

Practice Flashcards — Reconceptualising Authorship in the Age of Generative AI: A Theoretical Review

10 flashcards. Fold each card in half — front on top, answer underneath.

Q: **Is AI authorship a new phenomenon?**

A: No, generative AI intensifies pre-existing theoretical instabilities rather than creating a rupture. Authorship has historically been a contested, distributed concept rather than a stable, solitary ideal.

Q: **Legal-Copyright Tradition**

A: This tradition requires a human author and original creative act. It is structurally anthropocentric and struggles to assign ownership to non-human generative processes.

Q: Intentionalist Tradition

A: This framework locates authorial meaning in the purposive mental states of a human agent. It struggles with LLMs because they produce argumentative content without human intention.

Q: Posthumanist-Assemblage Tradition

A: This view posits that agency is emergent across humans, algorithms, and institutions. While it accounts for distributed agency, it risks making scholarly accountability unworkable.

Q: The 'Legitimation Paradox'

A: This occurs when users claim authorship within frameworks their own practice undermines. It highlights the tension between institutional requirements for individual credit and collaborative AI-mediated work.

Q: Continuum Model of Authorship

A: Authorship is reconceived as a transparency-regulated spectrum of human-AI delegation. It moves away from a binary distinction between 'tool' and 'author' toward measuring causal distance.

Q: **What is 'causal authorship'?**

A: A metric of the distance between human and machine in the creative process. It focuses on the degree of human involvement in questioning, evaluating, and revising AI output.

Q: **Transparency vs. Radical Deconstruction**

A: Transparency advocates seek to disclose AI use within existing frameworks, while deconstructionists argue for dismantling the individual-author model entirely. This paper supports transparency while maintaining human accountability.

Q: Implications for Academic Integrity

A: Originality must be reconceived as a relational property rather than an intrinsic one. Policies should be calibrated to the degree of delegation rather than a tool-vs-ghostwriter binary.

Q: Key limitation of the study

A: The synthesis is entirely theoretical and lacks empirical demonstration. Furthermore, the literature is heavily skewed toward Western, Anglo-American, and literary-legal perspectives.