ComAI | Working Papers

Andreas Hepp, Wiebke Loosen, Juliane Jarke, Christian Katzenbach, & Michaela Pfadenhauer

Communicative Artificial Intelligence
Introduction to a Living Handbook

ComAI Working Paper | No. 01
ISSN 3054-1182

Universität Bremen ZeMKI Zentrum für Medien-, Kommunikations- und Informationsforschung

Universität Bremen | University of Bremen
ZeMKI, Zentrum für Medien-, Kommunikations- und Informationsforschung
Linzer Str. 4, 28359 Bremen, Germany, E-mail: zemki@uni-bremen.de
www.zemki.uni-bremen.de | www.zemki.uni-bremen.de/en/

Andreas Hepp (ahepp@uni-bremen.de)
Dr. Andreas Hepp is Professor of Media and Communications and Head of ZeMKI, Centre for Media, Communication and Information Research, University of Bremen, Germany. He previously worked at the University of Trier, the University of Karlsruhe (now KIT), the Technical University of Ilmenau and the University of Münster. He was Visiting Researcher and Professor at leading institutions such as the London School of Economics and Political Science, Goldsmiths University of London, Université Paris II Panthéon ASSAS, Stanford University and others. Andreas Hepp's research focuses on mediatization, datafication, automation of communication / communicative AI, media use and appropriation. He is the author of 12 monographs including "The Mediated Construction of Reality" (with Nick Couldry, 2017), "Transcultural Communication" (2015) and "Cultures of Mediatization" (2013). His latest book is "Deep Mediatization" (2020). He is currently working on a book on digital pioneers to be published by Polity Press.

Wiebke Loosen (w.loosen@leibniz-hbi.de)
Dr. Wiebke Loosen has been a senior researcher at the Leibniz Institute for Media Research | Hans-Bredow-Institut (HBI) and a professor at Universität Hamburg (in accordance with §17 of the HmbHG) since April 2010. She researches the transformation of journalism within a changing media environment, journalism theories and methods of communication and journalism research. She studied communication science, psychology, and German studies at the University of Münster, where she also completed her doctorate. Her habilitation at Universität Hamburg was dedicated to the topic of "Transformations of Journalism and Journalism Research". Wiebke Loosen held visiting professorships at the Universities of Münster and Munich.

Juliane Jarke (juliane.jarke@uni-graz.at)
Juliane Jarke is Professor of Digital Societies at the University of Graz, Austria. She has previously worked at the University of Bremen (D) and Lancaster University (UK) and was a visiting research fellow at the University of Bristol (UK) and the Federal University of Minas Gerais (Brazil). Juliane's research intersects critical data studies, participatory (design) research, anticipation studies and feminist STS. Her latest co-edited books include Algorithmic Regimes: Methods, Interactions and Politics (Amsterdam University Press) and Dialogues in Data Power: Shifting Response-abilities in a Datafied World (Bristol University Press). She is co-editor of a special issue on "Care-ful Data Studies" in Information, Communication and Society and on "Designing Postdigital Futures" in Postdigital Science and Education. Juliane is co-organiser of the Data Power Conference series.

Christian Katzenbach (katzenbach@uni-bremen.de)
Christian Katzenbach is Professor of Communication and Media Studies with a focus on media governance and platform economics at the Centre for Media, Communication and Information Research (ZeMKI) at the University of Bremen. In Bremen, Christian is head of the Lab "Platform Governance, Media, and Technology" and director of the MA programme Digital Media and Society. In research and teaching, Christian addresses the interrelationships of communication, technology and politics in the context of the digitalisation of society. Currently he focusses on the conceptual and empirical investigation of the regulation and governance of the internet and platforms, the role of data, algorithms and infrastructures for the (re-)organisation of societal communication, as well as discourses and regulation of "artificial intelligence".

Michaela Pfadenhauer (michaela.pfadenhauer@univie.ac.at)
Michaela Pfadenhauer has been Professor of Sociology at the University of Vienna since 2014, where she represents the Department of Culture and Knowledge. After working as an assistant professor at the Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich (LMU), TU Dortmund University and the University of St. Gallen, she was Professor of Sociology of Knowledge at the Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT) from 2007-2014 and held visiting professorships at Boston University, the University of South Florida (USF) and Keio University, among others. Her research focuses on Artificial Companions and Social Robotics (ComAI), knowledge cultures and scientific skepticism, social and communicative constructivism, phenomenologically based ethnography.

Working Paper No. 01, August 2026

Published by ZeMKI, Centre for Media, Communication and Information Research, Linzer Str. 4, 28359 Bremen, Germany. The ZeMKI is a Central Research Unit of the University of Bremen.
Copyright in editorial matters, University of Bremen © 2026
ISSN: 3054-1182
Copyright, Electronic Working Paper (EWP) 01 – Communicative Artificial Intelligence: Introduction to a Living Handbook, Andreas Hepp, Wiebke Loosen, Juliane Jarke, Christian Katzenbach, & Michaela Pfadenhauer, 2026
The authors have asserted their moral rights.
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission in writing of the publisher nor be issued to the public or circulated in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published. In the interests of providing a free flow of debate, views expressed in this EWP are not necessarily those of the editors or the ZeMKI/University of Bremen.

Communicative Artificial Intelligence: Introduction to a Living Handbook

Abstract

Preliminary note: As the first working paper in the 'Communicative AI' research unit's Working Papers series, this initial version of the introduction to the forthcoming handbook Communicative Artificial Intelligence *is being published. There are several reasons for this. First, it enables us to present the key ideas underlying our investigation into communicative AI in a concise manner. When we refer to communicative AI, we wish to emphasize that the distinctive feature of language models—also known as generative AI—is that they serve communicative purposes. It also allows us to introduce the concept of our 'living handbook' to a wider audience at an early stage.*

Our objective is to use this handbook to foster dialogue between our own research and that of other researchers in this field. There are two reasons why we have chosen the format of a "living handbook." On the one hand, we believe it is necessary to bring together academic knowledge on the rapidly evolving field of communicative AI. On the other hand, it is precisely this rapid development that means this can only be achieved through a publication project that is itself dynamic. What makes the living handbook unique is that its texts are continuously updated. Further information on the handbook can be found on this website: https://comai.space/en/the-living-handbook-on-communicative-ai/

Keywords

AI, sociomateriality, appropriation, media, communications

1 Introduction

Few technologies have moved as quickly from research laboratories into everyday life as the generative artificial intelligence (AI) systems that became publicly visible with OpenAI's ChatGPT. Within months, conversational applications built on large language models (LLMs) were drafting emails, writing software, tutoring students, and answering questions that people had previously entered into search engines. The public debate escalated just as quickly. In a very short space of time, there was widespread public debate not only about the potential of these latest forms of AI but also about the risks associated with them—from potential job displacement to fears of a 'superintelligence' escaping human control.

This handbook emerges from the conviction that, beneath the hype, something of genuine significance is taking place that social sciences in general, and media and communication research in particular, cannot afford to ignore: AI concerns not only our interactions with individual chatbots, but also the transformation of *societal communication* as a whole. This shift also unsettles what we mean by *media*: AI-based systems are no longer merely channels that mediate communication between people but are increasingly becoming *communicative participants* in their own right (Gunkel, 2024; Esposito, 2022). This shift reaches into every area of society—domains such as journalism, public discourse, politics, the economy, law, education, health, and the most ordinary routines of everyday life. It also poses a double challenge. Theoretically, the foundational concepts of the field—agency, media, and communication—are unsettled once machines begin to take part in communication rather than merely transmit it (Guzman & Lewis, 2020; Hepp et al., 2023). Empirically, researching

such systems and their consequences for societal communication poses a challenge to researchers across disciplines.

To address these challenges, we need a concept that captures what these phenomena have in common. We bring these developments together under the term *communicative AI*. The term is used deliberately. Its purpose is to foreground the communicative role of these systems rather than technical thresholds: it encompasses systems that engage users in direct communicative interaction, such as ChatGPT or Replika, as well as systems that shape societal communication more indirectly, for example through the automated production of journalistic text or images. Rather than asking whether a given system is "really" intelligent, the term directs attention to the family resemblance among a wide range of automated communication systems and to their role in society (Esposito, 2022). Speaking of "communicative AI" rather than simply "generative AI," "super-intelligence," or "AGI" sensitizes us to the fact that we are dealing primarily with a phenomenon of communication.

In this handbook, we intend to approach communicative AI in a very specific way—namely, as a phenomenon that is still in its infancy, as something *emerging*. We use this term deliberately. First, it captures a temporal condition: at a pace unmatched by almost any other media and communication technology before it, communicative AI is still in the process of coming into being. What was considered the latest fundamental language model just a few months ago is already outdated today; the ways in which communicative AI is being appropriated by organizations, communities, and individuals are changing rapidly; and the societal discourses surrounding communicative AI itself—its possibilities, limitations, and risks—are likewise characterized by rapid cycles.

Anyone engaging with communicative AI is therefore grappling with a process of emergence, which is why we have conceived this handbook as a "living handbook" and this introduction as a "living document": texts that must be continuously updated as communicative AI continues to emerge and becomes increasingly stabilized as part of our sociodigital fabric. But to call communicative AI *emerging* means more than noting that something new has entered the world. It means that the question of its consequences for societal communication is itself a question of emergent phenomena—consequences that are not *inscribed* in communicative AI as a technology, yet are not independent of it either. They unfold as part of hybrid figurations of humans, AI systems, and other materialities, which has properties that none of them possess alone. No single perspective can capture a phenomenon of this kind. The contributions to this handbook therefore approach communicative AI from a wide range of perspectives—empirical and theoretical, drawing on different traditions and disciplines, and focused on particular domains as much as on societal communication as a whole.

The remainder of this introduction proceeds in three steps. The next section elaborates on communicative AI as a sensitizing concept, situating it within the broader phenomenon of the automation of communication and proposing three criteria that hold its diverse instances together. We then argue that communicative AI is best understood as an emerging media and communication technology, which calls for a perspective of emergence alongside the well-established investigation of impact. Finally, we introduce the handbook's four parts, and outline the shared structure of each chapter.

2 Communicative AI as a sensitizing concept

It would be a misconception to treat the automation of communication as an invention of the last few years. Historically, today's digital systems of automated communication are deeply rooted in cybernetics (Turner, 2006) and in debates reaching back to the 1960s—from

Joseph C.R. Licklider and Robert W. Taylor's (1968) vision of the computer as a communication device to Joseph Weizenbaum's (1966) ELIZA and the controversies surrounding the Turing Test (Searle, 1980). Much of this discussion, however, took place outside media and communication studies and was addressed within the field only later, and only after a few notable exceptions had made it a sustained concern (Gunkel, 2012; Natale, 2021b).

In a deliberate simplification, the growing interest of media and communication studies in automated communication can be reconstructed as three overlapping steps in the field's engagement with digital communication. In the first, the field asked how communication and social relationships change when media become digital. The dominant concept was "computer-mediated communication" (Jones, 1998), and scholarly attention turned to person–computer interaction and to the growth of online relationships and communities (Baym, 1994; Wellman et al., 1996), later broadening to questions of the mediatization of society (Hepp & Krotz, 2014; Hjarvard, 2013; Lundby, 2014). In a second step, datafication and its societal contexts moved to the fore, giving rise to critical engagements with big data, surveillance capitalism, data power, and data colonialism, as well as to the field now known as critical data studies (Bates & Jarke, 2024; Couldry & Mejías, 2019; Dalton et al., 2016; Hepp, Jarke, & Kramp, 2022; ; Kitchin & Lauriault, 2014; Milan & Treré, 2019; Zuboff, 2019). Here, automation mattered above all as the automation of data processing. In a third step, the focus shifted toward communicative automation itself, with the institutionalization of human–machine communication (HMC) as a research field (Fortunati & Edwards, 2020; Guzman, 2018b; Guzman, McEwen, & Jones, 2023) and a parallel interest in robot journalism, social (ro-)bots, and automated media (Andrejevic, 2020; Carlson, 2015; Gehl & Bakardjieva, 2016; Napoli, 2014; Pfadenhauer et al., 2015).

Initially, and very much in keeping the trajectory of computer-mediated communication, there was a tendency in media and communication research to approach automated communication mainly from the perspective of human-machine interaction: how people engage with automated systems and what agency they attribute to them. This is evident in the media-psychology-oriented CASA paradigm ("computers are social actors"), whose core claim is that the moment a technical system looks, communicates, or acts like a person, people respond to it as if it were a real person (Lee & Nass, 2010; Nass, Takayama, & Brave, 2006; Reeves & Nass, 1996). Even productive extensions of this paradigm, which argue that users draw on scripts from both human and machine interaction (Gambino et al., 2020), remain centered on the individual–machine relationship, as does much early work in human–machine communication (Guzman, 2018a).

The starting point of this handbook is that the phenomenon demands more: we need to broaden the perspective beyond the direct interaction between humans and machines. Social bots were not only designed to interact with individual users, but also serve to influence the dynamics of online discourse by enabling individual posts to become trending topics (Keller & Klinger, 2019; Muhle, 2022). This is even more true of current language models such as those from Anthropic or OpenAI. While many users are familiar with them through chat applications like ChatGPT or Claude, their functionality extends much further. Via API interfaces, they are used to moderate online content (Keydar et al., 2026) or edit journalistic content (Bartleman et al., 2026), to name just a few examples. The automation of communication therefore has to be understood in both greater depth and greater breadth than a focus on dyadic interaction allows. Its depth follows from the way automation is

entangled with the overall dynamics of a "hybrid media system" (Chadwick, 2017; Fürst et al., 2025); its breadth follows from the diversity of the technologies involved, from artificial companions and news bots to social bots and work bots (Lokot & Diakopoulos, 2016; Loosen & Solbach, 2020; Pfadenhauer & Lehmann, 2022). To grasp this depth and breadth, the automation of communication must be taken seriously in its overarching, societal and social character (Katzenbach & Pentzold, 2024).

It is against this background that the concept of communicative AI becomes useful. The term has become established in international research (Dehnert & Mongeau, 2022; Guzman & Lewis, 2020; Natale, 2021a; Schäfer & Wessler, 2020; Stenbom et al., 2023). Andrea Guzman and Seth Lewis, who originally proposed it, define communicative AI as "technologies designed to carry out specific tasks within the communication process that were formerly associated with humans" (Guzman & Lewis, 2020, p. 3), while Schäfer and Wessler (2020) stress that such technologies should be understood no longer just as mediators of communication between people but as communicators in their own right. These proposals rightly emphasize the communicative aspect, yet they remain generic: they outline a genre of technologies without clarifying what its instances share or how they differ from others, and they leave open whether "artificial intelligence" here is more than a buzzword borrowed from the current hype (Bareis, 2026).

Against this background, this handbook proposes a definition of communicative AI based on three criteria (Hepp et al., 2023, p. 48). Communicative AI (1) rests on various forms of automation designed primarily for communication, (2) is embedded within digital infrastructures which are part of globalized "power geometries" (Natale et al., 2025), and (3) is entangled with human practices through which acquires social meaning. Each criterion requires explanation, and each gains its full meaning only when communicative AI is considered as part of societal communication.

The first criterion points to a nexus that Elena Esposito captured in her work on "artificial communication": in contrast to the Turing Test, the decisive question is not whether a machine can think but whether it can communicate (Esposito, 2017, 2022). This shifts attention away from the question of intelligence and toward communication itself. In this view, the "intelligence" of communicative AI is not a property that these systems possess but a communicative construction—something attributed through and within the communicative process itself. From a social science perspective, the attribution of intelligence to a technical system is a variable and contested construct that does not depend on whether the system runs on machine learning (Bareis & Katzenbach, 2022; Natale, 2021b). ELIZA, a program based on simple scripts, could already be understood as communicative AI because it communicated with people in an automated way and was thereby ascribed intelligence—the Turing Test rests precisely on this idea, that a machine counts as intelligent if, in conversation, it cannot be distinguished from a human counterpart (Natale, 2019; Strippel, 2025; Weizenbaum, 1966). The same holds for many script-based social bots. Defining intelligence is thus less a matter of fixed technical features (Mühlhoff, 2019) than of communicative construction that refers back to prevailing understandings of being human, sometimes including affective and emotional qualities (Guzman & Lewis, 2020; Ling & Björling, 2020).

The second criterion concerns the embedding of communicative AI within digital infrastructures and, with it, the need to distinguish the interface that users encounter from

the structures on which it operates. Many communicative AI systems are media within media that rely on existing "infrastructural platforms" (van Dijck et al. 2018, 2019). The materiality of communicative AI therefore extends to technical networks, server farms, and other infrastructures (Constantinides et al., 2018); it draws these systems into what has been described as structures of surveillance capitalism and data colonialism (Couldry & Mejías, 2019; Turow, 2021; Zuboff, 2019); and it is associated with considerable "planetary costs," from energy consumption to broader socio-ecological consequences (Brevini, 2021; Crawford, 2021; Mollen, Jansen, Kannengießer, & Velkova, 2026). Ultimately, foundational language models are developed by a limited number of companies and labs—currently, in particular, Anthropic, OpenAI, and Huanfang (幻方)—which is why the emergence of "empires of AI" (Hao, 2025) is becoming apparent. Accordingly, an analytical focus on the infrastructural embedding of communicative AI always entails engaging with the globalized "power geometries" (Natale et al., 2025) of which it is a part. The imaginative landscapes of AI—the visions of what futures might be possible with AI—are, in this sense, always locally anchored (Hepp, 2026b), which helps explain the current dominance of the United States and China.

The third criterion—entanglement with human practice—emphasizes that the operation of these systems cannot be understood apart from being entangled with human practice. The notion of entanglement, developed in particular by Karen Barad (2007) and taken up in studies of organizing (Scott & Orlikowski, 2014), holds that matter and meaning are produced together, forming the specific phenomena that are ontologically primary rather than existing as independent, pre-given entities. For communicative AI, this means attending to the entanglement of the technical and the corporeal in human practice (Introna, 2013; Latimer & López Gómez, 2019; Frauenberger, 2019; Pfadenhauer & Grenz, 2017)—an emphasis that helps overcome the reductionism of some versions of practice theory (Reckwitz, 2002, p. 253). It is also analytically concrete: models for speech recognition, for instance, are built on large datasets that are themselves by-products of human practice online.

Defined in this way, communicative AI is more than a label for the current hype; it can function as a "sensitizing concept" in Herbert Blumer's (1954) sense. Where a definitive concept specifies exactly what to observe, a sensitizing concept offers "a general sense of reference and guidance in approaching empirical instances" (Blumer, 1954, p. 7). Communicative AI thus draws attention to a family resemblance (Wittgenstein, 1971) shared by very different automated communication systems and makes visible why their breadth, their depth, and societal embedding matter. The challenge of any sensitizing concept is that it cannot simply be operationalized; this is where definitive concepts regain their importance. A figurational approach, for example, can offer a way to bridge this gap: it understands the social contexts into which communicative AI enters as "hybrid figurations" with their own supra-individual agency (Hepp et al., 2023, p. 51).

Read as a sensitizing concept, communicative AI also clarifies how the present debate fits together. Generative systems such as conversational agents, social bots, systems of automated journalistic production, and voice assistants are not separate curiosities but instances of a common phenomenon: the automation of communication. As an umbrella concept, communicative AI is thus broad enough to connect, within this handbook, work that is otherwise dispersed across subfields, while remaining open enough to accommodate

new ssystems as they emerge. At the same time, treating the attribution of intelligence as a communicative construction reminds us that what counts as "intelligent," "autonomous," or "agentic" is determined differently across cultural contexts—an observation that the handbook takes up in its commitment to contribute to the de-Westernizing of the debate (Curran & Park, 2000; Craig & Xiong, 2022; Waisbord, 2022).

3 Communicative AI as an emerging media and communications technology

If the previous section clarifies what we take communicative AI to be, this section asks how it can be approached as a media and communication technology that is still coming into being. The term *emergence* carries a double meaning here, and both are at stake. In a temporal sense, communicative AI is, at the time of writing, an emerging technology: its institutionalization and materialization remain relatively unstable, and the social arrangements that will form around it are far from settled.

Emergence also carries an additional meaning already implied by the notions of entanglement and hybrid figurations introduced above. Within figurations, communicative AI becomes part of acquired characteristics and therefore contributes to a supra-individual agency that none of their elements possesses on its own. This also works the other way around (Albert, 2013): the elements themselves—humans and communicative AI alike—acquire their quality as communicative "participants" only within the figuration. What counts as a communicative other, as authorship, or as content takes shape within figurations, not in advance. This makes a perspective of emergence especially important, because it allows us to examine the societal potentials and risks of a technology before they become entrenched, while the futures associated with it are still comparatively open (Hepp, 2025).

Contemporary media and communication research on societal transformation is, by contrast, predominantly shaped by a perspective of consequence. Here, consequence is understood broadly, encompassing the effects of media in the narrower sense (Neuman & Guggenheim, 2011) as well as the wider interrelations between media developments and cultural or social change studied in mediatization research (Lundby, 2014). The same orientation runs through influential accounts of the present, from medium theory's history of civilization (Meyrowitz, 1995) to diagnoses of a "network society" (Castells, 2000), a "platform society" (van Dijck et al., 2018), and "surveillance capitalism" (Zuboff, 2019). These accounts have considerably advanced our understanding, and research on the consequences of media remains essential. Yet an exclusive reliance on this perspective is insufficient for understanding transformation as it unfolds.

To complement consequence, we need at least one further lens: emergence, understood as the coming into being of "new" media and their infrastructures—not merely as a precursor to social change but as an integral component of it (Williams, 1990). From this perspective, new media emerge as technological materializations embedded within specific social figurations that must be examined in their broader societal contexts. This leads to the notion of *sociomaterial emergence* (Barad, 2007; Law, 2016).

Several strands of theory can be identified as being associated with the concept of sociomateriality, namely new materialism, posthumanism, and actor-network theory (ANT). Each of these strands brings a specific emphasis to the discussion of sociomateriality. Actor-

network theory proposes a relational ontology in which human and non-human actors are entangled in sociomaterial networks. Importantly, actors do not enter their relations as independent entities but are produced through them. Agency is not confined to humans but emerges out of sociomaterial network relations (Latour, 2007). If these networks become stabilized they become recognized as actors in their own right, and *act* in the world. In other words, actors are "made to be" (Mol, 2010). In new materialism, the argument is similar: humans are part of and constituted by sociomaterial arrangements. Karen Barad (2007) coined the term "intra-action" to capture this emergent agency but criticized ANT for upholding a dichotomy between humans and non-humans. Key to their approach is the concept of "agential cuts," through which phenomena come to be produced. The point we want to make in this introduction is that socio-materiality should not only be understood as an ongoing process of linking the social and the material, but also as something that itself produces new phenomena. With the rise of communicative AI, we therefore need to consider the emergence of new sociomaterial figurations.

Another argument regarding communicative AI is that emergence must clarify the forms of agency through which possible futures are shaped. Phenomenological sociology has long stressed that a distinctive feature of human agency is its projective element: action is oriented toward imagined potential futures (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998; Pfadenhauer, 2015; Schütz, 1962). In the emergence of communicative AI, this projective orientation becomes collective and consequential. Imagined futures are performative: actors who succeed in establishing influential visions can shape eventual outcomes (Urry, 2016), as captured in the notions of "sociotechnical imaginaries" (Jasanoff, 2015) in society and "fictional expectations" in the economy (Beckert, 2016). The emergence of communicative AI is also linked to visions of the future as "sociodigital" (Halford & Southerton, 2024). Such "anticipatory regimes" serve as a driving force behind significant investment in the development of these technologies (e.g. Adams et al., 2009; Jarke & Manchester, 2025).

Approached through the concept of figuration, the emergence of digital futures has a dual structure. On the one hand are the social figurations in which visions of digital futures are generated. A key context for the development of communicative AI is provided by the corporations, labs, and pioneer communities of Silicon Valley. Not only are they leading the way in Western AI development, but they are also linking it to political ideologies. Given the current shift to the right in parts of Silicon Valley (Turner, 2025), developments are therefore increasingly being viewed in the context of "technofascism" (Coeckelbergh, 2026; McQuillan, 2022).

On the other hand, are the imagined figurations of a digital future themselves—the visions and societal imaginaries that become visible in particular scenarios and discourses. Studies of the "future of journalism" (Manninen, Niemi, & Ridge-Newman, 2022), for instance, condense diverse findings into trend narratives that depict a future newsroom as data-driven, dialogic, experimental, and oriented toward continuous innovation. Whether or not their authors intend it, such trend summaries apply a classic futurology method, projecting one possible figuration as if it were a stable destination. Recognizing this performative dimension is part of what a perspective of emergence contributes: it treats visions and imaginaries not as neutral forecasts but as interventions that help bring the futures they describe into being (Halford & Southerton, 2023; Hepp, 2026a; Mangnus et al., 2021; Macgilchrist et al., 2024).

Taking imaginations seriously also brings the global situatedness of communicative AI into view. It is striking how thoroughly Silicon Valley has become a "global imaginary" (Marwick, 2017, p. 317)—a symbolic place where digital futures are envisioned and from which they radiate outward (Cheney-Lippold, 2025)—and how its self-understanding is rooted in a "Californian ideology" (Barbrook & Cameron, 1996) that fuses countercultural and entrepreneurial ideals. Crucially, this orientation is neither confined to the "West" nor uncontested. Research on the "next billion users" (Arora, 2019), on innovation and entrepreneurship in China (Lindtner, 2020; Fu, 2026), and on technical innovation in Kenya and Uganda (Pollio, 2026; Srinivasan, 2019) shows both how Silicon Valley imaginaries travel and how they are reworked, resisted, and supplemented elsewhere. For a handbook committed to de-Westernizing the study of communicative AI, this is more than a regional addendum: the imaginations that guide the development of communicative AI, and the very meaning of categories such as agency, differ across cultural contexts and must be examined comparatively.

Two implications follow for the study of communicative AI. First, a handbook on communicative AI must broaden its subject area beyond the use and content of established media to include both discourses about possible futures and the contexts in which media come into being—not only the development departments of large technology companies, but also the laboratories, think tanks, social movements, and pioneer communities that imagine and shape them. Second, a handbook on communicative AI should broaden its methodological repertoire: in addition to AI-based methods for investigating communicative AI itself, it should also draw on futures methods such as scenario techniques—not to predict outcomes, which would be naïve, but to understand how particular imaginations of the future are produced and mobilized in the present, often with the intention of shaping it.

Approached through emergence, then, communicative AI is not a stable object whose consequences we merely register, but a phenomenon that is still being negotiated and stabilized. This happens both in the development contexts—pioneer communities, laboratories, think tanks, and corporate and regulative units—as across different social domains, such as education, health, journalism, publics, and the private sphere. This perspective of the living handbook broadens the field's subject area beyond the use and content of established media and connects directly to the questions of sociomaterial constitution and domain-specific appropriation that the handbook pursues. It is also what makes the format of this handbook a considered choice rather than a matter of convenience, as the next section explains.

4 Overview of the handbook's sections

The very emergence described in the last section is the reason this handbook takes the form of a living handbook. Communicative AI is developing too quickly, and in too many directions at once, for a conventional volume to remain current: a printed handbook risks being out of date before it reaches its readers. A living handbook responds to this condition. Its chapters appear online on a rolling basis and are updated regularly, allowing the work to track an evolving field rather than freeze a single moment of in time. This format also serves the handbook's ambition to adopt the broadest possible social-science perspective on communicative AI, including non-Western perspectives, and to keep that perspective open to revision as research develops. The handbook is published with Springer and addresses

students and researchers across the social and technical sciences who seek a current, interdisciplinary overview of the field. It is organized into four parts.

Part 1 presents the theories and approaches used to research communicative AI. The study of communicative AI is a broad, interdisciplinary endeavor, and this part offers an overview of its theoretical landscape from a social science and humanities perspective. It begins with the established discourses of computer-mediated communication and human–computer interaction, moves to the more recent field of human–machine communication, and then takes up theoretical debates about the agency of automated systems, science and technology studies, critical data studies, and social theories of automation. It also addresses philosophical and ethical theories, as well as questions of AI and inequality, before closing with an integrative perspective that draws these strands together. Throughout, the part gives explicit room to non-Western theorizing.

The following Part 2 brings together approaches, research strategies, and methods for studying communicative AI. It reflects two methodological perspectives: how established methods can be adapted to investigate communicative AI appropriately, and how communicative AI systems can themselves be integrated into empirical research processes, for example, for automated transcription or coding. Across its chapters, the part addresses several research foci—the governance and imaginaries of communicative AI, its societal consequences, the interactions and evolving practices that surround its use, and its design—each of which calls for a different methodological repertoire, ranging from discourse and platform analysis through algorithm auditing and digital ethnography to user studies and speculative design. It concludes with the ethics of conducting research with and about communicative AI.

With Part 3, we turn to the sociomaterial constitution of communicative AI. The emergence of a new technology is never simply a matter of functional technical development; it is equally shaped by economic, political, and discursive factors. Challenging the assumption of technological primacy, this part examines how communicative AI is constituted and embedded—in its materiality of computers, networks, and data centers as much as in social practices and structures. Its chapters move from the communicative construction and imagination of communicative AI, through its material infrastructures and interfaces, to its economics, politics, and governance, and finally to its global and cultural situatedness.

Part 4 addresses the domains in which communicative AI is appropriated. The broader social significance of communicative AI becomes tangible in the way different domains take it up, each shaping and constraining its use within the hybrid figurations that form around it. The part begins with a set of central domains—among them journalism, political discourse, the personal sphere, health, and education—and asks how each appropriates communicative AI and copes with the challenges it brings. Attending to cross-domain patterns, it reflects on what these hybrid figurations imply for the supra-individual agency of the domains involved and for societal communication more broadly. It is also designed to expand over time to encompass as many social domains as possible.

With this approach, the handbook aims to provide a foundation for dialogue in order to understand communicative AI as a broad, societal phenomenon. This can only be achieved through the integration of very diverse disciplines. In addition to media and communication studies, we orient ourselves to sociology, science and technology studies, political science,

law, and informatics, as well as other disciplines in the humanities such as philosophy, religious studies, and linguistics. We hope to offer a broad perspective on the emerging phenomenon of communicative AI.

5 References

Adams, V., Murphy, M., & Clarke, A. E. (2009). Anticipation: Technoscience, life, affect, temporality. *Subjectivity*, *28*(1), 246–265.

Albert, G. (2013). Figuration und Emergenz. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, *65*(2), 193–222.

Andrejevic, M. (2020). *Automated media*. Routledge.

Arora, P. (2019). *The next billion users: Digital life beyond the West*. Harvard University Press.

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Duke University Press.

Barbrook, R., & Cameron, A. (1996). The Californian ideology. *Science as Culture*, *6*(1), 44–72.

Bareis, J. (2026). Ask me anything! How ChatGPT got hyped into being. *International Journal of Communication*, *20*, 285–311.

Bareis, J., & Katzenbach, C. (2022). Talking AI into being: The narratives and imaginaries of national AI strategies and their performative politics. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, *47*(5), 855–881.

Bartleman, M., Schapals, A. K., & Dubois, E. (2026). Generative AI and the new landscape of automated journalism: A systematized review of 185 studies (2012–2024). *Journalism and Media*, *7*(1), Article 39.

Bates, J., & Jarke, J. (Eds.). (2024). *Dialogues in data power: Shifting response-abilities in datafied worlds*. Bristol University Press.

Baym, N. K. (1994). *Communication, interpretation, and relationships: A study of a computer-mediated fan community* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign].

Beckert, J. (2016). *Imagined futures: Fictional expectations and capitalist dynamics*. Harvard University Press.

Blumer, H. (1954). What is wrong with social theory? *American Sociological Review*, *19*(1), 3–10.

Brevini, B. (2021). *Is AI good for the planet?* Polity.

Carlson, M. (2015). The robotic reporter. *Digital Journalism*, *3*(3), 416–431.

Castells, M. (2000). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.

Chadwick, A. (2017). *The hybrid media system: Politics and power* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Cheney-Lippold, J. (2025). The silicon future. *New Media & Society*, *27*(7), 4164–4180.

Coeckelbergh, M. (2026). Technofascism: AI, Big Tech, and the new authoritarianism. *AI & Society*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-026-02862-9

Constantinides, P., Henfridsson, O., & Parker, G. G. (2018). Introduction: Platforms and infrastructures in the digital age. *Information Systems Research*, *29*(2), 381–400.

Couldry, N., & Mejías, U. A. (2019). *The costs of connection: How data is colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism*. Stanford University Press.

Craig, R. T., & Xiong, B. (2022). Traditions of communication theory and the potential for multicultural dialogue. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *17*(1), 1–25.

Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence*. Yale University Press.

Curran, J., & Park, M.-J. (Eds.). (2000). *De-westernizing media studies*. Routledge.

Dalton, C. M., Taylor, L., & Thatcher, J. (2016). Critical data studies: A dialog on data and space. *Big Data & Society*, *3*(1), Article 2053951716648346.

Dehnert, M., & Mongeau, P. A. (2022). Persuasion in the age of artificial intelligence (AI): Theories and complications of AI-based persuasion. *Human Communication Research*, *48*(3), 386–403.

Emirbayer, M., & Mische, A. (1998). What is agency? *American Journal of Sociology*, *103*(4), 962–1023.

Esposito, E. (2017). Artificial communication? The production of contingency by algorithms. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, *46*(4), 249–265.

Esposito, E. (2022). *Artificial communication: How algorithms produce social intelligence*. MIT Press.

Fortunati, L., & Edwards, A. P. (2020). Opening space for theoretical, methodological, and empirical issues in human-machine communication. *Human-Machine Communication*, *1*, 7–18. https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.1.1

Frauenberger, C. (2019). Entanglement HCI: The next wave? *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, *27*(1), 1–27.

Fu, P. (2026). *Maker culture in China: Agile innovators between state and market*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Fürst, S., Muhle, F., & Porlezza, C. (2025). Journalism in the hybrid media system. *Media and Communication*, *13*, Article 1.

Gambino, A., Fox, J., & Ratan, R. (2020). Building a stronger CASA: Extending the computers are social actors paradigm. *Human-Machine Communication*, *1*, 71–86. https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.1.5

Gehl, R. W., & Bakardjieva, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Socialbots and their friends: Digital media and the automation of sociality*. Routledge.

Gunkel, D. J. (2012). Communication and artificial intelligence: Opportunities and challenges for the 21st century. *communication +1*, *1*(1), Article 1.

Gunkel, D. J. (2024). *AI for communication*. CRC Press. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003442240

Guzman, A. L. (2018a). Introduction: What is human-machine communication anyway? In A. L. Guzman (Ed.), *Human-machine communication: Rethinking communication, technology, and ourselves* (pp. 1–28). Peter Lang.

Guzman, A. L. (Ed.). (2018b). *Human-machine communication: Rethinking communication, technology, and ourselves*. Peter Lang.

Guzman, A. L., & Lewis, S. C. (2020). Artificial intelligence and communication: A human-machine communication research agenda. *New Media & Society*, *22*(1), 70–86.

Guzman, A. L., McEwen, R., & Jones, S. (Eds.). (2023). *The SAGE handbook of human-machine communication*. SAGE.

Halford, S., & Southerton, D. (2023). What future for the sociology of futures? Visions, concepts and methods. *Sociology*, *57*(2), 263–278.

Halford, S., & Southerton, D. (2024). Sociodigital futures? An agenda for sociological research and practice. *Sociologia Italiana*, 25.

Hao, K. (2025). *Empire of AI: Dreams and nightmares in Sam Altman's OpenAI*. Penguin Press.

Hepp, A. (2025). Approaching digital futures: Why media and communication research needs to move from a perspective of consequence to one of emergence. *Communication Theory*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/qtaf028

Hepp, A. (2026a). *Pioneer communities: How our digital futures emerge in Silicon Valley and beyond*. Polity.

Hepp, A. (2026b). The imaginative landscape of AI: Locating Silicon Valley's "quiet futuring." *Media, Culture & Society*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437261454515

Hepp, A., Jarke, J., & Kramp, L. (Eds.). (2022). *New perspectives in critical data studies: The ambivalences of data power*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-96180-0

Hepp, A., & Krotz, F. (Eds.). (2014). *Mediatized worlds: Culture and society in a media age*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Hepp, A., Loosen, W., Dreyer, S., Jarke, J., Kannengießer, S., Katzenbach, C., Malaka, R., Pfadenhauer, M., Puschmann, C., & Schulz, W. (2023). ChatGPT, LaMDA, and the hype around communicative AI: The automation of communication as a field of research in media and communication studies. *Human-Machine Communication*, *6*, 41–63. https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.6.4

Hjarvard, S. (2013). *The mediatization of culture and society*. Routledge.

Introna, L. D. (2013). Epilogue: Performativity and the becoming of sociomaterial assemblages. In F.-X. de Vaujany & N. Mitev (Eds.), *Materiality and space: Organizations, artefacts and practices* (pp. 330–342). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137304094_17

Jarke, J., & Manchester, H. (2025). Datafied ageing futures: Regimes of anticipation and participatory futuring. *Big Data & Society*, *12*(1), Article 20539517241306363.

Jasanoff, S. (2015). Future imperfect: Science, technology, and the imaginations of modernity. In S. Jasanoff & S.-H. Kim (Eds.), *Dreamscapes of modernity: Sociotechnical imaginaries and the fabrication of power* (pp. 1–33). University of Chicago Press.

Jones, S. G. (Ed.). (1998). *Cybersociety 2.0: Revisiting computer-mediated communication and technology*. SAGE.

Katzenbach, C., & Pentzold, C. (2024). Automating communication in the digital society: Editorial to the special issue. *New Media & Society*, *26*(9), 4925–4937.

Keller, T. R., & Klinger, U. (2019). Social bots in election campaigns: Theoretical, empirical, and methodological implications. *Political Communication*, *36*(1), 171–189.

Keydar, R., Mor, N., Shany, Y., & Abend, O. (2026). Bending the rules: On large language models and content moderation. *Israel Law Review*, *59*(1), 96–133.

Kitchin, R., & Lauriault, T. P. (2014). *Towards critical data studies: Charting and unpacking data assemblages and their work* (The Programmable City Working Paper No. 2) [Preprint]. SSRN.

Latimer, J., & López Gómez, D. (2019). Intimate entanglements: Affects, more-than-human intimacies and the politics of relations in science and technology. *The Sociological Review*, *67*(2), 247–263.

Latour, B. (2007). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford University Press.

Law, J. (2016). STS as method. In U. Felt, R. Fouché, C. A. Miller, & L. Smith-Doerr (Eds.), *The handbook of science and technology studies* (4th ed., pp. 31–57). MIT Press.

Lee, J.-E. R., & Nass, C. I. (2010). Trust in computers: The Computers-Are-Social-Actors (CASA) paradigm and trustworthiness perception in human-computer communication. In D. Latusek & A. Gerbasi (Eds.), *Trust and technology in a ubiquitous modern environment: Theoretical and methodological perspectives* (pp. 1–15). IGI Global.

Licklider, J. C. R., & Taylor, R. W. (1968). The computer as a communication device. *Science and Technology*, *76*, 21–31.

Lindtner, S. M. (2020). *Prototype nation: China and the contested promise of innovation*. Princeton University Press.

Ling, H. Y., & Björling, E. A. (2020). Sharing stress with a robot: What would a robot say? *Human-Machine Communication*, *1*, 133–159. https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.1.8

Lokot, T., & Diakopoulos, N. (2016). News bots. *Digital Journalism*, *4*(6), 682–699.

Loosen, W., & Solbach, P. (2020). Künstliche Intelligenz im Journalismus? Was bedeutet Automatisierung für journalistisches Arbeiten? In T. Köhler (Ed.), *Fake News, Framing, Fact-Checking: Nachrichten im digitalen Zeitalter* (pp. 177–203). transcript.

Lundby, K. (Ed.). (2014). *Mediatization of communication*. De Gruyter Mouton.

Macgilchrist, F., Allert, H., Cerratto Pargman, T., & Jarke, J. (2024). Designing postdigital futures: Which designs? Whose futures? *Postdigital Science and Education*, *6*(1), 13–24.

Mangnus, A. C., Oomen, J., Vervoort, J. M., & Hajer, M. A. (2021). Futures literacy and the diversity of the future. *Futures*, *132*, Article 102793.

Manninen, V. J. E., Niemi, M. K., & Ridge-Newman, A. (Eds.). (2022). *Futures of journalism: Technology-stimulated evolution in the audience-news media relationship*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Marwick, A. (2017). Silicon Valley and the social media industry. In J. Burgess, A. Marwick, & T. Poell (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of social media* (pp. 314–329). SAGE.

McQuillan, D. (2022). *Resisting AI: An anti-fascist approach to artificial intelligence*. Bristol University Press. https://doi.org/10.56687/9781529213522

Meyrowitz, J. (1995). Medium theory. In D. J. Crowley & D. Mitchell (Eds.), *Communication theory today* (pp. 50–77). Polity Press.

Milan, S., & Treré, E. (2019). Big data from the South(s): Beyond data universalism. *Television & New Media*, *20*(4), 319–335.

Mol, A. (2010). Actor-network theory: Sensitive terms and enduring tensions. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, *50*(1), 253–269.

Mollen, A., Jansen, F., Kannengießer, S., & Velkova, J. (Eds.). (2026). *AI infrastructures and sustainability: Expanding perspectives on automation, communication and media*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Muhle, F. (2022). Socialbots at the gates: Plädoyer für eine holistische Perspektive auf automatisierte Akteure in der Umwelt des Journalismus. *Medien & Kommunikationswissenschaft*, *70*(1–2), 40–59.

Mühlhoff, R. (2020). Human-aided artificial intelligence: Or, how to run large computations in human brains? Toward a media sociology of machine learning. *New Media & Society*, *22*(10), 1868–1884. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444819885334

Napoli, P. M. (2014). Automated media: An institutional theory perspective on algorithmic media production and consumption. *Communication Theory*, *24*(3), 340–360.

Nass, C., Takayama, L., & Brave, S. (2006). Socializing consistency: From technical homogeneity to human epitome. In P. Zhang & D. F. Galletta (Eds.), *Human-computer interaction and management information systems: Foundations* (pp. 373–391). M. E. Sharpe.

Natale, S. (2019). If software is narrative: Joseph Weizenbaum, artificial intelligence and the biographies of ELIZA. *New Media & Society*, *21*(3), 712–728.

Natale, S. (2021a). Communicating through or communicating with: Approaching artificial intelligence from a communication and media studies perspective. *Communication Theory*, *31*(4), 905–910.

Natale, S. (2021b). *Deceitful media: Artificial intelligence and social life after the Turing test*. Oxford University Press.

Natale, S., Biggio, F., Guzman, A. L., Ricaurte, P., Downey, J., Fassone, R., Keightley, E., & Ji, D. (2025). AI, agency, and power geometries. *Media, Culture & Society*, *47*(5), 1057–1073. https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437251328207

Neuman, W. R., & Guggenheim, L. (2011). The evolution of media effects theory: A six-stage model of cumulative research. *Communication Theory*, *21*(2), 169–196.

Pfadenhauer, M. (2015). The contemporary appeal of artificial companions: Social robots as vehicles to cultural worlds of experience. *The Information Society*, *31*(3), 284–293.

Pfadenhauer, M., & Grenz, T. (2017). Von Objekten zu Objektivierung. *Soziale Welt*, *68*(2–3), 225–242.

Pfadenhauer, M., & Lehmann, T. (2022). Affects after AI: Sociological perspectives on artificial companionship. In A. Elliott (Ed.), *The Routledge social science handbook of AI* (pp. 91–106). Routledge.

Pfadenhauer, M., Sugiyama, S., & Ess, C. M. (2015). Special issue of IJSR on social robots: Form, content, critique. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, *7*(3), 333–334.

Pollio, A. (2026). *Silicon elsewhere: Nairobi, global China, and the promise of techno-capital*. University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/luminos.262

Reckwitz, A. (2002). Toward a theory of social practices: A development in culturalist theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *5*(2), 243–263.

Reeves, B., & Nass, C. (1996). *The media equation: How people treat computers, television, and new media like real people and places*. Cambridge University Press.

Schäfer, M. S., & Wessler, H. (2020). Öffentliche Kommunikation in Zeiten künstlicher Intelligenz. *Publizistik*, *65*(3), 307–331.

Schütz, A. (1962). Choosing among projects of action. In M. Natanson (Ed.), *Collected papers: Vol. 1. The problem of social reality* (pp. 67–96). Martinus Nijhoff.

Scott, S. V., & Orlikowski, W. J. (2014). Entanglements in practice: Performing anonymity through social media. *MIS Quarterly*, *38*(3), 873–893.

Searle, J. R. (1980). Minds, brains, and programs. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *3*(3), 417–457.

Srinivasan, R. (2019). *Beyond the valley: How innovators around the world are overcoming inequality and creating the technologies of tomorrow*. MIT Press.

Stenbom, A., Wiggberg, M., & Norlund, T. (2023). Exploring communicative AI: Reflections from a Swedish newsroom. *Digital Journalism*, *11*(9), 1622–1640.

Strippel, C. (2025). Antizipation von Kontinuitäten: Joseph Weizenbaums Kritik an der Künstlichen Intelligenz als Zukunftsprognose. In A. Hepp, S. Kannengießer, M. Pfadenhauer, & J. Wimmer (Eds.), *Zukunft der Medien – Medien der Zukunft* (Medien • Kultur • Kommunikation, pp. 73–86). Springer VS.

Turner, F. (2006). *From counterculture to cyberculture: Stewart Brand, the Whole Earth Network, and the rise of digital utopianism*. University of Chicago Press.

Turner, F. (2025). Texan ideology: Silicon Valley looks for Lebensraum in the Bible Belt. *The Baffler*, *84*.

Turow, J. (2021). *The voice catchers: How marketers listen in to exploit your feelings, your privacy, and your wallet*. Yale University Press.

Urry, J. (2016). *What is the future?* Polity.

van Dijck, J., Nieborg, D., & Poell, T. (2019). Reframing platform power. *Internet Policy Review*, *8*(2). https://doi.org/10.14763/2019.2.1414

van Dijck, J., Poell, T., & de Waal, M. (2018). *The platform society: Public values in a connective world*. Oxford University Press.

Waisbord, S. (2022). What is next for de-westernizing communication studies? *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *17*(1), 26–33.

Weizenbaum, J. (1966). ELIZA—A computer program for the study of natural language communication between man and machine. *Communications of the ACM*, *9*(1), 36–45.

Wellman, B., Salaff, J., Dimitrova, D., Garton, L., Gulia, M., & Haythornthwaite, C. (1996). Computer networks as social networks: Collaborative work, telework, and virtual community. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *22*, 213–238.

Williams, R. (1990). *Television: Technology and cultural form* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Wittgenstein, L. (1971). *Philosophische Untersuchungen*. Suhrkamp.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. Profile Books.