial intelligence into the creative process must be seen as an innovation within the structured landscape of literature, rather than as a simple technological curiosity. Indeed, with an algorithm generating a story narrative, the question must be re-examined from whether or not they can generate in cooperating with postmodern literary styles. The question is how their presence modifies the distribution of symbolic capital, the criteria of cultural consecration, and the boundaries of authorship. A pertinent empirical example of this shift is the 2024 Akutagawa Prize awarded to Rie Kudan. Upon receiving Japan's most prestigious literary honour, Kudan revealed that approximately 5% of her novel, *The Tokyo Tower of Sympathy*, was AI generated. This case serves as a sociological "litmus test", demonstrating that institutional gatekeepers are beginning to legitimize hybrid creativity, thereby reconfiguring the traditional boundaries of 'individual genius' and authorial authenticity.

Given its longstanding relationship with Sociology, literature provides the conceptual tools to address this shift (Perreault, 2025). It allows us to examine how new actors alter existing hierarchies. The range of possible associations between sociology and AI reflects the extent to which we are willing to adopt these features of AI discourse (Woolgar, 1985). It directs attention toward institutions rather than individual genius. It situates creativity within systems of power. The crucial issue is not whether literature survives.

---

Literature has survived empires, revolutions, and media transitions. The issue is how its internal structure reorganizes when the authority of authorship becomes technically reproducible.

However, a significant sociological limitation persists: while AI can broaden the range of literary production, it inherently lacks 'ideological consciousness' and interpretative depth. As Papa (2025) demonstrates through computational analysis, AI models excel at pattern recognition but consistently fail to grasp deeper subtexts, such as gender critiques or socio-historical trauma. This confirms that while the form of literature can be algorithmic, the meaning remains a strictly human-mediated construct, anchored in shared social reality and historical memory (Papa, 2025).

### **The Literary Field and Symbolic Power**

The world of literature represents an arena for conflict; it contains limited recognition, negotiated legitimacy, and a range of texts vying for space within pre-existing forms and dominant player(s). The literary world is constantly on the move with shifts in generations, economy, and society/culture. A society (meaning culture) can play this “moderating role” (Finkielsztein, 2025).

The operation of symbolic power is often insidious; decisions as to which texts are reviewed, translated, used in curricula, and/or awarded occur through/within these structures. Ultimately, through time, all of these processes give birth to a literary canon. The canon will always have the potential to be changed by the institutions that support it. AI has an impact on all levels of the literary structure; it accelerates the process of producing literature, increases the volume of writing produced, and it ultimately undermines the scarcity that has historically been the basis for the formation of symbolic power. With the ability to generate hundreds/thousands of different narrative(s) in mere minutes, the process of establishing distinctions will no longer be based solely on authorship becoming rare. AI systems, however, also utilize/require access/exposure to pre-existing corpora, these AI systems are based on and trained through canonized (institutional) literature, or symbolic capital that has developed over hundreds/year of literature creation. In this light, one can also say that AI technologies are essentially parasitical on literature; they rely on the recombination of previously established forms of institutional validation and status to create literature as an artefact of contemporary literary creation. This “parasitic” relationship is concretized in the escalating legal and social conflicts between AI developers and established authors. For instance, the class-action lawsuits filed by organizations such as the Authors Guild (including figures like Jonathan Franzen and George R.R. Martin) against OpenAI highlight a structural struggle over data as a raw material. Sociologically, this represents an attempt by traditional actors to defend their symbolic and financial capital against de-territorialized algorithmic extraction. This creates a paradox in that as the algorithm appears to become increasingly autonomous, the algorithm will increasingly require the established authority of the literature it's based on.

This transition within the literature field is fundamentally restructuring the body of literature. Traditional institutions in the literature field will likely either reject algorithmically produced literature and maintain the author as the sole measure of authenticity or will accept algorithmically produced literature as co-created and reconstituted forms of literature/creativity. Either way, the way literature is produced and the nature of literature will undergo significant reorganization through negotiation. Symbolic power is migrating from singular authorship to a new hybrid network of various players such as: programmers, platforms, and data infrastructures. Yet the struggle for legitimacy remains recognizably literary. Reviews are written. Debates unfold. Critics evaluate. Readers respond. The form of conflict changes, but its sociological logic persists.

Literature has always been a site where society negotiates meaning. In the age of artificial intelligence, it becomes a site where society negotiates the definition of authorship itself.

### **Literary Production and Cultural Capital in the Digital Epoch**

The material infrastructures of publishing have always been critical to literary production. Manuscript culture was dependent upon patronage. Print culture was reliant upon printing presses, distribution networks, and bookstores. Through digital platforms, online retailers, and algorithms, the foundations of

the previous publishing structures have been fundamentally reorganized under the conditions of the current digital epoch.

Structuration theory effectively integrates two traditionally opposing approaches in sociology by examining the duality of the relationship between agents and structures, emphasizing the critical roles of space and time in social practices (Anam, 2025). Cultural capital moves around differently under the new conditions of publishing. Cultural capital is given a quantitative measure through metrics. Reader engagement can be tracked. Publishing decisions are made increasingly based on data and analytics. As a result, elements of the literary field are becoming more transparent, while at the same time, the algorithms that govern it paradoxically add layers of opacity. AI exacerbates these changes. AI significantly speeds up the process of creating content and decreases costs for an individual to enter authorship. AI will continue to amplify the existing inequalities in the global political landscape and undermine the conditions necessary for democratic deliberation (Latinović B. &, 2025). Self-publishing creates a deluge of text and the resulting sheer volume challenges the process of assessment of that text. The twofold division between social and technological influences obscures the reality that theories of orality, literacy, and digitality always reflect political positions about social development (Emigh, 2024). Prestige will no longer be defined through scarcity, but rather through abundance.

As a result, distinction is being redefined from the act of production to the act of curation. The practical implications of this shift are visible on platforms like Amazon Kindle Direct Publishing (KDP). The influx of AI-generated content led to a “scarcity crisis” in visibility, forcing the platform to implement daily upload limits to preserve the integrity of its ecosystem. This confirms that in an era of algorithmic abundance, the locus of power shifts from the creator to the curatorial algorithm, which dictates whose 'symbolic capital' is allowed to circulate in the digital marketplace. Cultural intermediaries will play a larger role than ever before. Editors, critics, influencers, and recommendation systems will be the gatekeepers in a much larger space than in previous eras. Symbolic capital is no longer generated solely through the act of writing, but also through the ability to be selected for, recognized, and circulated.

This raises a larger sociological question: if democratization of production results in democratization of social sanction? The short answer is that there's no easy answer. While the options have greatly expanded for the production of literary works, some institutions' legitimacy has not. Major publishers, literary awards, and educational institutions continue to define the limits of canon. AI interacts with both elements of this relationship in a contradictory manner. On the one hand, AI supports the empowerment of new writers. On the other hand, AI exists as part of the corporate infrastructures that enable those writers but also consolidate control. The entities that provide the main platforms for AI's tools are often integrated into the framework of global digital capitalism, wherein data ownership and monetary capital are consolidated. Literature thus becomes a site where cultural capital is reconfigured but not dissolved. The field adapts. New hierarchies emerge. Hybrid forms of legitimacy develop, combining traditional prestige with digital visibility.

Sociologically, this moment reveals a tension between abundance and authority. The proliferation of text destabilizes evaluation, yet evaluation persists as a social necessity. Without mechanisms of distinction, the field collapses into noise. Therefore, new forms of symbolic filtration arise.

Literary production in the digital epoch is not merely faster. It is structurally reorganized. Artificial intelligence does not eliminate the struggle for recognition. It intensifies it.

### **Algorithmic Intervention and the Restructuring of the Literary Field**

AI exists as a component of the literary landscape and as such has no neutral position; it projects assumptions regarding knowledge and meaning from their data sets, their algorithmic structures, and the institutions using them. AI-created works of literature reconfigure agency and authority and the allocation of symbolic capital in both subtle and overt ways.

The social significance or meaning of algorithmic intervention lies in its ability to redistribute power within the literary domain. Traditionally, authorship, editorial mediation, and institutional recognition served as

gatekeepers. The substantial volume, continued growth, and resulting complexity of the scientific literature not only increases the need for systematic, replicable, and rigorous literature reviews, but also highlights the natural limits of human researchers' information processing capabilities (Antons, 2023). Symbolic power was built cumulatively; it was accumulated through canonicity, awards, and critical validation. Prestige must engage in negotiation with the reproducibility of the text created through the algorithm.

At the same time as the field of literature is adjusting to their algorithmically created products, methods of evaluation are changing as well. Rather than the inherent qualities of the text being used as measures of validity, their place within networks of legitimacy is being used as an evaluation tool. Editors, critics, and platforms are increasingly acting as intermediaries choosing to determine what gets circulated as "prestigious" regardless of whether it is through human or algorithmic authorship. Although the structure of the field remains intact; the topology that defines it is changing. New forms are appearing that include curatorial practices around reviewing AI-created works, analysing narratives produced from big data, and evaluating hybrid authorship. Along with this transformation of authorship is a significant acceleration of temporal time within the field of literature, where production is fast-tracked, iteration becomes continuous, and the creation of new texts is occurring at an incomprehensible speed compared to traditional print culture. The traditional education system faces several issues, including overcrowded classrooms, a lack of personalized attention for students, varying learning paces and styles, and the struggle to keep up with the fast-paced evolution of technology and information (Labadze, 2023). Consequently, there is a feedback loop created between audience reception and institutional validation as it relates not to singular instances of authorship but to a range of processes through which literature is generated continuously.

The paradox of AI in literature is thus social rather than technological. While the machine produces, it relies on the social structures that constitute value. Canonized works, historical linguistic norms, and critical assessments feed the algorithms that replicate and recombine textual forms. AI does not bypass the literary field; it is absorbed into it, reinforcing some hierarchies while unsettling others.

Sociologically, the field demonstrates resilience and adaptation. Authority is redistributed, creativity is hybridized, and evaluation becomes dynamic. Yet the struggle for legitimacy remains central. Literature, even when algorithmically produced, continues to operate within a network of social recognition, symbolic power, and negotiated meaning.

### **Canon, Legitimacy, and Institutional Mediation**

The Canon is a historical object as well as an operational social regulation mechanism. It defines the objects that are valued, the objects that are preserved, and the objects that will be studied. The canon is negotiated through the interplay of critics, scholars, institutions, and audiences and not limited to aesthetics. There is symbolic capital circulating within these powers.

The first wave of historical sociology were the writers whom we today consider the classical sociological canon (Hammer, 2025). AI-generated text results in the canon being both a physical and metaphorical reference point for interpretation. AI uses the canon to develop its models of creation but may produce work that reproduces, remixes, and transforms existing forms. This creates a sociological tension where the canon makes the machine legitimate while the machine changes how legitimacy happens in the canon.

Institutions are the mediators of this tension. Academic programs, literary journals, and publishing perform a stabilising function in evaluating machine written texts and texts written by man. They determine how symbolic capital is attributed. The conditions under which text quality, originality, and significance exist are socially constructed rather than being a result of technical dictates.

Legitimacy is contextually based, relational, and performative in nature. Even when one creates machine-generated text that is of equal quality to a text written by a human, the recognition of this creates social equity. Critics, editors, and readers together decide whether or not it holds literary merit. This realisation demonstrates that the social structure will always determine literary authority.

---

The canon is also evolving through hybridisation. Texts produced collaboratively between human and algorithm, or combining elements produced by both, will enter into symbolic negotiations. These texts represent the interactivity of previous materiality and contemporary experimentation. The social structures defined by institutions will govern the intended reception of these texts and define the structure for interpreting them.

Ultimately, the sociology of literature demonstrates that legitimacy is a product of negotiation. The introduction of AI amplifies complexity but does not dissolve the field. Authority, distinction, and recognition remain central, even as the actors and mechanisms multiply.

### **Readers, Reception, and the Social Construction of Meaning**

Literature not only comes into being through the act of producing it but also via the act of receiving it as well. Readers do not passively soak in meaning; they create meaning along with the text as they read it. The sociology of literature communicates that the act of interpreting a literary work is a social process developed through a network of readers, critiques, and through the cultural circulation of the text. The act of receiving literature occurs within parameterized social structures, such that when reading readers bring social expectations, educational experience, and cultural capital to their interactions with texts. Readers interact with literary works via genres, conventions, and through the use of established norms/legal titles that were established prior to their reading. Thus, when interpreting the meaning of a literary work, readers will tend to follow a particular standard or the use of moral authority to validate their interpretation of that literary work (as an example, a literary work that is widely recognized and praised by literary critics, publishers, authors, and professional literary organisations will be viewed as valid) whereas, a literary work that is disregarded or considered irrelevant will not be viewed as valid or meaningful. The advent of AI provides an additional layer of complexity to the process of social construction of meaning. With the use of algorithms to create and generate texts, questions arise regarding how traditional models of interpreting are relevant when interpreting a text whose origin, intentionality, and creative process is unknown or undetermined. It will force readers to re-evaluate both the criteria they currently use to evaluate the quality of literary texts and the value of authorship given that the authorship of the text is in fact a machine.

Although this will be challenging for many readers, the social construction of meaning will continue to exist as a result of the continuing process being created by combining readers' relationship with institutions (reviews, academics, online platforms) to interpret and authorise the text they created. Both online communities and readers' physical presence in community spaces to critique literature provide both a collective legitimacy for literature as well. Therefore, while the technology supporting both the creation and the social process of meaning creation will provide new and exciting ways to read and enjoy literature, the process of interpreting and creating meaning will always be viewed as a social rather than a technological experience. When co-creating literature, authorship also complicates the work (individually and/or collaboratively) as such literature exemplifies the relational aspect of creating meaning within literature. Interpretation becomes a negotiation among multiple agents: human authors, algorithmic systems, institutional mediators, and readership communities. Meaning is distributed and contingent, reflecting the complex architecture of the literary field.

This sociological perspective underscores a central insight: literature is not defined solely by textual form or authorial intent. It is defined by the interactions, expectations, and negotiations that constitute a living cultural field. The AI era magnifies the social dimensions of reading and reception, revealing the enduring centrality of collective engagement in the construction of literary meaning.

### **Hybrid Authorship and the Future of Literary Subjectivity**

Authorship has traditionally been imagined as singular, intimate, and personal. The author's identity, experiences, and intentions were central to the production and interpretation of literature. Sociology, however, has long emphasized that authorship is socially constructed, mediated by institutions, and situated within power relations.

---

Is there a possibility that in the future the ethical rules known so far will be violated indiscriminately, and will transhumanism affect them and to what extent (Latinović B. , 2023)? The age of artificial intelligence intensifies this insight: authorship is no longer exclusively human, yet its social functions remain critical.

Hybrid authorship emerges as a central phenomenon. Texts may be co-created by human writers, algorithmic systems, and collaborative networks. The boundaries between creator, medium, and tool blur. A human author may initiate a narrative, but the algorithm expands, recombines, and suggests trajectories. Conversely, algorithmic generation may prompt human revision, commentary, or contextualization. Authorship becomes a networked practice rather than an individual achievement.

From a sociological perspective, hybrid authorship is a site where symbolic power is renegotiated. Authority is distributed among programmers, literary editors, institutional evaluators, and readership communities. Recognition no longer resides solely in a singular signature; it is mediated by the social acknowledgment of contribution and legitimacy. The social field, rather than the algorithm itself, determines the value of authorship. This shift also reshapes literary subjectivity. Writers no longer exist solely as autonomous creators; they are nodes within relational systems that include both human and non-human agents. Creativity becomes emergent, contingent, and performative. The concept of originality transforms: it is no longer the solitary act of a genius, but a socially situated process of selection, adaptation, and recombination. The social meaning of literature depends on these interactions, emphasizing collective negotiation over individual expression.

Hybrid authorship challenges traditional hierarchies while preserving essential sociological functions. From a policy perspective, these transformations necessitate a move toward algorithmic literacy within educational institutions. Rather than strictly prohibitory stances, future research and educational frameworks must address how hybrid authorship alters the assessment of 'originality.' Policies should focus on transparency and the ethical disclosure of AI involvement, ensuring that the social recognition of merit accounts for the collaborative nature of the sociotechnical creative process. Literature remains a space for negotiating agency, meaning, and legitimacy. What changes is the mechanism by which these negotiations occur. Social structures absorb algorithmic actors, creating new patterns of recognition, prestige, and influence.

In this sense, the future of literary subjectivity is not diminished by artificial intelligence. It is reframed, revealing that literature's enduring significance lies not in the solitary author, but in the social field that interprets, legitimizes, and circulates texts. Hybrid authorship exemplifies the resilience and adaptability of literature as a sociological institution, capable of absorbing technological change while sustaining its central social functions. The consolidation of hybrid authorship also necessitates immediate educational and policy interventions, pointing to critical avenues for future research. As the boundaries of original creation blur, educational systems must pivot from strictly prohibitory policies focused merely on automated plagiarism detection toward fostering comprehensive "algorithmic literacy". Future academic curricula must equip students and emergent writers with the critical faculties to navigate AI as a sociotechnical collaborator, recognizing the biases embedded in language models. Furthermore, macro-level cultural policies and intellectual property frameworks must evolve beyond the binary of "human versus machine". Policymakers will need to establish nuanced legal categories for algorithmically mediated cultural products, ensuring that the redistribution of symbolic power does not translate into systemic economic disenfranchisement of human creators.

## CONCLUSION

Newly attentive to the social, this study has treated literature in the age of AI as a profoundly sociological phenomenon, one that exposes the emergent relations between social structures and authorship and meaning-making. Literature is not just a body of texts, but a social formation located within systems of symbolic power, cultural capital and institutional mediation. Its worth, status and legitimacy are collectively negotiated through critics, publishers, academia and readerships. Though algorithms come to disrupt the mode of production itself, literature still at bottom remains social. AI isn't so much replacing the author as redistributing agency, from human and inhuman agents. In this process, authorship is hybridized,

relational, and networked to show creativity is socially conditioned and mediated rather than individual in nature. Generated texts created by AI disturb established hierarchies, they stretch the process of production and trouble scarcity but the domain regulates itself through recalibrating mechanisms of evaluation, canonization and symbolic recognition. These metamorphoses remind us of a fundamental sociological fact: literature is alive in configured fields, and its meaning remains forever socially constructed. Readers, as co-creators of meaning, continue to play a central role in negotiating value. Interpretation, reception, and legitimacy emerge from collective engagement rather than intrinsic textual qualities. Algorithmic intervention amplifies the social processes of recognition, highlighting the relational nature of literary authority and the contingent, performative dimensions of creativity. The sociology of literature, therefore, offers an indispensable lens for understanding the contemporary and future literary landscape. Hybrid authorship, institutional mediation, and the recalibration of symbolic capital exemplify literature's resilience and adaptability. Even amidst technological disruption, the social field remains the crucible in which literary meaning, authority, and subjectivity are forged.

Ultimately, literature in the age of artificial intelligence exemplifies the enduring capacity of social structures to absorb innovation while preserving cultural significance. It demonstrates that creativity, authority, and interpretation are collective achievements, and that the literary field remains a profound arena for the negotiation of human agency, social legitimacy, and symbolic power in technologically mediated societies.

## REFERENCES

1. Anam, R. K. (2025). Anthony Giddens's structuration theory and relevance with sociology of knowledge. *SOCIAL EDU: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Pendidikan*, 1(2), 73-84.
2. Antons, D. B. (2023). Computational literature reviews: Method, algorithms, and roadmap. *Organizational Research Methods*, 26(1), 107-138.
3. Chun, H. &. (2025). Toward New Organizational Sociology of Quantification: From Interlopers to Plurality and Contestation. *Sociology Compass*, 19(7).
4. Emigh, R. J. (2024). Whither Digitality? Relationship Between Orality, Literacy, and Digitality, Past and Present: From Spoken Traditions to Digital Media. *The Annual Review of Sociology*, 50.
5. Finkielstein, M. (2025). *The sociology of boredom*. John Wiley & Sons.
6. Gregory, S. C. (2025). Introduction: Imagining Equitable Working Life in the Creative Industries—Constructions, Challenges, Contradictions. *Journal of Sociology*, 61(3), 363-372.
7. Hammer, R. &. (2025). Rethinking Historical Sociology: Learning from WEB Du Bois and the Black Radical Tradition. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, 22(1), 171-189.
8. Labadze, L. G. (2023). Role of AI chatbots in education: systematic literature review. *International journal of Educational Technology in Higher education*, 20(1), 56.
9. Latinović, B. &. (2025). Social and Ethical Challenges of Artificial Intelligence in International Political Communication. *Journal of UUNT: Informatics and Computer Sciences*, 2(2), 15-22.
10. Latinović, B. (2023). THE SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE OF TRANSHUMANISM THROUGH THE PRISM OF THE SPORTS-MARKETING INDUSTRY. *Sports Science & Health/Sportske Nauke i Zdravlje*, 13(1).
11. Latinović, B. K. (2025). The Sociology of Artificial Intelligence Through the Lens of Ethics in the Digital Age. *Journal of UUNT: Informatics and Computer Sciences*, 2(1), 1-8.
12. Liu, Z. (2021). Sociological perspectives on artificial intelligence: A typological reading. *Sociology Compass*, 15(3).
13. Lowenthal, L. (2020). On sociology of literature. In *Critical Theory and Society*. Routledge, 40-51.
14. Papa, E. (2025). (Re) Thinking Literary Interpretation in the Digital Age: AI, Virtual Reality, and Immersive Reading. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(4), 46.
15. Perreault, G. P. (2025). Epistemologies of digital news Production: Power and technological Adaptation in Knowledge Production. *Digital Journalism*, 13(3), 351-361.
16. Váňa, J. (2020). Theorizing the social through literary fiction: For a new sociology of literature. *Cultural Sociology*, 14(2), 180-200.



- 
17. Váña, J. (2025). Sally Rooney and Cultural Sociology of Literature: Towards Epistemological Symmetry within Literature-and-Society Research. *Journal of literary theory*.
  18. Woolgar, S. (1985). Why not a sociology of machines? The case of sociology and artificial intelligence. *Sociology*, 19(4), 557-572.