Bias in recognizing GenAI in text

After the [em-dash has been declared ChatGPT's new signature](), I decided to look further into the "indicators of AI usage in text", because I, as a person who loves parenthesis, would hate to have my text flagged as AI generated, while I'm just trying to fit as many thoughts into one sentence as possible.

The [Capitol Technology University](), listed the following signs:

- Inconsistencies and repetition
- Context and content
- Buzzwords and grammar
- Quick responses
- Placeholder text
- Lack of citations.

They back the lack of citations with the addition, that AI chatbots also love to cite non-existent sources, which is obviously an indicator, that can be found easily.

Lack of citations I have rather encountered in people, who have simply never been taught scientific research and frankly, I think if you let their three-source reports pass for the first three semesters, you have no ground to tell them, that their references aren't sufficient enough in the fourth (I love my uni).

The [Government of Canada]() also released a list, rather directed at internet users in general than teachers looking for help, that stated as one indicator: No emotion.

The rest of the signs sounded rather like bad writing, OR also just neurodivergent expression traits. So, I decided to further look into the Bias – not of AI when generating text – but rather of humans/programs when trying to detect AI.

I do recognize that AI detection programs can analyse the text on a completely different level than humans usually can, so for example there was a period, where ChatGPT simply "signed" its texts with invisible Unicode, using U+200B as space instead of the "normal" space: U+0020.

But institutions without detection programs, or teachers who are requiring printed submissions, even written homework won't be able to use that.

I found an [article]() that verifies, that listed AI signs, usually just describe "robotic" expressions, which is mostly also how autistic writing will be received. If you struggle to understand social cues, express emotions and adhere to conventional communication norms, your writing will most likely reflect that.

The increasing checks can now unfairly impact autistic individuals. A key aspect of the similarities is the ability to perceive patterns and details, that others may not even notice. Both autists (generalising) and AI tend to extend in specific areas of expertise. Intense interest in specific subjects can easily lead to repetition and use of unusually specific language/buzzwords.

Neurodivergent people are already facing bias and struggle with adjusting to society. Individuals on the autism spectrum often encounter misconception and stigmatization. It is therefore crucial to recognize and work around these biases.

Also texts of people who learn English as a second language get flagged disproportionately as using AI.

Obviously, it is nice to have some signs to focus on, not just as teaching staff, but also in the workplace or even uni. If my employee can create a presentation in mere minutes, but *all* the slides are structured with three to four listings, that may be AI. If my classmate who was just struggling to understand the markdown syntax suddenly provides a perfect file with buzzwords bolded and maybe even blockquotes, that may be AI.

But sometimes that's just the part where you kindly offer help.
Or write a report for your portfolio.

Super cool article, I recommend!

https://medium.com/bouncin-and-behavin-academy/from-human-to-machine-the-astonishing-similarities-between-autism-and-ai-in-writing-0e10fd528f23