Genre-Based Differences in User Reception of AI-Generated Texts: Informative versus Reactive

Yunsoo Shin

Department of English Language and Literature, Yonsei University

camping1221@yonsei.ac.kr

As large language models (LLMs) have rapidly adopted into ordinary advertisements and social media platforms, AI-generated writing might now seem highly familiar to the users. While previous studies have mainly focused on developing AI detection techniques, several considerable aspects for this topic, such as awareness or preference of the users toward those AI-generated contents, remain underexplored. To go beyond the AI detection research itself and identify the practical modes in which users encounter AI-generated contents, this study aims to clarify genre-based differences in discourse structures of AI-generated texts and their correlation with user responses across two social media platforms. Two types of genres, informative and reactive, are selected because each evokes distinctive user expectation.

For the pilot study, 50 AI-generated texts and 50 human-authored texts from each genre were collected with their user responses. Although not the platform itself but the genre is the unit of comparison, informative texts from “Naver Blog” posts and reactive texts from “Twitter(now X)” replies were used in the experiment based on data collection efficiency. All data were collected via web crawling from texts uploaded since December 2024, when both platforms adopted own AI chatbot services such as “CLOVA for writing” and “Grok”, across diverse topics without topic restriction. For the limited authorship verification, AI-generated texts were identified through a two-step confirmation: automatic classification by similarity to texts from self-disclosed AI accounts across linguistic and behavioral signals, and then retention of only those texts unanimously judged as AI by three human raters.

As expected, the two genres differ in surface-level linguistic features such as interrogative frequency, hedging or proper nouns usage in the texts. Corresponding user reception differences can be divided into two dimensions. For the quantitative engagement, which was measured with “like” and “share” numbers, human-authored texts tended to receive more positive and active engagement than AI-generated texts within both platforms, indicating that users still shown a general preference for human-authored writing than AI-generated one. For the qualitative engagement, interestingly, reactive AI-generated text received frequent criticism from the users who show their awareness of its authorship while informative AI-generated text barely received any mentions. This implies that the different users’ expectation toward the text genre affects their reception patterns, leading to indifference for generic Naver posts and anger for bland Twitter replies.

Keyword: AI-Generated text, Genre, User reception