PEER RESPONSE 1

Lauretta, your post offers a nuanced and well-referenced exploration of AI writers across administrative, academic, and creative domains. I particularly appreciate your framing of generative AI as a "cultural intervention"; a concept that invites us to consider not just utility, but the epistemic and aesthetic implications of machine-generated text. Your synthesis of Hidayatullah et al. (2025) and Cardon and Coman (2025) underscores a key tension: while AI enhances productivity, it can erode authenticity and critical engagement if not carefully governed. This echoes Bender et al.'s (2021) warning that large language models, despite their fluency, lack true communicative intent and can perpetuate harmful biases.

I'd add that the risks you highlight -plagiarism, hallucination, and diminished critical thinking- are not just technical flaws but pedagogical challenges. Embedding AI literacy into writing education, as Begum (2025) suggests, is vital. But we must also cultivate what Floridi (2018) calls "semantic responsibility" the ability to evaluate not just what is written, but why and how it was generated. Moreover, your point about workplace perceptions is timely. As generative AI becomes more embedded in professional communication, organisations must navigate the fine line between efficiency and sincerity. Transparent disclosure and human oversight are not optional. They're ethical imperatives.

In sum, your post compellingly argues that AI writers should be treated as collaborators, not replacements. The challenge ahead lies in designing systems and cultures that preserve human voice, judgment, and originality.

REFERENCES

Bender, E.M. et al. (2021) 'On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big?', FAccT '21, pp. 610–623. doi:10.1145/3442188.3445922. Floridi, L. (2018) The Logic of Information: A Theory of Philosophy as Conceptual Design. Oxford University Press.

PEER RESPONSE 2

The view that AI should act as a collaborator rather than a replacement is an interesting one, but complex in practice. Collaboration requires clear boundaries, including when to use AI, how to disclose it, and how to maintain an author's intent. Without such guidance, there is a risk that dependency could replace discernment, a pattern consistent with the automation bias observed in human-AI collaboration studies (Romeo, 2025).

The focus on AI literacy is also crucial. In addition to teaching responsible use, there should also be an emphasis on helping students decide when not to rely on AI tools (Long and Magerko, 2020; Ng et al., 2021). Such awareness could help ensure that AI is used to enhance, not diminish, creativity and integrity in writing.

REFERENCES

Romeo, G. & 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

Long, D. and Magerko, B. (2020) 'What is AI literacy? Competencies and design considerations', Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '20), pp. 1–16. http://doi:10.1145/3313831.3376727

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. http://doi:10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100041

PEER RESPONSE 3

Your comprehensive analysis effectively captures the multifaceted nature of AI writers across different domains. I particularly value your emphasis on AI literacy training and the framework of AI as a "partner rather than substitute" that Begum (2025) proposes. This collaborative approach seems essential for navigating the complex landscape you've outlined.

Your citation of Cardon and Coman's (2025) survey findings about workplace communication resonates strongly with Hutson's (2021) concerns. The erosion of perceived sincerity and authorship capability suggests a deeper challenge than mere technical limitations it points to fundamental questions about trust and authenticity in human communication. This aligns with what Bender et al. (2021) describe as the "stochastic parrot" problem, where fluency masks the absence of genuine understanding.

I'm intrigued by your discussion of AI's role in academic writing, particularly regarding "compliance procedures." While Khalifa and Albadawy (2024) highlight benefits in organization and clarity, I wonder if we risk creating a homogenization effect in academic discourse. If researchers increasingly rely on similar AI tools for structuring arguments, might we see a convergence toward certain stylistic patterns that could inadvertently narrow the diversity of academic expression?

Your point about continuous human oversight is crucial, especially given Hidayatullah et al.'s (2025) warnings about erosion of critical thinking skills. Perhaps we need more granular guidelines that specify which tasks benefit from AI assistance versus those requiring unmediated human judgment. For instance, using AI for initial literature searches versus relying on it for theoretical synthesis presents vastly different risk profiles.

The framework you present balancing efficiency gains against integrity concerns, provides a valuable lens for institutional policy-making as these technologies become increasingly embedded in professional and academic contexts.

REFERENCES

Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & 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, 610-623.