

## Summary Post

Reflecting on the discussions in Units 8 to 10, as well as the insightful feedback from my peers, I have deepened my understanding of the ethical, creative, and administrative dimensions of AI-generated writing. My initial post emphasized the dual nature of AI writers—enhancing productivity in administrative tasks while also posing significant ethical and creative risks. This perspective was reinforced and expanded through peer engagement.

Rayyan highlighted the ethical pitfalls of automating human functions, especially the erosion of professional responsibility and the need for algorithmic fairness. His focus on the emotional absence in AI-generated creative writing aligns with Floridi and Chiriatti's (2020) argument that AI lacks true comprehension. Majed expanded the conversation by introducing the concept of data provenance—raising concerns about the legitimacy of training datasets and their impact on the credibility and legality of AI output. He also proposed that AI can act as a co-creative partner, not a substitute, which adds nuance to the productivity debate.

Shaikah's input stressed the risk of deskilling in professional environments and echoed the necessity for diversity in creative outputs to preserve artistic originality. She emphasized that clear AI labelling is essential to combat misinformation and maintain public trust—resonating with Jobin et al.'s (2019) call for enforceable ethical AI standards.

The key takeaway is that while AI writers offer clear benefits in both workplace and creative contexts, these advantages come with complex responsibilities. Transparent practices, ethical frameworks, and ongoing human oversight are essential to ensure AI remains a supportive tool rather than a disruptive force. As AI continues to shape communication and content creation, the human role must evolve—not disappear—to safeguard originality, critical thinking, and accountability.