Healed by Code: Hybrid Intelligence, Digital Grief, and the Ethics of Posthuman Bereavement Support-A Digital Humanities Study*

Richa Mishra[1,†]

[1] *Institute of Technology, Nirma University, Gujarat, India*

Abstract

This paper explores the emerging role of Hybrid Intelligence systems in supporting individuals through grief and bereavement. Drawing on psychoanalytic theory, particularly Freud's work on mourning and identification, and philosophical frameworks such as Derrida's hauntology, the study investigates how AI technologies can mediate loss in the digital age. By analyzing grief-specific conversational AI, such as ChatGPT, and integrating qualitative interviews with bereavement counselors alongside computational modeling of online grief narratives, the paper identifies both opportunities and limitations in current implementations. It argues for the co-design of culturally sensitive, ethically informed Hybrid Intelligence systems that blend human empathy with AI scalability. Through the lens of Value Sensitive Design, the paper proposes a roadmap for grief technologies that honor autonomy, cultural variation, and the complex emotional dimensions of mourning. The findings highlight the potential of AI to augment, rather than replace, human care in posthuman bereavement.

Keywords

Digital mourning, HI, grief, AI[1]

1. Introduction

Freud's psychoanalytic view has remained influential in both clinical and technological understandings of grief. In his seminal essay Mourning and Melancholia [1], Freud conceptualized mourning as a gradual process of withdrawing libidinal energy from the lost object, allowing the ego to become "free and uninhibited again." This model presents grief as a task of detachment a painful but necessary disengagement. However, in The Ego and the Id [2], Freud revised this notion by introducing the idea that mourners internalize the lost object, incorporating its image into the ego as part of identity development. This form of identificatory mourning reframes grief as a complex interplay of loss and preservation, where the relationship with the deceased is psychically continued rather than terminated. While Freud laid the foundation for psychoanalytic grief theory, contemporary thinkers have expanded and challenged his concepts. Shedler argues for a dynamic model of affect regulation, while McWilliams re-positions mourning as a relational rather than merely intrapsychic process. This shift aligns with digital grief narratives that foreground interactivity, relationality, and the persistence of presence. Derrida's concept of hauntology is particularly relevant in understanding digital grief. The idea that the deceased linger as spectral presences aligns with the way individuals maintain connections via memorialized social media profiles, chatbots, or AI-generated voices. This ghostly persistence complicates the binary of

HHAI-WS 2025: Workshops at the Fourth International Conference on Hybrid Human-Artificial Intelligence (HHAI), June 9–13, 2025, Pisa, Italy

† Corresponding author.

richa.mishra@nirmauni.ac.in (R. Mishra)

0000-0002-6531-5447 (R. Mishra)

presence/absence and suggests that grief is not an event to be resolved but a relational mode that continues, technologically mediated.

In the 21st century, as society becomes increasingly digitized, nearly every domain of human experience including memory, mourning, and intimacy has been transformed by technological mediation. The digital age, marked by ubiquitous computing, online sociality, and algorithmic personalization, has reconfigured how we engage with loss. Grief is no longer confined to private spaces or physical rituals; instead, it unfolds on public platforms and through interactive technologies [3,4]. Digital grieving practices now include visiting memorialized Facebook profiles, sharing tributes on Instagram, storing voice notes and videos in the cloud, and even engaging with AI-generated avatars and chatbots of the deceased [5,6]. These practices instantiate what scholars term continuing bonds in digital afterlife a process that aligns with Freud's theory of internalization but is now technologically extended and culturally amplified.

This shift necessitates a re-evaluation of grief not as an isolated emotional episode but as a dynamic, digitally mediated process. Rather than signalling a path to closure, digital mourning often fosters an ongoing connection to the deceased, challenging traditional therapeutic goals. In doing so, it underscores the need for grief-support technologies that are ethically aware and psychoanalytically informed.

2. Hybrid Intelligence and Human-Centric Design

Hybrid Intelligence (HI) operates on the principle of mutual augmentation bringing together human intuition, affective reasoning, and ethical discernment with the computational speed, scalability, and pattern recognition capabilities of AI systems [7]. Unlike purely autonomous systems that function without human input, HI frameworks rely on collaborative intelligence where the machine and human co-adapt in real time, responding dynamically to complex, emotionally charged situations such as grief. In this context, HI systems act as empathic mediators, extending the reach of human care while preserving the relational and cultural richness of mourning processes.

In grief support, where the experience of loss is non-linear, culturally diverse, and deeply personal, the role of empathy, symbolism, and storytelling is central. While systems such as Woebot, a fully automated chatbot grounded in Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT), have demonstrated efficacy in regulating mood and addressing anxiety and depression [8], grief requires more than emotional stabilization it demands meaning-making, ritualistic continuity, and narrative co-construction [9]. Grieving individuals often seek to re-narrativize their relationship with the deceased, create symbolic continuities, and integrate the loss into their evolving sense of self functions that require human-centered responsiveness and cultural sensitivity.

This is where Hybrid Intelligence distinguishes itself. Rather than standardizing grief into symptom checklists or pathologizing deviations from normative emotional trajectories, HI systems are designed to listen, learn, and adapt [10]. For example, grief support platforms embedded with HI could detect emotional inflections through natural language processing, understand culturally embedded mourning practices, and escalate conversations to human professionals when needed. Such systems are not just reactive but participatory, allowing the bereaved to co-shape their journey of mourning and memory-making in real time [11].

Moreover, Human-Centric HI design is deeply rooted in Value Sensitive Design (VSD), which emphasizes the integration of human values such as autonomy, dignity, cultural diversity, and transparency into the technical architecture from the outset [12]. In grief contexts, this means resisting paternalistic nudges toward "closure" and instead validating ongoing bonds, spiritual rituals, and diverse expressions of mourning. It also requires that users are clearly informed when they are interacting with AI, ensuring emotional authenticity and epistemic trust in the grieving process [13].

Crucially, Hybrid Intelligence in this domain is not merely about efficiency it is about ethical intimacy: the ability to accompany someone in their suffering without reducing it to data points. By

weaving together narrative, affect, memory, and machine learning, these systems can hold space for sorrow without silencing it. In doing so, they provide context-aware, compassionate companionship, offering support that is scalable but never impersonal.

3. Computational Approaches and Mixed-Methods Integration

The rise of computational social science has opened new frontiers for understanding grief as a multi-dimensional, time-sensitive, and linguistically expressed process. Recent advances in machine learning, particularly in Natural Language Processing (NLP), have enabled researchers to identify patterns of emotional distress in large-scale digital datasets. For example, Hutchinson et al. [14] used NLP to detect linguistic markers of Prolonged Grief Disorder (PGD) in online bereavement forums, including expressions of guilt, disbelief, yearning, and identity disruption. These computational models provide promising early warning mechanisms for identifying at-risk individuals who may require psychological intervention.

Another powerful tool in this domain is Latent Growth Mixture Modeling (LGMM), which captures the heterogeneity in grief trajectories by identifying latent subpopulations with different psychological responses over time. Nakajima's study [15] revealed that not all grief follows a pathological curve many individuals exhibit resilience, while others follow a delayed or chronic trajectory. LGMM helps avoid pathologizing natural mourning and instead encourages differentiated, evidence-based interventions.

4. Method

This study followed an exploratory research design informed by a cross-disciplinary literature review that spanned psychoanalysis, AI ethics, and digital grief practices. The goal was to build a conceptual foundation for understanding how grief is experienced and supported in increasingly digitized environments. The study tried to integrate insights from multidisciplinary studies to balance scale with empathy, abstraction and analysis. This dual-method framework ensures that they ae grounded and mitigate cultural insensitivity [16,17]..

5. Ethical Considerations

As grief support technologies gain momentum, ethical deployment becomes paramount. While technical feasibility is advancing rapidly, issues such as informed consent, data privacy, emotional safety, and digital legacy rights remain inadequately addressed [18]. AI-driven systems may inadvertently pathologize normal grief trajectories by enforcing linear or universal coping models. This is particularly concerning for individuals from marginalized communities, whose grieving practices may not conform to dominant psychological frameworks [19].

Equally critical is the concept of disenfranchised grief losses that are not socially recognized or publicly mourned, such as miscarriage, suicide, or the death of a same-sex partner [20]. If grief technologies rely on datasets skewed toward Western, heteronormative, or neurotypical narratives, they risk exacerbating existing social exclusions. Ethical grief technologies must be capable of recognizing and validating non-normative mourning experiences.

6. Solution

To mitigate these risks, designers must adopt frameworks such as Value Sensitive Design (VSD) and participatory AI, which embed user values, transparency, and human oversight into every layer of development [12,21].During writing of this paper, author interacted and simulated a conversation with generative AI.

The conversation though comforting lacked cultural sensitivity and context specific nuances. It is also imperative that the grief-supporting chatbots must disclose their non-human nature and

provide escalation protocols to connect users with trained human professionals during crises. Thus, AI should serve not as a replacement for mourning rituals, but as an augmented companion that respects emotional autonomy, cultural diversity, and psychological complexity.

The following table outlines key distinctions between proposed Hybrid Intelligence systems and Stand-Alone AI in the context of grief support:

Feature	Hybrid Intelligence System	Standalone AI (e.g., Replika, Woebot, basic LLM models)
Oversight	Human-in-the-loop for clinical validation and escalation	No real-time escalation; lacks human oversight
User Participation	Participatory input for tone, rituals, and preferences	Predefined responses; limited personalization
Cultural Adaptability	Context-sensitive; integrates cultural mourning practices	Often Western-centric; lacks contextual nuance
Feedback Maechanism	Co-evolutionary: learns and adapts with feedback	Static interaction models; no learning from user
Ethical Reflexivity	Grounded in Value Sensitive Design and clinical ethics	Limited ethical awareness or transparent logic
Emotional Responsiveness	Designed for empathy and symbolic meaning-making	May miss symbolic or poetic grief expressions

6.1. 6. Conclusion

As grief becomes increasingly entangled with digital technologies, the ethical, emotional, and cultural stakes of AI-mediated bereavement support demand urgent scholarly and design attention.

This paper has argued that Hybrid Intelligence (HI) systems when grounded in psychoanalytic theory, hauntological reflection, and Value Sensitive Design offer a nuanced alternative to mechanistic, stand-alone AI models.

Rather than attempting to standardize grief or hasten closure, HI frameworks are uniquely positioned to honor the complexity of mourning through participatory, empathic, and culturally adaptive design.

Grief is not a problem to be solved but an experience to be held one that resists linearity, thrives in ambiguity, and demands symbolic depth. Hybrid Intelligence systems that can respectfully co-exist with the spectral presence of the deceased, facilitate narrative re-authoring, and preserve dignity in posthuman mourning environments mark a promising horizon.

Declaration on Generative AI

The author(s) have not employed any Generative AI tools.

References

1. Freud S. Mourning and Melancholia. In: Strachey J, editor. The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. Vol. 14. London: Hogarth Press; 1917.
2. Freud S. The Ego and the Id. In: Strachey J, editor. The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. Vol. 19. London: Hogarth Press; 1923.
3. Walter T. New mourners, old mourners: Online memorial culture as a chapter in the history of mourning. New Rev Hypermedia Multimedia. 2015;21(1-2):10–24.
4. Brubaker JR, Hayes GR, Dourish P. Beyond the Grave: Facebook as a Site for the Expansion of Death and Mourning. The Information Society. 2013;29(3):152–163.
5. Klass D, Silverman PR, Nickman SL. Continuing Bonds: New Understandings of Grief. Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis; 1996.
6. van Dijck J. Mediated Memories in the Digital Age. Stanford: Stanford University Press; 2007.

7. Bassett D. The grief revolution: Digital mourning and the transformation of grief in the internet age. J Loss Trauma. 2015;20(3):187–195.
8. Fitzpatrick KK, Darcy A, Vierhile M. Delivering Cognitive Behavior Therapy to young
9. adults with symptoms of depression and anxiety using a fully automated conversational agent (Woebot). JMIR Ment Health. 2017;4(2):e19.
10. Neimeyer RA. Meaning Reconstruction and the Experience of Loss. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; 2001.
11. Dellermann D, Ebel P, Söllner M, Leimeister JM. Hybrid Intelligence. Business & Information Systems Engineering. 2019;61:637–643.
12. Friedman B, Kahn PH Jr, Borning A. Value Sensitive Design and Information Systems. In: Zhang P, Galletta D, editors. Human-Computer Interaction and Management Information Systems: Foundations. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe; 2008. p. 348–372
13. boyd d, Crawford K. Critical questions for big data: Provocations for a cultural, technological, and scholarly phenomenon. Inf Commun Soc. 2012;15(5):662–67
14. Crawford K, Calo R. There is a blind spot in AI research. Nature. 2016;538(7625):311–313.
15. Caswell M. Urgent Archives: Enacting Liberatory Memory Work. New York: Routledge; 2020.
16. Hutchinson C, Suh H, De Choudhury M. Understanding the language of prolonged grief in online communities. Proc ACM Hum-Comput Interact. 2021;5(CSCW1):1–29.
17. Eubanks V. Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor. New York: St. Martin's Press; 2018.
18. Benda NC, Veinot TC, Sieck CJ, Ancker JS. Digital health equity and COVID-19: The innovation curve cannot reinforce the social gradient of health. J Am Med Inform Assoc. 2021;28(1):33–39.
19. Derrida J. Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning and the New International. London: Routledge; 1994.
20. Shedler J. The efficacy of psychodynamic psychotherapy. Am Psychol. 2010;65(2):98–109.
21. McWilliams N. Psychoanalytic Diagnosis: Understanding Personality Structure in the Clinical Process. New York: Guilford Press; 2004.
22. Benjamin J. An outline of intersubjectivity: The development of recognition. Psychoanal Psychol. 1990;7(Suppl):33–46.