

SUMMARY POST

The discussion on AI writers has deepened my understanding of both their transformative potential and their complex ethical, pedagogical, and creative implications. In my initial post, I argued that AI tools should be regarded as collaborators rather than replacements valuable for enhancing efficiency in administrative and academic contexts but requiring critical oversight to safeguard integrity and originality (Hutson, 2021; Hidayatullah et al., 2025).

Through peer engagement, this view evolved into a more nuanced appreciation of the philosophical and socio-technical dimensions surrounding AI writing. Feedback from peers highlighted crucial considerations. The notion of semantic responsibility (Floridi, 2018) and warnings about “stochastic parrots” (Bender et al., 2021) reinforced that AI-generated fluency does not equate to genuine understanding or intent. Others expanded on automation bias (Romeo and Conti, 2025) and the risk of homogenisation in academic and creative outputs, prompting reflection on how over-reliance could erode both trust and expressive diversity.

These insights underscored the need for structured AI literacy that empowers users not only to deploy AI effectively but also to discern when its use is inappropriate (Ng et al., 2021). My responses to peers further enriched this dialogue. I explored the importance of integrating ethical and technical governance frameworks to address copyright, misinformation, and data privacy risks (Wang et al., 2024; Ye et al., 2024) and highlighted AI’s potential to promote accessibility and inclusion when responsibly applied (Anderson, Shah and Kreminski, 2024).

Overall, this exchange reaffirmed that the future of AI-assisted writing depends on balance embracing its efficiencies while maintaining human judgment, creativity, and accountability. Responsible innovation must ensure that AI complements rather than compromises the intellectual and moral dimensions of communication.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, B.R., Shah, J.H. and Kreminski, M. (2024) ‘Homogenization effects of large language models on human creative ideation’, *Proceedings of the 16th Conference on Creativity & Cognition*, pp. 413–425.
- Bender, E.M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A. and Shmitchell, S. (2021) ‘On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big?’, *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pp. 610–623.
- Floridi, L. (2018) *The Logic of Information: A Theory of Philosophy as Conceptual Design*. Oxford University Press.
- Hidayatullah, M.H., Fahmi, M., Wahyuni, S. and Sari, D.P. (2025) ‘A systematic literature review of artificial intelligence in academic writing: Challenges and opportunities’, *Journal of Research on English and Language Learning*, 6(1), pp. 145–162.
- Hutson, M. (2021) ‘Robo-writers: The rise and risks of language-generating AI’, *Nature*, 591(7848), pp. 22–25.

Ng, D.T.K., Leung, J.K.L., Chu, S.K.W. and Qiao, M.S. (2021) 'Conceptualizing AI literacy: An exploratory review', *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 2, 100041.

Romeo, G. and Conti, D. (2025) 'Exploring automation bias in human–AI collaboration: A review and implications for explainable AI', *AI & Society*. doi:10.1007/s00146-025-02422-7.

Wang, J.T., Deng, Z., Chiba-Okabe, H., Barak, B. and Su, W.J. (2024) 'An economic solution to copyright challenges of generative AI'. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2404.13964>

Ye, X., Yan, Y., Li, J. and Jiang, B. (2024) 'Privacy and personal data risk governance for generative artificial intelligence: A Chinese perspective', *Telecommunications Policy*, 48(10), p. 102851