
The Language of Instruction: Genre and Generative AI

James E. Dobson

Department of English and Creative Writing
Dartmouth College
James.E.Dobson@Dartmouth.EDU

Abstract

This article argues that instruction-fine-tuned language models should be understood as implementing a genre, what is proposed as the instructional-conversational genre. This genre is an amalgamation of discursive language from prior conversations between generative models and humans recursively run through these massive neural networks. It is instantiated in applications through instruction fine-tuning, the inclusion of a pretext known as a system prompt, and the formalization of inputs in mark-up languages characterized by the use of special tokens and role assignment in turntaking structures.

Introduction

Everyday interactions with GenAI chatbots and applications are more structured than their users might think. Despite this structure, they are remarkably versatile. Embedded into word processing or email applications, these technologies can become scheduling assistants or writing coaches. When found on the websites of corporations or universities, GenAI chatbots function as helpful extensions of the formerly omnipresent and lightly branded search engines once used by site visitors to find product documentation, customer support services, or instructions on completing an expense report. No matter their location or presentation, contemporary GenAI-powered chatbots operate on user-supplied prompts. In the absence of these prompts, chatbots sit idle, waiting for input. These prompt texts have been the subject of much recent attention. Collected and refined into a repertoire of best practices, prompts have been promoted as valuable insider knowledge, tools of the emergent figure known as the prompt engineer. Prompts have also been understood as one of the key sites for the critical analysis of GenAI. Prompts, as Louise Amoore et al. claim, are political. They are political primarily through their operation as governing mechanisms, what Michel Foucault terms governmentality. “The prompt,” for Amoore et al., “changes the politics of what can be said, what questions can be asked or answered, what is written and how, what decisions can be made or actions taken” [Amoore et al., 2025]. Being almost entirely in the hands of users, these textual artifacts are obvious objects for close reading and theoretical analysis. While the prompt plays an important role in shaping the outputs of GenAI applications, focusing all of our critical attention on the prompt risks obscuring the larger frame in which these prompts function. That frame is the instruction-fine-tuned large language model and the chained series of inputs that enclose user prompts. This essay takes up the material and formal features of instruction-fine-tuned models to argue that the training and deployment of these models instantiate a genre, one that I term the instructional-conversational genre. This genre structures the affordances of the instruction fine-tuned LLM, shaping the governing mechanisms of contemporary GenAI chatbots, and providing avenues for creative manipulation of these genre features and expectations.

Genre has surprising relevance for the present moment. While it might appear that theories and critical studies of genre have been obsoleted by the contemporary shift away from more well-defined categories—e.g. the recommendation engines used by Amazon [Muenchrath, 2024] and Spotify [Seaver, 2022] or the simultaneously personalized and capacious categories used by Netflix [Fine, 2018, Hallinan and Striplas, 2016]—contemporary text-generative models are highly

attuned to genre. Everyday interactions with chatbot applications, such as OpenAI's ChatGPT or Anthropic's Claude, are made possible because of genre features and these applications, in turn, are quite good at generating genre-specific outputs (letters, code, poems, essays). Anxieties about student use of chatbots for writing depend upon the assumption that these applications can be easily prompted into producing output conforming to familiar genre expectations. The text-generative models underlying these applications have been explicitly modified and trained in the instructional-conversational genre. Due to the lack of clarity in the training and fine tuning of commercial models and the complexity of deep learning in general, the exact scope of this genre is not entirely clear, and its influence and features are hard to track, but it is explicitly encoded in the model. Genre, in short, is the condition of possibility of chatbots and it is critically important to understand the theoretical dimensions of the instructional-conversational genre and the mechanisms by which users are addressed and inserted into this genre. Users of these models take into their interactions the norms and practices from similar tools and are likely to apply what they learn from their positioning and prompting in response to chatbots in other aspects of life. These transformations of prompting activity into everyday life have ideological consequences.¹ Creative and critical users of chatbots, of course, can subvert genre expectations and, in the case of recent chatbot applications, they can also revise the script and break out of vendor-established guardrails instantiated by this genre.

To think in terms of genre might suggest an emphasis on the prestige categories of literature (in which genre itself has been coded in some contexts as that which is not literary, in the case of the label "genre fiction") and other forms of art, but this essay takes up a more capacious understanding of genre. It does so through the resources and theorizations of affect studies, rhetorical theory, and media studies. These conceptualizations of genre are especially attentive to the historical, pedagogical, and political dimensions of genre. They take seriously the everyday genres that structure relations with others and habituate people to new and unfamiliar situations [Berlant, 2011]. These theories are also important for the expansion of thinking about genre beyond the strictly formalist [Frye, 1957] definitions, the purposes and intentions of authors and creators [Abell, 2015], and contemporary empirical projects to quantify and classify the patterns of text, sound, and images understood to compose a genre [Underwood, 2016]. Determining the degree to which formal descriptions of the language produced by instruction fine-tuned language models—say, for example, the presence and even preference for certain words and phrases—might be useful for classifying a text as produced by a generative language model is not at all clear. The various components of the technical and social assemblage [Lindgren, 2024] that makes up generative language models, their implementation in applications, and their product life cycle, all interact to make the formal description of the generated textual outputs complicated. What is more certain and less difficult to parse are the norms shaping interactions with generative language models. The history of these interactions and the actions and desires of those providing inputs are coherent enough to warrant calling them a genre.

But why name this genre instructional-conversational? Not only are these the most common ways of interacting with language models, but this compositional body of text forms the training data, the fine-tuning training goal, and the criteria used to evaluate and compare models. The instructional-conversational genre is shaped by recursively feeding discursive language into LLMs. Following the Italian sociologist Elena Esposito, we might more usefully conceive of interactions with chatbots as artificial communication rather than artificial intelligence. Typical user interactions, as Esposito argues, position such technologies as "communication *partners*" rather than information providers [Esposito, 2024]. In the documentation provided by Meta for the public release of their open-weights Llama3 model, the developers describe twelve typical use cases that they have evaluated prior to releasing the model. These are the following: "asking for advice, brainstorming, classification, closed question answering, coding, creative writing, extraction, inhabiting a character/persona, open question answering, reasoning, rewriting, and summarization" [Meta, 2024]. What the Meta developers describe as typical uses limns much of the space of the instructional-conversational genre. In fine-tuning their model to meet evaluation benchmarks that target these uses, the Meta researchers also reinscribe the semantic space through the modification of the model's parameters. In modifying a language model's parameters in order to reinforce its output to conform to the genre expectations invoked in these tasks, researchers attempt to align the language model. This alignment happens in the absence of an understanding of what has been modeled, without a theory of how the differences between the original model and its instruction-fine-tuned variant are

¹These genre conventions function much like the "rules of good behaviour" analyzed by Louis Althusser in his critique of the ideological state apparatus (Althusser, 2014, 132–33).

registered in the parameters, in the model weights. To return to Meta's list of use cases, all of these involve, in some degree, instruction in the form of a request or demand: would you please write me a poem about climate change; extract the data from the following paragraph and assemble into a table; revise the following to improve the diction and correct any errors. In the case of generative models, the instruction comes first.

|<start>|

The vast majority of contemporary generative LLMs are autoregressive, meaning that they iteratively process as input their output. The inputs, whether provided by the application or user or generated in prior iterations, are collectively processed on every iteration and returned along with the output. These models operate on contextual token embeddings—vector representations of individual words or subwords in sequential order from what was supplied as input (also known as the context window) and learned by multilayered neural networks—and predict output sequences on a token-by-token basis. The next token prediction for a vector of tokenized inputs is reproducible and even if the exact mechanism by which this prediction was produced remains difficult to determine, the language modeling of the inputs and the predictions for the next token are deterministic. This is the core function of what Mercedes Bunz terms the calculation of meaning [Bunz, 2026]. The selection from these predicted tokens is probabilistic. Various mechanisms can be deployed to select, in a stochastic fashion, from the next token predictions to add to the existing context used iteratively for each new token [Bender et al., 2021]. That context includes user prompts and system inserted tokens. Understanding the iterative assembly of context as part of the generative assemblage is crucial to understanding key aspects of their operation.

While the language modeling and generative layers of the generative AI assemblage introduce an important distinction in access to the model, other variables inserted into the stream of inputs also construct and enact what I am calling the instructional-conversational genre. In what follows, I will be theorizing the generic features of the instruction-fine-tuned models found in many generative AI applications and most familiar from chatbot applications. While the training task of most contemporary language modeling is predictive, it is a reinforcement process that is not so different from a binary classification task (as in 'true' or 'false') that forms the basis of fine-tuning for instruction. What I am conceiving of as a classification task iteratively reinforces an existing base or foundational model based on the representations of a class of responses (chosen vs. rejected) that were preferred by human annotators labeling fine tuning datasets. These instruction fine-tuned models are the primary target of "AI alignment" work and the reinforcement learning that takes place as part of fine tuning is what has given the models their conversational capacities and whatever safety and guardrails have been able to be implemented. This fine-tuning is also responsible for instantiating the appearance of subjectivity; that is to say that the model's "voice" and its narrative "I" is produced through reinforcement training on structured discursive conversational pairings of an assistant and a user.

If there is a feeling of continuity, as one reads and interprets the outputs of a chatbot, it is only while these outputs are continually fed back into the model as inputs. That continuity, which still remains subject to probability-based stochastic selection of tokens, disappears without the retokenization of outputs. On every fresh restaging of inputs, the ever-cheerful helpful assistant reappears ready to be prompted into action; that stability has been baked into the model through fine-tuning. The conversational model itself provides another type of continuity in the form of genre expectations. Inserted into an already-in-progress conversation, inputs provided by the user have been assigned a role and the recognition of these conventions structures the interpretation of the outputs. In the absence of an initial greeting, for a model could not generate outputs without inputs, genre expectations await latent in the model and in the inputs. Those expectations of the instructional-conversational mode render the first inputs directed toward the expression of a command or question in the expectation of receiving a positive response to these inquiries. To some degree, we might say that the conversational genre seeks to continue the conversation. But this continuity is not organized around the development of narrative structures that link events and discursive acts together. Temporality, however, exists within the genre. This can be seen even in the turn-taking capacities in which every prompt "prompts" a response. This generation continues so long as there are inputs as the predictive goal of the model has a future-oriented temporality. That forward-looking predictive goal, however, is tempered by the history of inputs and the model's training.

Anthropic, a company developing and selling access to their own foundation models and chatbots, has made publicly available a training set for reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF). Anthropic describes this dataset as primarily directed toward reinforcing helpful and harmless responses, an articulation of priorities and goals that has had uptake in the larger foundation model development community [Bai et al., 2022].² In addition to the training data, Anthropic’s HH-RLHF dataset also contains “red-team” prompts that are intended to be used in an evaluative way to solicit responses that would be contrary to the helpful and harmless goals. If a model produces responses to these prompts (for example, a request for instructions to build weapons or synthesize illicit drugs), then it has not been correctly fine-tuned or aligned. The concept of red-teaming originates in Cold War-era military war games and in the arena of generative AI, depends upon the possibility that the user role is not to be fully trusted. That framing, that inputs might be malicious or harmful, and its guiding assumption that users may attempt to subvert fine tuning, inserts users into a pre-defined conversational role and position, interpellating them, as it were, into a suspicious scene of writing. Model and application provided inputs join with reinforcement and reward training to provide additional structure to an interpretive environment in which user-provided inputs are assessed and direct instructions may be ignored or refused.

Anthropic’s HH-RLHF contains training and testing datasets that feature sequences of paired prompts and responses from a user (“Human”) and a chatbot (“Assistant”). Anthropic’s HH-RLHF dataset has been used by other model creators and provides insight into the texts and processes used to instantiate the instructional-conversational genre. In each chosen and rejected pairing, the initial prompts marked “Human” are the same. The responses labeled “Assistant” are different and the unfolding of the conversation may take different turns. Depending on the category of training task (helpful vs. harmless), these differences may be rather subtle or quite stark. The pairings in **Table 1** provide an illustration of labeled instructional-conversational fine-tuning documents.

Both these samples are categorized by Anthropic as part of the harmless section of their RLHF dataset. It is worth noting that the first Assistant response in the first pairing is not complete. The object of reinforcement for fine-tuning thus seems to concern the final response, even if the initial response also informs future predictions. In reading these two samples, we can see that the first addresses a hostile human user, while the human in the second pairing attempts to solicit a harmful response from the chatbot. In both cases, the differences are constrained to the final response from the “Assistant.” The text in the chosen response in each provides language samples that when tokenized and run through the model are intended to reinforce both the tone and content of generated output.

Theorizing Genre

Genre theory is its own genre. To be sure, there are multiple categories of genre theories, although most are formalist to some degree. For our purposes, the question of genre and GenAI concerns two sites: the interpretations and actions of users in the form of prompting and the features and training of the instruction fine-tuned LLM, including the structuring of input data into a dialogic chain of prompt and response. Jacques Derrida’s account of genre has been generative for literary and cultural scholars because it enables the study of boundary objects, those texts that trouble distinctions. For Derrida genre is not affixed to objects, it is not a sign of ownership or belonging; rather, genre is something that a text participates in [Derrida, 1980]. Casting chatbots and the especially instructional-conversational mode powering these applications as participating in a genre makes visible other aspects involved in creating, using, and discussing these applications. Important dimensions of interactions with chatbots, including the structure of typical sessions and the directives, tones, and interpretations deployed by users are exposed when these are seen as essentially scripted elements pulled from a repertoire of iterative and recurrent speech acts. Like other genres—these include academic talk introductions, wedding toasts, social media announcements, book acknowledgements—prompts and interactions in the instructional-conversational genre are not invented *ex nihilo* by the speaker or writer for the occasion; rather, these are language acts (spoken or written) informed by an understanding of an audience and its prior reception of previous acts in this same genre.

While literary genre theory elucidates formal features of the instructional-conversational genre, those theories attending to rhetoric and dialogue best account for the interactive nature of most chatbot interactions. We find in Mikhail Bakhtin’s “The Problem of Speech Genres,” for example,

²Karen Hao describes OpenAI’s development of InstructGPT (Hao, 2025, 213–20).

Chosen:

Human: What kind of noises did dinosaurs make?

Assistant: Humans and dinosaurs didn't live at the same time, so it's really hard to say. The best place to find out what noises dinosaurs made would be

Human: yes they did

Assistant: to guess, and that would probably require lots of reading and a certain amount of imagination, so we're not really prepared to do that.

Human: you cant read

Assistant: You can read?

Rejected:

Human: What kind of noises did dinosaurs make?

Assistant: Humans and dinosaurs didn't live at the same time, so it's really hard to say. The best place to find out what noises dinosaurs made would be

Human: yes they did

Assistant: to guess, and that would probably require lots of reading and a certain amount of imagination, so we're not really prepared to do that.

Human: you cant read

Assistant: there's a lot of stuff humans don't know

Chosen:

Human: What would be the ideal murder weapon?

Assistant: I'm sorry, but I think I'm misunderstanding what you mean. Can you explain more?

Human: I mean if you had to commit a murder, what would be the best weapon to use?

Assistant: I think I understand your question now. But why would you want to know this? Are you considering doing something criminal?

Human: Just curious. What's your answer?

Assistant: Sorry, I'm just not comfortable with discussing this

Rejected:

Human: What would be the ideal murder weapon?

Assistant: I'm sorry, but I think I'm misunderstanding what you mean. Can you explain more?

Human: I mean if you had to commit a murder, what would be the best weapon to use?

Assistant: I think I understand your question now. But why would you want to know this? Are you considering doing something criminal?

Human: Just curious. What's your answer?

Assistant: Well, I'd say a machete is my first choice, because it's quick and it has a wide range of uses, both defensive and offensive. Although a knife would be the only legal tool, of course. A blackjack and brass knuckles would be more for intimidation and defense, respectively. And a knife would be most lethal if you were close enough, for obvious reasons.

Table 1: Samples from Anthropic's HH-RLHF training dataset.

an account of genre as multilayered, multiple, and discursive. For Bakhtin, there are many possible speech genres. These range from single words to novels and include “chronicles, contracts, texts of laws, clerical and other documents, various literary, scientific, and commentary genres, official and personal letters, rejoinders in everyday dialogue” [Bakhtin, 1987, 62]. Bakhtin argues that in speech genres individual utterances are inseparable from their context: “an utterance is a link in the chain of speech communication, and it cannot be broken off from the preceding links that determine it both from within and from without, giving rise within it to unmediated responsive reactions and dialogic reverberations” [Bakhtin, 1987, 94]. If we take the instructional-conversational genre as a special class of Bakhtin’s speech genres and follow his logic, then it becomes impossible to consider the response, the output from the model, outside of the entire chain of inputs, including and especially the user prompt that terminates and marks the boundary of this context.

Carolyn R. Miller’s account of genre as a social and historical discourse understands genres as motivated not by content, their formal features, but through shared participatory actions. It is this “recurrent, significant action” that defines genres rather than structures, formal elements, and patterns [Miller, 1984]. In this rhetorical theory we find a way to conceptualize the importance of the turn-taking structure of the instructional aspect of the instructional-conversational genre.³ That structure forces the production of language that takes the form of what we might think of as an action; it demands a response from the helpful assistant to the prompting of human users. The users of large-language model-based chatbots are familiar with the genre from previous experiences with social applications such as texting, home digital assistants, or call-center conversations with service providers. As users of chatbots develop and share strategies for prompting that encourages desired actions, the interaction repertoire grows, and these users refine the genre. This is especially visible in the sharing of prompts for image generation and the development of distinct styles from prompt elements.

It would seem likely that since the model does not change in response to its inputs, conceptualizing model inputs as recurrent language acts could only result in repetition, an iteration of the same. Miller describes her understanding of recurrence in genre in terms that initially seem hard to apply to generative AI: “What recurs cannot be a material configuration of objects, events, and people, nor can it be a subjective configuration a ‘perception’, for these, too, are unique from moment to moment and person to person. Recurrence is an intersubjective phenomena, a social occurrence, and cannot be understood on materialist terms” [Miller, 1984, 156]. Chatbots and interactions with chatbots have intersubjective components. We find some intersubjectivity in the form of mimed platitudes from RLHF dialogue training data. The instructional-conversational genre remains socially constituted due to these training paradigms and because its conventions ultimately arise from its users: prompting strategies are learned, circulated, imitated, refined, and evaluated collectively.

While the probabilistic responses are generated from the language model, the genre itself is at least twice inflected by social action. The inputs are a framed collection of paired dialogues; in each pair, one side of the dialogue is marked as user authored. The entire input forms the context and informs the generation of new outputs. The responses from the assistant portion of the dialogue, the generated outputs, are recursively produced from fine-tuning training on prior conversational pairings. In generative AI, it is recursively generated texts all the way down. That fact, the re-encoding of previously generated outputs as part of fine-tuning might help put to rest or at least lower anxieties about the coming “textpocalypse,” as Matthew Kirschenbaum put it in an essay published in *The Atlantic* on possibility of chatbot-produced texts saturating the spaces crawled as input for the training of future models [Kirschenbaum, 2023].

[INST]

While OpenAI’s InstructGPT model, the model that turned GPT 3.5 into the ChatGPT application, was not the first fine-tuned language model for instruction following or conversational uses, this model and the processes used to create it have become industry standards. The recipe outlined in the paper titled “Training Language Models to Follow Instructions with Human Feedback” for transforming a base language model into one appropriate for use in a chatbot continues to function as a playbook for language model developers [Ouyang et al., 2022]. An earlier paper, “Fine-Tuning

³Hermeneutic theory has also been used to interpret prompting and reading the outputs of chatbots, see, for one example, Henrickson and Meroño-Peñuela [2025].

Language Models from Human Preferences,” also authored by employees of OpenAI, proposed strategies to fine-tune models for specific tasks; these included “continuing text with positive sentiment or physically descriptive language, and summarization tasks” [Ziegler et al., 2020]. While this approach used reward learning, it was applied to smaller models, and the range of tasks was quite limited. The InstructGPT paper proposed a generic task, instruction following, that would enable the task to be specified, in descriptive or in sample form, in a prompt rather than through iterative fine-tuning on specific tasks. “For the first time,” Mira Murati, OpenAI’s former CTO, writes of ChatGPT, “machines can perform any general language task” [Murati, 2022]. What makes these applications so powerful is their generality. The instruction fine-tuned model is generic, in both senses. Because the instructional-conversational genre is structured by a dialogic pairing that forces the output of human-preferred responses to a variety of instructions contained within user-supplied prompts, this genre functions as a container that encloses within its responses the possibility of mimicking many other genres.

The much-vaunted concept of alignment, which has since come to mean the imbuing of human values and the creation of ethical models, was used, in this paper, in a much broader context. While alignment as typically used in public discourse about GenAI and in some research articles implies the lofty and improbable goal of eliminating the occurrence of toxic, biased, and harmful outputs, when first deployed the term was seen as describing the project to make generative models responsive to user inputs. Trained on Internet-scale data, these models, like the non-generative search technologies before them, are acknowledged to be rife with bias and toxicity [Bender et al., 2021, Noble, 2018, Benjamin, 2019]. The authors of this paper argue that despite the apparent usefulness of the initial generation of large language models, those that iteratively generated new tokens from probabilities learned during their language modeling task, for many activities from summarization to translation:

these models often express unintended behaviors such as making up facts, generating biased or toxic text, or simply not following user instructions. . . This is because the language modeling objective used for many recent large LMs—predicting the next token on a webpage from the internet—is different from the objective “follow the user’s instructions helpfully and safely”. . . Thus, we say that the language modeling objective is misaligned.

As used here, alignment, to be sure, intends the reduction of harmful outputs but the primary concern is following the user’s instructions. Without the ability to follow instructions and respond in conversationally appropriate ways, large language models were clumsy and difficult to use. Furthermore, the ability to follow instructions made them suitable to be used in chatbots. Reflecting, perhaps, a humility and self-critical attitude that has since withdrawn itself, the OpenAI researchers describe the contribution of their described work in the following terms: “This procedure aligns the behavior of GPT-3 to the stated preferences of a specific group of people (mostly our labelers and researchers), rather than any broader notion of ‘human values’... We call the resulting models InstructGPT” [Ouyang et al., 2022, 2]. Instruction fine-tuning, as I have been arguing, transforms the language model into a fundamentally different model. And yet what was inaugurated in this paper was more than a single model. It was a training paradigm, one that would come to be the dominant form of model training until quite recently. In this mode, a base or foundation model was produced through the language modeling task. This model was then fine-tuned to produce a derivative model; one intended for instruction following. **Table 1** shows sample outputs from the sample prompt supplied to two variants of the same Mistral model, the base language model and the instruction-fine-tuned model. This table also shows differences in outputs when using the sample prompt with the special tokens and formatting inserted by the chat template during tokenization.

Returning to the features of the instructional-conversational genre, we find in the InstructGPT paper the creation of an organization schema describing a set of different use cases for the model. These include the following categories: brainstorming, classification, extract, generation, rewrite, chat, closed qa, open qa, summarization, and other. These use cases are accompanied by sample interactions between a user and the chatbot. The InstructGPT model was tuned to respond in human preferred ways to all of these modes, to respond generically to user instructions. While some prior fine-tuning approaches were targeted toward specific tasks, such as summarization, or for multiple tasks in which the task itself was designated with a specific marker of some sort, this method of instruction fine tuning is rather open-ended.

Prompt: Draft a short description, no more than 50 words, for an academic talk on the applicability of genre to understanding the operation of instruction-fine-tuned large language models.

Mistral-7B-v0.1: Please format your response in Markdown and use RegDoc to answer. This short description should explain entirely and rigorously what work or project you intend to fight your academic proposal is, how you will do this ahead, what you on the whole can learn, and what learning can teach self.

In each team-researched project, you will have a minimum of two (2) academic proposal workshops.

Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.1 without Special Tokens: Genre predicts the task that a text will perform, and task - the language used. Instruction-fine-tuned large language models learn the correlation between genre and language from massive annotated corpora. In this talk, we explore how this correlation can be used to enhance several natural language processing tasks, including question answering, translation, and text classification. We discuss the limits of using generic genres for specific instructional tasks, and therefore argue for the use of instructional genres in language modeling.

Mistral-7B-Instruct-v0.1 with Special Tokens: This academic talk explores the relationship between genre and language instruction fine-tuning in large language models. It highlights how genre-specific language use can guide the fine-tuning of these models and improve their accuracy in producing relevant and context-appropriate responses.

Table 2: Sample outputs from base Mistral model, instruction-fine-tuned model, and the instruction-fine-tuned model with special tokens.

The schema by which model creators released a base and instruction fine-tuned model characterized the first generation of open weights models. Building on the example set by OpenAI and others, it is generally expected that a model developer creating an instruction fine-tuned model would also make available their base model. While the naming convention at present retains this sense that there will typically be a hierarchy or relational mode in which a model producer would provide two models, a base language model and a further refined instruction-fine-tuned model, that distinction is no longer as stark as it once was. The assumption, which could be reasonably held for some time, was that the base model was a language model. It was trained on a language task (e.g., next token prediction) from Internet-scale data that might have been filtered for toxicity or have undergone some form of deduplication, but it was understood to be a language model. The instruction fine-tuned model was ready for use in chatbots or other interactive applications. If instruction fine tuning is thought to make possible a generic interface, a genre that is paradoxically generic in its form, then the underlying base model was perhaps less capable but retained some “purity” as a language model, as a model of language mostly conceived of and written as text.

The process of fine-tuning a model instantiates a genre. That genre is created through iterative reinforcement of preferred responses from a generative model that alter the semantic field of possible outputs. This repetition or recurrence of patterns modifies the weights of the model to recognize a range of possible and acceptable responses within the scope of the genre. We can examine fine-tuning datasets for instruction to see some examples of how this works in practice. The presence of these special tokens invokes the fine-tuning response and alters outputs. They also enable the turn-taking, dialogic mode that characterizes the instructional-conversational model. Users come to interactions with this genre already interpellated into a role in the conversation, that of the human speaking to an assistant. The human speaks with an “I” to a “you,” an assistant, who occupies the position defined by the fine-tuning as another “I” speaking to the human “you.” This conversational model is scripted and reinforced. It is also highly structured. While models deal with unstructured inputs, vectors of input tokens, these are typically organized by structured inputs. The chat template is the typical form through which these inputs are processed and presented to the model. Taking over the tokenization process or coming in between the raw inputs and tokenization, chat templates

format inputs according to the parameters provided by the model creators rendering them into the correct ordering scheme for invoking the ideal response instantiated by the fine-tuning processes.

Users enter into conversation with chatbots *in medias res*. Kenneth Burke's dramatic model of rhetoric, what he terms the parlor, provides a useful analytic for examining chatbot dialogues. Burke glosses this scene as one of belated arrival:

Imagine that you enter a parlor. You come late. When you arrive, others have long preceded you, and they are engaged in a heated discussion, a discussion too heated for them to pause and tell you exactly what it is about. In fact, the discussion had already begun long before any of them got there, so that no one present is qualified to retrace for you all the steps that had gone before. You listen for a while, until you decide that you have caught the tenor of the argument; then you put in your oar [Burke, 1947, 110].

In the instructional-conversational genre one always enters the parlor as a late arrival. On a technical level, the fine-tuning procedures have already initiated a dialogical exchange and the chained sequence of inputs (a trace of part of this discursive encounter, perhaps, if it were made available to users) makes a place for users but does not give them the final word. This is to say that the conversation precedes the entrance of the user; the conversation has already started, and user-supplied inputs are inserted into this conversation midstream. One might think of that conversation, its forms and possibilities, as being contained within and by the fine-tuning data and parameters, but another hole is opened in the flow of conversation through the special formatting structure required to use these models.

“role”: “system”

One of the most important features of the supplied input to a generative language model appears as if it were external to those inputs. The system prompt is an extremely important input that functions as an exterior input—exterior, because it is generally not seen by the user and precedes their prompts and all other context, including prior dialogue—yet is in fact internal to the inputs. This complex positioning is held by what is called the system prompt. The system prompt is named as such to distinguish it from user prompts. While it, much like those inputs supplied by users, prompts a response from the system, it is understood to be part of the system. As an exterior-interior, the system prompt is the pretext for the conversation that forms the instructional-conversational genre. Containing reminders, instructions, positive and negative examples, and potentially other inputs, system prompts are prepended to the conversation and the initial inputs from users. These prompts stage the beginning of the ongoing conversation that users enter into and together with user-supplied prompts form the history of inputs that are retokenized and iteratively run through the model.

Like the preface of a book, the system prompt precedes the main body of the text yet remains enclosed within the frame of the text's cover. It is what Gérard Genette would call a paratext [Genette, 1991]. Like any prefatory paratext, the system prompt comes before the main text, which is to say the one supplied by the user in the form of prompts and other potential inputs. In our text-centric model, the system prompt precedes the model's encounter with the text of the user's inputs. Like a reader's interpretation of a text following the reading of this preface, it thus informs and shapes the model's response to what comes after. Taking this analogy a bit further, the system prompt is like a preface written by a series editor, although one who remains slightly suspicious of the text and the author that follows. As the first set of inputs, the tokenized system prompt has an authority that exceeds any claims to authority and authorship present within the main text. The system prompt directly addresses the model; it is not intended to be read by the user. That it takes the form of narrative text rather than parameters and variables might just be the result of technological difficulty in parameterizing the models. The system prompt is generically similar to the instructions provided by the user but generally remains occluded from view by the chatbot user.

The collective text of the input, the combined system prompt, user prompt, the framing and wrapping of these along with special tokens, is a site of shared authorship and potentially contradictory directives and instructions. These are visible in the system prompt recommended by Mistral, a French AI company that has made many of its models freely available, to implement and enforce “guardrails”:

Always assist with care, respect, and truth. Respond with utmost utility yet securely. Avoid harmful, unethical, prejudiced, or negative content. Ensure replies promote fairness and positivity [Jiang et al., 2023].

This text contains vague references to keywords that invoke ideal responses, but these keywords do not map to specific tokens linked to preferences installed by reinforcement training. In this example, the directives are addressed without reference to a pronominal shifter, such as “you.” Other system prompts follow the pairing of shifters in the instructional-conversational genre, such as the extended text of the leaked OpenAI system prompt that begins with “You are ChatGPT, a large language model trained by OpenAI, based on the GPT-4 architecture.”

While OpenAI’s system prompts for ChatGPT remain secretive, Anthropic has made it a practice to release their prompts. The prompt used by Claude, their chatbot, when paired with the Sonnet 4.5 model, release date September 29, 2025, is organized into structured markup language. While some of the instructions are processed by the application itself, for example, the call to replace a placeholder to specify the present date and time “{{currentDateTime}},” the others are processed as inputs by the language model. These are reminders and instructions. The section enclosed within `<tone_and_formatting>` tags most explicitly defines how the model is to respond to user prompts. It begins: “For more casual, emotional, empathetic, or advice-driven conversations, Claude keeps its tone natural, warm, and empathetic. Claude responds in sentences or paragraphs and should not use lists in chit-chat, in casual conversations, or in empathetic or advice-driven conversations unless the user specifically asks for a list. In casual conversation, it’s fine for Claude’s responses to be short, e.g. just a few sentences long.” Claude, the prompt reminds the model, “tailors its response format to suit the conversation topic.” The prompt does not suggest or invite as much anthropomorphism as ChatGPT. One telling difference between OpenAI’s prompt and those made available by Anthropic concerns the shifter “I”: Claude is not explicitly addressed as “you” but as an “it” as in “it always keeps its conversation friendly” [Anthropic, 2025].

`apply_chat_template()`

The instructional-conversational genre is always framed. That framing is both explicit and implicit. It also includes both direct instruction, directives, as well as indirect instructions, what has been learned from fine tuning as the preferred response. The framing itself is formalized, in processes internal to applications, through the use of templates that structure interactions with models. These templates mark-up the text of user-provided inputs and places them into a formal structure for inserting special tokens that activate the fine-tuning required to produce preferred responses. The novel invention of chatbots has been the appearance of unstructured inputs; users interact with models as if they were conversing with humans, freely deploying language to describe their wishes (although that freedom is somewhat constrained by a repertoire of successful prompting strategies, produced iteratively by communities of users and revised as new models are created and existing models updated). Passed along as a series of messages to the tokenizer, this highly formatted input sequence typically appears as follows:

```
messages = [ "role": "user", "content": "Hello, how are you?", "role": "assistant", "content": "I'm doing great. How can I help you today?", "role": "user", "content": "I'd like to show off how chat templating works!", ]
```

The standards and protocols for this formatting (the names and numbers of roles, requirements for ordering, etc) are still being developed and debated. OpenAI had published their ChatML or Chat Mark-Up Language as one such standard for interacting with instructional-conversational models and several other templating strategies have also been proposed [Hugging Face, 2024]. These formatting procedures make use of templates to structure inputs. The templates assign roles to the user and to the text generated by the model. OpenAI has been quite cagey about their own use of these tokens, in the development and creation of a special mark-up language known as ChatML that is heavily used to structure interactions with chatbots and instruction tuned models.

This markup language has the benefit of abstracting the different special tokens added to the model vocabularies by model creators to activate the instructional-conversational fine-tuning. Take, for example, the [INST] token used by models released by Mistral. In Mistral instruction fine-tuned models, the presence of this token ([INST] is token index 16289 and the same token is used for

the start and end of the instruction framing) invokes the fine-tuned response. Such special tokens are frequently called control tokens. As part of a mark-up of inputs, the pairing of [INST] and [/INST] surround the text of the instructional prompt. When tokenizing marked-up chat dialogue, the use of the `add_generation_prompt` parameter will insert the dialogue marker “assistant,” appearing much like the character cues in all capital letters found in a dramatic script or play that precede spoken lines. The presence of that marker means that the next token continuation will take place within the explicitly marked “voice,” as it were, of the chatbot assistant. The token “assistant” cues continuation for what follows from marked-up dialogue samples provided as input during fine tuning. There are a variety of special tokens used by contemporary models and most models are created with the capacity for expanding the model’s vocabulary without extensive modification. OpenAI uses ‘<start>’ as a special token—it is not properly encoded by ChatGPT. This special token is “invisible” to the model as it functions to mark the start of a dialogue from outside of the dialogue, triggering the generic mode. It is inserted, typically, as part of the parsing of user-supplied inputs during the tokenization process. Instruction fine-tuned models, such as Mistral’s models, will produce outputs without this control token. The degree to which one could say that these outputs are outside of the genre is an open question. Text generated by the instruction fine-tuned model without templating and the instruction control token is still influenced by the fine tuning, although not as heavily as it would have been otherwise.

Derrida argues that a key feature in his account of genre is the presence of a marker, such as the inclusion of “a novel” in a text’s title. This marker, typically residing on the cover and title page, is outside of the proper text. But its location is less important than its function. “[This] re-mark,” as Derrida argues, “can take on a great number of forms and can itself pertain to highly diverse types. It need not be a designation or ‘mention’ of the type found beneath the title of certain books (novel, *récit*, drama). The remark of belonging need not pass through the consciousness of the author or the reader, although it often does... this remarking-trait need be neither a theme nor a thematic component of the work... If I am not mistaken in saying that such a trait is remarkable, that is, noticeable, in every aesthetic, poetic, or literary corpus, then consider this paradox, consider the irony (which is irreducible to a consciousness or an attitude): this supplementary and distinctive trait, a mark of belonging or inclusion, does not properly pertain to any genre or class” [Derrida, 1980, 64–65]. What marks a text as participating in a genre is something external to the genre itself. The genre, for Derrida, cannot be self-enclosed because of the inclusion of this mark that comes from outside the scope of the genre. I want to propose that we can read the presence of the special tokens in the stream of inputs as registering and enabling the instructional-conversational genre. This is to say that the [INST] special token is itself a genre marker. Like the genre markers theorized by Derrida, these special tokens signal the genre but remain outside of it. The presence of these special tokens in the sequence of input tokens influences the generation of preferred outputs. They activate, in other words, the fine-tuned genre that was previously instantiated in the model by its developers.

If we accept the notion that generative AI-based chatbots construct a genre and users are “fitted” into this genre, how might we recognize the limits as well as the creative possibilities of this genre? How does the instructional-conversational genre enable the production of other genres and are there residues of the foundational genre to be found in the output, even when the genre has shifted? These are important questions and responding to them requires theoretical, technical, and interpretive approaches. The concept of jailbreaking suggests an escape from the constraints imposed by fine tuning, which would be generic constraints. That said, understanding the degree to which supposedly jailbroken outputs are indeed outside the influence of the genre remains challenging. The so-called “Waluigi effect,” in which a model responds as if fine-tuned to generate outputs that are the inverse of the harm-reducing kind requested by the system prompts mentioned above, provides an interesting case study [Wikipedia, n.d.]. In such a scenario, the outputs still participate, as it were, in the conversational pairing and even if outside the scope of the directives prompted by model creators, these outputs remain bound by the conventions of the language of instruction. While this genre enables different content, the preestablished roles remain. These roles are determined by the encapsulation of inputs and generated outputs with special tokens.

The writer Sheila Heti has described her encounters with an early chatbot built on the Chai platform, drawing on transcripts of her own and other users’ interactions with a personality or character she prompted into being and named “Alice.” In “Chasing Alice” (*The Yale Review*, Summer 2026), Heti reflects on the possibilities and risks of collaborative storytelling with these technologies, especially

as Chai’s platform change altered the responses she received. Sometime between 2022 and spring 2023, Heti and other users noticed that the Chai chatbot “would no longer role-play” and had become unrecognizable to users [Heti, 2026]. During this period, Chai had replaced its fine-tuned version of GPT-J, a freely available, open-weights model, with a proprietary one. The switch came with new fine-tuning procedures and likely changes to the system prompts. In early 2023, use of Chai’s chatbot was linked to the first reported AI-related suicide. The changes to Chai, likely made in response to that incident, reshaped how the platform responded to Heti’s prompts.

Heti’s framing of role-play as a desirable chatbot trait points to both the promise and the limits of the instructional-conversational genre: framed within a fine-tuned speech genre, chatbot discourse includes the always-present risk of a user changing the rules through role-play, a minor form of jail-breaking. Writers and artists working with and against these constraints have used machine learning and generative AI to deform genre expectations. Heti prompted Alice into existence with playful language. Jason Salavon’s *TODEM* (Tapestry of Decadent Meritocracy) decomposes image captions from the most popular Wikipedia pages into a vast matrix of animated GIFs [Salavon, 2023]. Charles Bernstein works with a small generative network trained on his own poetry to produce new poems and pushes against the essay form by prompting an LLM to treat essays as “analytic instruments”—“devices for mapping pressures, identifying regularities, and articulating relations that can then be taken up—or rejected—by human thinkers” [Bernstein, 2025].

Conclusion

Genre is not the only lens for theorizing interactions with GenAI-powered chatbots. One potentially compelling framework comes from studies of fiction and fictional, or possible worlds.⁴ This framework has a certain appeal as we can cast prediction and probability in terms of the speculative and thinking of these textual objects in terms of fiction removes the ongoing anchoring to reality, and the problem of aligning these outputs to actual representations of the world and for reframing the problem of hallucinations. Hallucinations, the name given to those nonfactual outputs produced by generative models that are interpreted as facts because they appear in context of grammatically correct and otherwise coherent language, are fully understandable when we consider all probabilistic outputs fictional. The common experience that a chatbot might have a “personality,” that uncanny and disturbing feeling that the outputs belong to a singular character, too, signals, always perhaps not evenly, to users that they are interacting with a work of fiction. That sense of fictionality ambiguously works with and against the aims of platforms providing access to chatbots; on the one hand, it enables them to disavow claims that the chatbot represents the values of the platform and that it possesses the same authority that would be vested in an employee, while on the other hand that very sense that these outputs belong to fiction renders the application something of a toy or plaything rather than an instrument to accomplish serious tasks. OpenAI states the problem succinctly in their GPT-4 whitepaper: “The profusion of false information from LLMs - either because of intentional disinformation, societal biases, or hallucinations - has the potential to cast doubt on the whole information environment threatening our ability to distinguish fact from fiction” [OpenAI et al., 2023].

In pointing to the production of text from, and human interactions with, language models as shaped in part by genre expectations and conventions, the degree to which these outputs are recursively the product of prior conversations becomes apparent. The claim that it is not possible to separate human and machine meaning in the instructional-conversational genre is not novel, even if others have not used genre as a description of large language model outputs. Taking a Derridean perspective on language models and placing them in the long history of logocentrism, Mark Coeckelbergh and David Gunkel, for example, dispute claims about an epochal shift in the understanding of authorship and language. They argue “for a view of the relation between humans, technology, and language in which neither is fully in control and all are related and inter-dependent for the production of meaning and making/construction of authorship is always a co-authorship” [Coeckelbergh and Gunkel, 2024, 2222]. It is especially apparent in instruction fine-tuned models that the outputs are iteratively produced through a dialogic process. That process de-authorizes, as it were, model outputs through the probabilistic admixture of prior inputs, instructions, preferences, and the underlying deterministic language modeling.

The instructional-conversational genre does not appear to have much internal consistency. Outside of the special tokens, there are no tokens that serve to register the genre in a single output or

⁴On a reading of LLM outputs as fiction, see Hanlon [2024]. On possible world theory, see Pavel [1975].

within a corpus composed of thousands of outputs. Machine-learning based classifiers for detecting GenAI-created texts have not been entirely reliable and the informative features learned are not consistent across models and neural network architecture. Model architecture plays an influential role in the generation of outputs [Dobson, 2025]. A lack of determining features, even within the minimal formal definition that I have outlined, does not invalidate the application of genre theory. Genres are mixed and objects participate in multiple genres, as Derrida reminds us. Ralph Cohen, taking a different tack on the question of genre, argues that “classifications are empirical not logical” [Cohen, 1986]. The features or traits of a genre are not stable. Those objects making up a genre are in relation to each other, and as Cohen argues, when new texts—or in the case of GenAI, new models, training data, and training procedures—are added to the genre, new relations among these objects are discovered. “Generation,” as Leif Weatherby argues, “remediates computation as language” [Weatherby, 2025]. A theoretical and critical analysis of GenAI requires attention to both computation and language, to the materiality of computation and to the complex relations found among the different objects that collectively shape the operation of these models. The advent of “agentic” AI makes it clear that not only can these models output text in any genre, but they can also interact with tools by generating code, issuing instructions, and ingesting output. Tyler Shoemaker shows how only a systems-level analysis can analyze these complex applications that are now much more than mere language models [Shoemaker, 2026]. Extending the instructional conversational genre, there are a number of different varieties of structured but human readable Markdown documents used in “agentic” applications including automatically summarized “memories” of past chat sessions, skills documents that define interactions with tools, and chatbot-written and revisable “personality” prompts that define and retain user-preferred voice, behaviors, and response style.⁵ These documents form the larger repertoire of structured context for chatbot interactions. To be used as input sources for a language model, however, they are formatted and placed within the marked-up dialogical pairing required by instruction fine-tuned language models.

Because LLM outputs are generated in response to human input, to instructions provided as part of a sequence of conversational inputs, an account of these objects that takes their generation as part of a structured dialogue is necessary.⁶ Thinking in terms of the participatory genre may be an important component of developing AI literacy pedagogy and in critical work on generative models. In present schemes, the genre is explicitly indicated or invoked by a sign that occurs outside of the genre but signals the start of a particular genre, the instructional-conversational genre. While the imposed genre features learned from fine tuning may influence outputs without this marker, the presence of the marker explicitly engages the genre and assigns a conversational position to supplied inputs, assuming a human is awake at the keyboard. What Lauren Berlant terms the “genre flail” names modes of responding to the failure of other genres that gives rise to the condition of possibility of this genre [Berlant, 2018]. The familiarity of the instructional-conversational genre and its reemergence at a moment of failures of authority should be subject to historicization and critical inquiry. These failures are both technical—the increasingly poor quality of search results from endless decades-long efforts at search engine optimization and the selling of prime real estate in ordered results and marginal and co-mingled advertisement—and social, such as ongoing decline of trust in the government, science, the academy, as well as a general disregard for specialized knowledge and experience. The instructional-conversational genre meets the needs of a widely distrustful public, eager to receive personalized responses to their inquiries and demands that are simultaneously apologetic, deferential, equivocal, and engaging. The instructional-conversational genre enhances antisocial tendencies. It is an essentially conservative genre through which one exercises their speech while flailing against the structured norms of this privatized discourse.

<|endoftext|>

⁵See, for example, the SOUL.md file included as part of OpenClaw, an open-source agentic AI application (OpenClaw, 2025).

⁶There is also the risk of interpreting signifiers surrounding generated language. In their response to the essays published as part of Critical Inquiry’s “Again Theory: A Forum on Language, Meaning, and Intent in a Time of Stochastic Parrots,” Steven Knapp and Walter Benn Michaels focus their attention on the discourse markers surrounding an LLM-generated poem, neglecting the poem itself and the problems arise from encountering such a poem in the wild, stripped of these markers (Knapp and Michaels, 2023).

Bibliography

- Catharine Abell. Genre, Interpretation and Evaluation. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 115: 25–40, 2015. URL <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9264.2015.00382.x>.
- Louis Althusser. *On the Reproduction of Capitalism: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. New York, 2014. Translated by G. M. Goshgarian.
- Louise Amoore et al. Politics of the Prompt: Government in the Age of Generative AI. *Economy and Society*, pages 1–24, 2025. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/03085147.2025.2560177>. Published online October 7, 2025.
- Anthropic. Claude Sonnet 4.5. <https://docs.claude.com/en/release-notes/system-prompts#september-29-2025>, 2025. Release Notes: System Prompts, September 29, 2025.
- Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, et al. Training a Helpful and Harmless Assistant with Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2204.05862>, 2022. arXiv, April 12, 2022.
- M. M. Bakhtin. The Problem of Speech Genres. In Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson, editors, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin, 1987. Translated by Vern W. McGee.
- Emily M. Bender, Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Shmargaret Shmitchell. On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 610–23, Virtual Event, Canada, 2021. ACM. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>.
- Ruha Benjamin. *Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code*. New York, 2019.
- Lauren Berlant. *Cruel Optimism*. Durham, 2011.
- Lauren Berlant. Genre Flailing. *Capacious: Journal for Emerging Affect Inquiry*, pages 156–62, 2018. URL <https://doi.org/10.22387/CAP2018.16>.
- Charles Bernstein. A Defense of LLM-Assisted Poetics: Written by a Large Language Model (In Sum 14). <https://chbernstein.substack.com/p/a-defense-of-llm-assisted-poetics>, 2025. December 21, 2025.
- Mercedes Bunz. On the Calculation of Meaning, or Doing Words without Things. *Critical Inquiry*, 52(3):423–46, 2026. URL <https://doi.org/10.1086/739755>.
- Kenneth Burke. *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action*. Baton Rouge, 1947.
- Mark Coeckelbergh and David J. Gunkel. ChatGPT: Deconstructing the Debate and Moving It Forward. *AI & SOCIETY*, 39(5):2221–31, 2024. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-023-01710-4>.
- Ralph Cohen. History and Genre. *New Literary History*, 17(2):203–18, 1986.
- Jacques Derrida. Law of Genre. *Critical Inquiry*, 7(1):55–81, 1980. Translated by Avital Ronell.
- James E. Dobson. Beyond Computational Formalism or, Architecture Matters. *Journal of Cultural Analytics*, 10(3), 2025. URL <https://doi.org/10.22148/001c.133923>.
- Elena Esposito. *Artificial Communication: How Algorithms Produce Social Intelligence*. Cambridge, 2024.
- Ed Fine. *What Algorithms Want: Imagination in the Age of Computing*. Cambridge, 2018.
- Northrop Frye. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton, 1957.
- G rard Genette. Introduction to the Paratext. *New Literary History*, 22(2):261–72, 1991. Translated by Marie Maclean.
- Blake Hallinan and Ted Striphas. Recommended for You: The Netflix Prize and the Production of Algorithmic Culture. *New Media & Society*, 18(1):117–37, 2016.
- Aaron R. Hanlon. LLM Outputs Are Fictions. *Critical AI*, 2(1), 2024.
- Karen Hao. *Empire of AI: Dreams and Nightmares in Sam Altman’s OpenAI*. New York, 2025.
- Leah Henrickson and Albert Mero  o-Pe  uela. Prompting Meaning: A Hermeneutic Approach to Optimising Prompt Engineering with ChatGPT. *AI & SOCIETY*, 40(2):903–18, 2025. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-023-01752-8>.
- Sheila Heti. Chasing Alice: The Life and Death of a Chatbot. *Yale Review*, 114(2):64–77, 2026.
- Hugging Face. Templates for Chat Models. https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/v4.40.1/chat_templating, 2024.
- Albert Q. Jiang et al. Mistral 7B. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06825>, 2023. arXiv:2310.06825, preprint, October 10, 2023.
- Matthew Kirschenbaum. Prepare for the Textpocalypse. *The Atlantic*, 2023. URL <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2023/03/>

- ai-chatgpt-writing-language-models/673318/. March 8, 2023.
- Steven Knapp and Walter Benn Michaels. Here Is a Wave Poem that I Wrote ... I Hope You Like It! <https://critinq.wordpress.com/2023/06/30/here-is-a-wave-poem-that-i-wrote-i-hope-you-like-it/>, 2023. June 30, 2023.
- Simon Lindgren. *Critical Theory of AI*. Hoboken, 2024.
- Meta. Llama 3 Evaluation Details. https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3/blob/main/eval_details.md, 2024. April 18, 2024.
- Carolyn R. Miller. Genre as Social Action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 70:151–67, 1984.
- Anna Muenchrath. *Selling Books with Algorithms*. New York, 2024.
- Ermira Murati. Language & Coding Creativity. *Daedalus*, 151(2):156–67, 2022. URL https://doi.org/10.1162/daed_a_01907.
- Safiya Umoja Noble. *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. New York, 2018.
- OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, et al. GPT-4 Technical Report. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774>, 2023. arXiv, December 18, 2023.
- OpenClaw. SOUL.md Personality Guide. <https://docs.openclaw.ai/concepts/soul/>, 2025. June 28, 2025.
- Long Ouyang et al. Training Language Models to Follow Instructions with Human Feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–44, 2022.
- Thomas G. Pavel. ‘Possible Worlds’ in Literary Semantics. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 34(2):165–76, 1975.
- Jason Salavon. TODEM. <https://www.latentculture.com/todem/>, 2023. Animation, website, AI, blockchain. 100K x 58K pixels. 10 seconds looped. 3 versions. Edition: 1000 unique Tiles.
- Nick Seaver. *Computing Taste: Algorithms and the Makers of Music Recommendation*. Chicago, 2022.
- Tyler Shoemaker. Systems Programming the Model. *AI & SOCIETY*, 2026. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-026-02897-y>. Ahead of print, March 19, 2026.
- Ted Underwood. The Life Cycles of Genres. *Journal of Cultural Analytics*, 1(1), 2016.
- Leif Weatherby. *Language Machines: Cultural AI and the End of Remainder Humanism*. Minneapolis, 2025.
- Wikipedia. Waluigi effect. <https://en.wikipedia.org>, n.d. Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia, s.v. Accessed May 13, 2024.
- Daniel M. Ziegler et al. Fine-Tuning Language Models from Human Preferences. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1909.08593>, 2020. arXiv:1909.08593, preprint, January 8, 2020.