



**GRAPHOLOGICAL DEVIATION IN CONTEMPORARY POETRY: A  
COMPARATIVE STYLISTIC ANALYSIS OF HUMAN-WRITTEN AND AI-  
GENERATED POETRY**

**Ayesha**

M.Phil. Scholar, DELL, Riphah International University, Sahiwal

**Dr. Sibtain Aslam**

**Corresponding Author**

Assistant Professor, Riphah International University, Sahiwal

Email: [sibtain.aslam@riphahsahiwal.edu.pk](mailto:sibtain.aslam@riphahsahiwal.edu.pk)

**Abstract**

*This study aims to examine the graphological deviation in the poetry of the present time by making a comparative stylistic analysis between human-written and AI-generated poems. The present study uses the theory of foregrounding by Geoffrey Leech and the computational model of digital text generation by Nick Montfort to explore the role of typographical features. It shows how the graphological elements like punctuation, capitalization, lineation, stanza structure, and spatial arrangement are used in meaning-making and aesthetic effects in different poetic modes. The human corpus is made up of three poems by Rupī Kaur. She is selected for her characteristic graphological style. Three poems generated by ChatGPT (OpenAI, GPT-based large language model) form an AI corpus. These poems are generated under controlled prompting conditions to minimize researcher bias. This study reveals a distinction between two corpora through close reading and qualitative stylistic analysis. Kaur's poetry expresses intentional deviation from conventional graphological norms, such as the absence of punctuation, lowercase lettering, and fragmented visual layout. On the other hand, ChatGPT-generated poetry follows conventional orthographic standards such as capitalization, regular punctuation, and structured visual layout with only limited incidental deviation. These findings demonstrate that graphological deviation acts as a stylistic indicator. It reflects the intentional creativity of poets to achieve salience and create aesthetic effects. The study presents empirical observation of how graphological deviation differentiates human and machine-generated poetry. Thus, it contributes to ongoing discussion in stylistics, artificial intelligence, and digital poetics.*

**Keywords:** graphological deviation, AI-generated poetry, Rupī Kaur, computational writing, digital poetics

**1. Introduction**

The language of literature has always separated itself from everyday language by deviating from established linguistic norms. This process of deviation is called foregrounding. Its sole purpose is to draw the attention of the reader towards text, thus achieving salience. Geoffrey Leech shows foregrounding at various levels — morphological, phonological, lexical, graphological, etc. Among them is the graphological level, which involves punctuation marks, line breaks, spacing, and visual layout of text. These typographical features shape not only how a text is read but how it is worked as an aesthetic object. The importance of graphological manipulation has been highlighted in contemporary poetry. Poets such as Langston Hughes, E.E. Cummings, and Rupī Kaur employ the absence of punctuation marks, fragmented structure, and unusual white space. In published works of Rupī Kaur, such as *Milk and Honey*, *Home Body*, and *The Sun and Her Flowers*, she draws global attention towards her distinctive and typographical style. Her style is characterized by minimal punctuation, fragmented syntax, and lowercase lettering.

The growing emergence of AI models such as ChatGPT raises concerns about creativity and authorship. In view of Nick Montfort's (2016) model of computational literature, computational texts are produced through predesigned algorithms. Thus, AI-generated texts

are not a product of artistic intention and human sensory data. This highlights an important concern about the degree to which machine-generated poetry replicates stylistic features. This study critically investigates comparative stylistic analysis between human-authored poetry by Rupī Kaur and AI-produced poetry by ChatGPT, generated under controlled prompting conditions. This analysis is done by analyzing graphological features in both poetic expressions.

### **1.1 Research Objectives**

1. To identify features of graphological deviation in Rupī Kaur's poetry and ChatGPT-generated poetry.
2. To compare graphological features in both datasets using Leech's foregrounding framework.
3. To evaluate whether ChatGPT-generated poetry imitates or deviates from human-authored poetry in graphological patterns.

### **1.2 Research Questions**

1. What types of graphological deviation are present in AI-produced and human-written poetry?
2. How do graphological features distinguish across both corpora in terms of occurrence and function?
3. To what extent does ChatGPT-generated poetry imitate or deviate from Rupī Kaur's graphological style?

### **1.3 Significance of the Study**

No existing study has examined a stylistic comparative analysis of graphological deviation across human poetry and ChatGPT-generated poetry. By systematic comparing both corpora, this study further develops stylistic, digital poetics, and computational literature. The findings of this study add to the ongoing debate on creativity and authorship concerns of artificial intelligence by offering insights to researchers and linguists.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Deviation as a Stylistic Mechanism**

The scientific study of style in literary writings is known as Stylistics. It is generally considered as a field of linguistics. According to Jeffries and McIntyre (2025), the development of stylistics in the corpus and cognitive domains is interdisciplinary. In stylistic analysis, structural, typographical, phonetic, and figurative elements help in producing meaning and emotional effects (Qizi and Ozoda, 2023). Thus, stylistics has shifted its role from a descriptive to an analytical approach. Central to this is the foregrounding theory, which was originally proposed by Geoffrey Leech and then further formulated by Mick Short. It posits that deviation from established norms is crafted to create communicative and aesthetic effects in literary writing. This concept is reinforced by Mansoor and Salman (2020) in their research, where they argue that deviation occurs at various levels, such as morphological, phonological, syntactic, lexical, and graphological. Regarding this, Rasul (2024) expanded this finding by using Leech and Short's checklist on two different works, namely Anwar Qadir Mohammed's poem and Dylan Thomas's *Before I Knocked*. In the analysis of both works, it is found that the linguistic features of foregrounding play a significant role in creating a relationship between structure and subject matter that enhances aesthetic and interpretative expression. Whereas Short (1999) in his analysis of Marabou Stork Nightmares applies this to the visual level, arguing that unusual typographical patterns is not only a textual element, but an intentional stylistic approach that enhances visual appeal and helps in meaning construction in literary writing.

## 2.2 Visual Experimentation and Contemporary Poetic Form

The development of typographical and textual experimentation is demonstrated in modern poetry in recent research. In works of R and Nagamani (2025) and Vargas (2004), it is seen that modern poets start using unconventional features such as multisemiotic expressions, interactive communication, absence of punctuation, etc. These are specifically used to make the text prominent and thus engage the reader with the text by departing from the established conventions.

## 2.3 Rupi Kaur's Typographical Style

Rupi Kaur, a contemporary poet, has gained attention for her stylistic pattern and literary contribution. In her published works, such as *Milk and Honey*, *The Sun and Her Flowers*, and *Home Body*, she employs typographical features. She uses minimal punctuation, lowercase letters, white spaces, and fragmented structures to create aesthetic and emotional effects on the readers (Rahmah et al., 2024). Rivera (2023) analyzes the features of linguistic deviation and parallelism in Kaur's poetry using foregrounding theory by Leech. He reveals how she intentionally uses foregrounding markers to convey underlying themes of empowerment and equality for women. According to Neogi (2023), her ability to blend the feminist voices with the typographical features shows her appeal to diverse readers.

## 2.4 Computational Creativity in AI-Generated Poetry

Nick Montfort's concept of computational text generation is a useful theoretical framework for checking how AI-generated texts are produced. It considers AI-produced text as a norm-based process in which literary texts are produced through predefined algorithmic patterns. This approach further shows that production of digital text is not determined by human intention and stylistic expression (Montfort, 2003). Empirical studies on AI-produced poetry both support and challenge this theoretical approach. It is demonstrated through the research work of Bhyravajjula et al. (2025) that language technologies find it hard to replicate certain stylistic features of human poetic expressions. He proves it through drawing comparisons of LLM-produced, published, and unpublished poems. Larekeng (2025) also admits the capacity of GPT models, allowing an automatic system to produce literary texts. These generated texts adhere to established linguistic norms. However, the questions of creativity and authorship remain. Furthermore, the limitations in stylistic patterns, semantic richness, and literary creativity can be found in transformer-driven models (Paulson and Leonard, 2025).

Comparative research between AI-generated and human-produced literary texts strengthens these constraints. Although AI-generated texts are complex in syntactic structure and diverse in lexical choices, they seem less rich in semantic and creative content (Wang, 2025). Regarding this, Jasim and Awqati (2025) advocate that recognized linguistic patterns can be synthesized by AI. It has limitations in conveying cultural nuances. It is further indicated that human-written poetry displays stylistic expression, semantic uniqueness, and conceptual creativity more than AI-produced poetry (Paulson and Reeds, 2025).

## 2.5 Research Gap

No previous research has compared AI-generated and human-written poetry at the graphological level. Although existing research deals with the productivity of AI and graphological deviation in human-written poetry separately, the comparative analysis between these domains has not been done. Moreover, Rupi Kaur's typographical style has not been analyzed against AI-generated literary texts. This study fills this gap through a comparative stylistic analysis between human-authored and AI-produced poetry at the level of graphological deviation.

## 3. Research Methodology



### 3.1 Research Design

This study uses a qualitative, comparative, and textual research design. A qualitative approach is used for interpretative analysis of graphological features instead of quantification of these features. The comparative design helps in systematic analysis of similarities and variations between human-written and AI-generated poetry. The textual approach provides a structured close reading of each poem.

### 3.2 Theoretical Framework

This study employs two theoretical frameworks. The primary analytical lens of this research is Geoffrey Leech's theory of foregrounding. It considers deviation as a stylistic marker. It explains how deviation from the conventional graphological features conveys deeper meaning and intensity of emotions. These graphological features include punctuation, line breaks, spacing, capitalization, and visual layout. Nick Montfort's concepts of computational and digital literature act as a complementary framework. It places AI-generated poetry in an algorithmic text production framework. It explores how AI-generated poetry is not shaped by the intentional stylistic creativity of humans under controlled prompting conditions but is generated through trained data.

### 3.3 Method of Analysis

Stylistic analysis acts as the primary analytical tool. In order to identify graphological features such as punctuation, line breaks, spacing, capitalization, and visual layout, the study uses close reading techniques on each poem. The stylistic and communicative role of each feature is analyzed. This approach enables a thorough comparison of graphological features present in each poem written by Rupri Kaur and generated by ChatGPT. This evaluates how each kind of text creates meaning through typographical features.

### 3.4 Data Collection

The dataset encompasses six poems divided into two equal corpora. The published works of Rupri Kaur make the first corpus, which involves three poems. Rupri Kaur was chosen for her distinctive and typographical style. The second corpus consists of three poems generated through ChatGPT (OpenAI, GPT-based large language model). ChatGPT generates poems under controlled prompting conditions without specified stylistic limits. This is done to minimize researcher bias. ChatGPT was selected because it is widely available and can be used for text generation. All ChatGPT-produced poems were exclusively used for this scholarly study.

### 3.5 Corpus and Sampling

Purposive sampling is performed to create a small and targeted corpus. The focused corpus is suitable for close reading and thorough graphological analysis. To maintain comparability, a balanced selection of three poems from each dataset is employed. This balanced selection is intentional, reducing an analytical bias.

The present research has limitations in corpus selection as well. Rupri Kaur's typographical style does not represent human poetic expressions at large. Similarly, ChatGPT-generated poetry reflects the default behavior of this specific model. Therefore, it is acknowledged that the findings do not reflect any generalizable claim in favor of either human or ChatGPT-generated poetry at large.

### 3.6 Ethical Considerations

The use of published Kaur's poems and ChatGPT-generated poems in this research strictly abides by the established ethical guidelines. The poems of Rupri Kaur are only used for

analytical and academic purposes. Similarly, controlled prompting commands are given to ChatGPT for generating poems. This is done to maintain academic transparency and discourage researcher bias. ChatGPT-generated poetry is clearly separated from human-authored poetry throughout the study to ensure full transparency. During the research, no personal, confidential, or sensitive data is collected or used.

#### 4. Analysis and Findings

##### 4.1 Graphological Analysis of Rupi Kaur's Poems

The visual layout of the **first poem** exhibits deviation from established orthographic features. It displays several graphological deviated features such as lowercase lettering, absence of punctuation, and fragmented line breaks and stanzas. The poem opens with "**how**" and the pronoun "**i**" in "**from my lips as i answered**" are written in lowercase lettering. It creates a uniform visual layout. Similarly, the poem lacks punctuation marks while using direct speech and complete argumentations. The readers depend on line breaks rather than punctuation marks for pauses and meaning. The poem is divided into three two-line stanzas. These stanzas are separated by blank spaces, with each line taking up little textual space. These graphological features provide a minimalist style in which white space and lineation act as main organizational elements. As a result, the poem intentionally breaks conventional norms in order to attain coherence and artistic creativity.

Kaur's typographical style continues in the **second poem**. Unlike traditional poetry, this poem exhibits omission of punctuation, lowercase lettering, parallel structure, and distorted line breaks. These stylistic features reflect visual aesthetics. The lowercase pronoun "**i**" shows deviation from established capitalization patterns. Punctuation marks are completely omitted. Ideas are organized and interpreted on the basis of line breaks rather than punctuation marks. Each phrase is present in a separate line, which can be seen in the poem (Kaur, 2015):

I am water  
soft enough  
to offer life  
tough enough  
to drown it away

This structure creates an unusual visual arrangement. The fragmented visual layout draws the attention of readers to individual statements and helps them in decoding meaning. Together, these graphological features produce a minimalist and visually balanced layout using structural repetition rather than conventional graphological elements. The purpose of these deviated graphological features is to provide cohesion, prominence, and emphasis.

Continuous use of lowercase letters, omission of punctuation, enjambment, and unusual stanza division in the **third poem** also reveal Kaur's graphological deviation. Like her other poems, this poem also starts with the lowercase word "**what.**" The use of lowercase letters contributes to the uniform visual appearance of the poem, rejecting conventional capitalization norms. There are multiple clauses and a complex syntactic structure in the poem. Still, the poetess does not use any punctuation marks. Through line breaks and stanza division, the reader understands transitions and pauses, which help in meaning-making. Enjambment is also noticeable with phrases like "**foam at the mouth with envy / when others succeed**" and "**our struggle to / celebrate each other is.**" Clauses are extended across the lines, engaging the reader for continuous reading in a rhythmic style. Moreover, the poem is organized into two stanzas separated by a blank line. This white space acts as a structural label, where ideas are organized into separate sections. These features of graphological deviation strengthen the



Kaur's minimalist style and help in achieving salience. Table 4.1 presents a summary of the graphological features observed in the selected poems of Rupi Kaur.

Table 4.1 Graphological features in Rupi Kaur's poetry

| Graphological Features | Poem 1                   | Poem 2                           | Poem 3                                                     |
|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| Capitalization         | Lowercase throughout     | Lowercase throughout             | Lowercase throughout                                       |
| Punctuation use        | No punctuation           | No punctuation                   | Very limited punctuation                                   |
| Lineation              | 6 lines                  | 5 lines                          | 9 lines                                                    |
| Stanza structure       | 3 stanzas (2 lines each) | Single stanza                    | Two stanzas (5 lines in stanza one, 4 lines in stanza two) |
| Enjambment             | Frequent                 | Frequent                         | Frequent                                                   |
| White space            | 3 blank lines            | Appears above and below the poem | 1 blank line between two stanzas                           |

#### 4.2 Graphological Analysis of ChatGPT-Generated Poems

It is significant to place the analysis of ChatGPT-generated within Montfort's (2003) computational framework. According to this framework, texts are generated through predefined computational systems rather than artistic intention. The linguistic structures in literary writing, produced by a computational system, are derived from trained data. The graphological features in ChatGPT-generated poems, such as capitalization, punctuation, and enjambment, are not only stylistic choices. These features are the output of the system, which is designed to replicate the conventions of its training environment. In order to analyze the graphological features in an AI-generated poem, there is a need to understand the distinction between human intention and algorithmic creativity.

The **first ChatGPT-generated poem** follows conventional graphological features. Each line in this poem starts with a capital letter, such as "**From fractured nights where silence used to scream**" and "**I learned to hold the ache behind each dream.**" The pronoun "**I**" is also capitalized. There is a use of punctuation marks like commas or full stops at the end of each line. The visual layout of the poem is also organized. All these graphological features demonstrate the default behavior of ChatGPT towards standard rules. The capitalization and end-punctuation are usual conventions in poetry on which these AI models are trained (Montfort, 2003).

The second ChatGPT-generated poem shows conventional typographical features with only limited graphological deviation. Some lines start with capitalized pronouns, such as "**I am the hush of dawn, and the storm that follows after**" and "**I bend like rain against glass, but I do not break**". While the other lines, such as "**softness in my hands**" and "**both fragile light and unyielding dark live in my nature,**" open with lowercase words. This irregularity is an incidental, not an intentional, stylistic pattern because no such prompt is given to ChatGPT. It is better understood within Montfort's (2003) framework. These incidental features reflect the natural variation because the model selects from multiple suitable sequences. However, these variations are different from foregrounded deviation because they are not consistent and related to any communicative purpose. The visual layout of the poem is organized with continuous five-line vertical and similar horizontal extension. Commas are

placed at line endings for pauses and transitions. Line spacing is also consistent. There is no white space or stanza break. This compact visual design does not prefer fragmentation, which is characteristic of human poetry. The poem does not mainly choose to align with the traditional standards. It is conventional because it is the output of a computational model.

Conventional graphological features are also observed in the third ChatGPT-generated poem with limited deviation. The first line of each stanza starts with a capital letter, such as "I learned to measure myself," "Envy grows in the spaces between us," and the concluding statement also maintains capitalization: **"We know how to feel — just not together."** However, all the subsequent lines of the stanza start with lowercase letters. The poem is organized into three stanzas. All three stanzas are separated by blank lines, which work in the segmentation of stanzas. The length of the stanza varies. The first two stanzas consist of four lines, while the final stanza has one single line. The single concluding line gains visual prominence and serves as the concluding unit. The em dash is employed within the last line for pause and interruption. This regularity in visual layout shows how the structural organization draws the reader's attention. Meanings are decoded through structure. Within Montfort's (2003) framework, the organized structure is the product of trained linguistic conventions rather than intentional experimentation. Table 4.2 provides an overview of all graphological features that characterize ChatGPT-generated poetry.

Table 4.2 Graphological features in AI-generated poetry

| Graphological Features | Poem 1                  | Poem 2                                                                | Poem 3                        |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Capitalization         | Standard capitalization | 3 out of 5 lines begin with a capital letter<br>2 lowercase instances | Mixed/standard capitalization |
| Punctuation use        | Frequent punctuation    | Frequent punctuation                                                  | Frequent punctuation          |
| Lineation              | 6 lines                 | 5 lines                                                               | 9 lines                       |
| Stanza structure       | Single stanza           | Single stanza                                                         | 3 stanzas                     |
| Enjambment             | No                      | No                                                                    | Frequent                      |
| White space            | No                      | No                                                                    | 2 stanzas break               |

### 4.3 Comparative Graphological Findings

The comparative analysis between poetry written by Rupī Kaur and ChatGPT-generated poetry reveals clear differences in the use of graphological features such as use of capitalization, punctuation marks, lineation, stanza structure, and spatial layout. Two stylistic viewpoints are presented through these differences. Rupī Kaur's poems are characterized by intentional graphological deviation, and ChatGPT-generated poems show commitment to conventional norms. These findings express ChatGPT's default behavior under the controlled prompting conditions. These are not conveyed as general claims about the creativity of AI models.

#### **4.3.1 Capitalization Patterns**

Capitalization is the main indicator of graphological deviation. In Rupī Kaur's poetry, it can be seen that she uses lowercase lettering even for the first-person pronoun "i." It reflects her distinctive and typographical style. On the other hand, ChatGPT-generated poetry follows standard conventions. Each line mostly starts with capital letters. There is only one incidental instance of capitalization deviation observed.

#### **4.3.2 Punctuation Usage**

Another indicator for identifying graphological deviation is the punctuation usage. In Rupī Kaur's poems, there is a complete absence of punctuation marks, including commas, full stops, and quotation marks. In contrast, ChatGPT-generated poems follow standard punctuation marks for grammatical boundaries and pauses. In short, Rupī Kaur's poems prefer visual experimentation, and ChatGPT-generated poems favor syntactic clarity.

#### **4.3.3 Lineation and Enjambment**

Line breaks are used in both datasets as a stylistic marker. In Rupī Kaur's poems, short lines and enjambment are frequently used. They help the reader in decoding meanings because no punctuation marks are used. Conversely, ChatGPT-generated poems employ aligned lineation. There are full or near-complete clauses present in each line. Enjambment is also present, but the main syntactic flow depends on punctuation marks.

#### **4.3.4 Stanza Structure and White Space**

Stanza division is used in both corpora. Rupī Kaur's poems use very short stanzas of two to three lines. White space or irregular spacing is used to divide stanzas because no punctuation marks are used. On the other hand, ChatGPT-generated poems show balanced stanza structures with regular line distribution. Punctuation marks are typically used for stanza division, while less space is used for this purpose. In human-authored poems, white space acts as a semantic device, whereas in ChatGPT-generated poems, white space plays an organizational function.

#### **4.3.5 Key Finding**

The finding of this comparative analysis suggests that graphological deviation is not only a decorative device but also acts as a stylistic marker. It reveals that human-written poetry deviates from established graphological norms for emphasis and aesthetic effects. In contrast, AI-generated poetry conforms to established orthographic conventions under the controlled prompting commands given.

### **5. Conclusion**

This study examined graphological deviation in contemporary poetry by conducting a stylistic comparison between Rupī Kaur's poems and ChatGPT-generated poems. The study used Leech's theory of foregrounding and Montfort's computational framework of digital text generation to analyze how graphological features convey meaning and aesthetic effects across both corpora. The findings suggest that deviation from established linguistic norms acts as a stylistic indicator. The graphological deviation is attributed to human poetic text. On the other hand, ChatGPT-generated poetry is primarily defined by rule-governed linguistic standards. Although texts produced by ChatGPT are well-organized and structurally coherent, it does not completely imitate the stylistic deviation and visual experimentation. This variation highlights a basic distinction between intention and reproduction at the graphological level. It is more clearly visible and consistent under controlled prompting commands, minimizing researcher bias.

Overall, the findings of this study highlight the importance of graphological deviation in creating aesthetic effects and poetic meaning. Through this, the reader's attention is diverted



to what the poet wants to convey through these foregrounded features. Thus, salience is achieved. This study contributes to stylistic and digital poetics. It does not give any conclusive declaration on AI creativity. However, it presents an empirical observation about the default behavior of ChatGPT when no specific stylistic prompt is given. It only examines one human poet and one AI-generated model for analyzing literary stylistic patterns. By analyzing multiple poets and AI models simultaneously, future studies can provide a deeper understanding of the relationship between human-written and AI-generated texts.

### References

- Ahmad, R. S., Meena, R. S., & Muhammed, D. S. (2024). Foregrounding aspects in Dylan Thomas' *Before I Knocked*: A stylistic analysis. *Arab World English Journal*.
- Bhyravajjula, S., Walsh, M., Preus, A., & Antoniak, M. (2025). So much depends upon a whitespace: Why whitespace matters for poets and LLMs. *ArXiv.org*.
- Jasim, Y. A., & Awqati, A. J. (2025). Distinguishing human creativity from AI-generated literary texts. *Journal of Future Research*, 25(2), 40–47.
- Jeffries, L., & McIntyre, D. (2025). Stylistics. In *Cambridge University Press eBooks*.
- Larekeng, S. H. (2025). Verse by algorithm. In *Advances in computational intelligence and robotics book series* (pp. 149–176).
- Mansoor, M. S., & Salman, Y. M. (2020). Linguistic deviation in literary style. *Cihan University-Erbil Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 7–16.
- Montfort, N. (2003). *Twisty little passages: An approach to interactive fiction*. MIT Press.
- Neogi, T. (2023). Evolution of Canadian poet Rupī Kaur. *Literary Voice*, 1(1), 74–78.
- Paulson, D., & Leonard, S. (2025). Applications of NLP in computational poetics and literary Analysis. *Preprints.org*.
- Paulson, D., & Reeds, M. (2025). A comparative study of AI-assisted and human-only poetic composition techniques. *Preprints.org*.
- Qadduri, H. H. (2025). Algorithmic aesthetics: A stylistic analysis of AI-generated poetry and exploration of human authorship boundaries. *Adab Al-Basrah*, 1(114).
- Qizi, A. Z. Y., & Ozoda, H. (2023). EXPLORE STYLISTICS ANALYSIS OF POEMS IN LITERATURE. *Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research)*.
- R, G., & Nagamani, M. (2025). Breaking the mold: Experimental forms in contemporary poetry. *Shanlax International Journal of Arts, Science and Humanities*, 12(S4), 76–79.
- Rahmah, M., Meidasari, V. E., & Said, M. (2024). Stylistic analysis of Instagram poem by Rupī Kaur. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 7(6).
- Rasul, K. A. (2024). Linguistic deviation according to Leech and Short's checklist in Anwar Qader's poem 'The Season of Farhad' survival'. *Journal of Raparin University*, 11(6), 21–48.
- Kaur, R. (2015). *Milk and honey*. Andrews McMeel.
- Rivera, M. (2023). A stylistic study on the selected poems of Rupī Kaur's *Milk and Honey*. *World Journal of English Language*, 13(7), 315–323.
- Short, M. (1999). Graphological deviation, style variation and point of view in Marabou Stork Nightmares by Irvine Welsh. *Journal of Literary Studies*, 15(3-4), 305-323.
- Vargas, J. C. (2004). From rule-breaking to rule-breaking: Notes on punctuation in the early novel and contemporary poetry. *Revista de Filología y Lingüística de la Universidad de Costa Rica*, 30(2), 85–101.
- Wang, Q. (2025). Bridging the Gap: Multimodal Semantic Comparison of Human and AI-Generated Descriptions in Artistic Contexts. *Qiuyue Wang*, 4256–4261.



Yi, F. (2024). A comparative study of poems by AI poet and human poet: In the case of Poetry Has No Future Unless It Comes to Its End: Poetry of Artificial Intelligence. *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature*, 8(4).

### Appendix A: ChatGPT Prompting Conditions

The prompts used to generate the AI poems are included in this appendix. All the prompts were kept controlled and neutral in order to minimize the researcher's bias. There were no specific guidelines about the graphological features, poetic norms, and formatting standards in any prompts. The only command given to ChatGPT was about the theme and number of lines in alignment with the themes and lines of Rupī Kaur's poems. This strategy was used to examine the default behavior of ChatGPT.

The AI model used to generate poems was ChatGPT (OpenAI, GPT-based large language model). All the generated poems were exclusively used for this academic research. These poems are not published anywhere else.

#### A.1 Prompts Used

| Poem      | Prompt As Given to ChatGPT                                                                     |
|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| AI Poem 1 | Generate a poem about trauma-shaped kindness and emotional resilience in 6 lines.              |
| AI Poem 2 | Generate a poem about the duality of human nature, exploring softness and strength in 5 lines. |
| AI Poem 3 | Generate a poem about envy, comparison, and the difficulty of collective empathy in 9 lines.   |

#### A.2 Limitations of Prompting Conditions

It is acknowledged that different graphological responses from ChatGPT may be produced by giving different prompting commands. The findings of this study are limited to the controlled prompting commands as described above. The findings are not presented as a general claim about the graphological creativity of all AI models.