Initial Post

In his article “Robo-writers: the rise and risks of language-generating AI”, Matthew Hutson (2021) examines the remarkable capabilities of large language models (LLMs) such as GPT‑3, highlighting their fluency in human-style writing while emphasising that they still lack an understanding of meaning. At the administrative level, AI-writers offer clear benefits: they improve efficiency, reduce the time spent on repetitive tasks and ensure a level of consistency in tone and structure. According to Khalifa and Albadawy (2024), AI tools can significantly assist with idea generation, content structuring, and editing in academic and professional contexts. For organisations, this means potential cost savings and faster turnaround for administrative writing jobs with no or minimal creative input (Struckell et al., 2022). However, the risks at this level are non-trivial. Hutson points out that these systems “sometimes make very silly mistakes” and lack causal reasoning or moral judgment — rendering errors plausible yet difficult to detect. Over-reliance on AI in administrative tasks might lead to diminished human oversight, unchecked mistakes, and an erosion of writing or critical reading skill among staff.

When we shift to creative writing (stories, opinion pieces, poetry, branding copy), the stakes change. The benefit lies in new forms of “co-creation”: AI can act as a brainstorming partner, suggest permutations of style, and help overcome writer’s block (Karanjakwut & Charunsri, 2025). Works show that generative AI assistance can boost productivity and confidence, particularly for tasks that are creative or exploratory. Yet the risks increase: Hutson notes that despite fluency, the AI doesn’t understand the language it produces, which raises concerns about authenticity, originality and deeper meaning. There is also a danger of homogenisation of style, loss of human voice, and ethical concerns of attribution or deception. Finally, across all levels there is the matter of ethical, legal and quality-control issues: bias, hallucinations (made-up facts or references), intellectual property, and transparency about AI use. Researchers warn of reduced critical thinking and dependency when users accept AI outputs uncritically.

In summary: AI writers hold substantial promise for reducing routine workload and generating creative sparks — but they are not replacements for human writing, judgement or meaning-making. The key is to use these tools as assistants, with robust oversight, clear attribution and awareness of their limitations (as Hutson emphasises).
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Peer response1 (Mariam Ibrahim)

Interesting perspective! Artificial Intelligence (AI) writing technologies have become increasingly sophisticated, enabling them to generate text nearly indistinguishable from human writing. Yet, as Hutson (2021) emphasises, their linguistic fluency masks a fundamental limitation — AI systems lack true comprehension or intentionality. This gap between form and understanding raises important questions about their role in different writing contexts.

In administrative writing, AI tools are particularly beneficial for automating routine communication, improving productivity and freeing staff to focus on higher-level decision-making (Babšek et al., 2025). Since outputs are typically reviewed by humans, the associated risks are relatively low. However, unchecked reliance could still lead to subtle inaccuracies or impersonal communication.

In professional and academic writing, generative tools enhance structure and grammar while supporting idea development. Qadeer (2025) reports that such tools improve efficiency and writing confidence but may reduce stylistic diversity and engagement with ideas — potentially weakening users’ critical and creative thinking.

Within creative domains, AI can aid brainstorming and drafting by producing novel combinations of text. Nevertheless, Elfa et al., (2023) warns that such content often mirrors existing cultural biases, posing ethical concerns around originality and authenticity.

Ultimately, as Hutson (2021) argues, AI should function as a *collaborative assistant*, not a substitute for human creativity or judgement. Maintaining transparency, factual accuracy, and ethical responsibility remains essential in integrating AI into writing practices.
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Peer Response 2

Hutson’s (2021) article presents an insightful discussion on the capabilities and limitations of AI-generated writing, highlighting a core paradox — AI’s linguistic fluency versus its lack of comprehension. This distinction underscores the ethical and practical challenges of integrating AI writers across various contexts.

In administrative writing, AI systems enhance efficiency by automating repetitive tasks like report generation and meeting summaries, thereby freeing human workers for higher-value tasks (Babšek et al., 2025). Since human oversight remains part of the process, the risks — such as minor inaccuracies or depersonalised tone — are comparatively low.

In academic and technical domains, AI supports writers in structuring content and improving clarity. However, Elfa et al. (2023) caution that overdependence on such tools can diminish engagement with ideas and reduce stylistic diversity, potentially weakening analytical and critical thinking skills. Thus, AI should function as a cognitive aid rather than a creative replacement.

The creative sector illustrates the sharpest tension. While AI can inspire new directions in narrative or poetry, its reliance on pre-existing data may lead to homogenised or biased content (Glynn, 2024). To address these risks, Hutson urges transparency and human-led authorship, ensuring AI complements — rather than supplants — human creativity.
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Summary Post

Matthew Hutson’s (2021) article “Robo-writers: the rise and risks of language-generating AI” offers a comprehensive analysis of the expanding role of large language models (LLMs) such as GPT-3 in modern writing. He acknowledges the impressive fluency of these systems, which can generate human-like text, yet warns that this fluency conceals a critical flaw — AI’s lack of genuine understanding. This gap between linguistic skill and semantic comprehension frames the ongoing debate about the role of AI in administrative, academic, and creative writing.

In administrative contexts, AI writing tools provide tangible efficiency gains by automating repetitive communication tasks, improving accuracy, and ensuring consistency. Research by Khalifa and Albadawy (2024) and Struckell et al. (2022) confirms that AI systems can significantly reduce workload and operational costs. Similarly, Babšek et al. (2025) highlight that when combined with human review, such automation enhances productivity while maintaining accountability. However, as Hutson (2021) notes, AI still makes contextually illogical or ethically questionable errors, requiring continuous human oversight to preserve trust and reliability.

In academic and professional writing, AI enhances structure, clarity, and idea generation Qadeer (2025) observes that AI improves confidence and productivity but may weaken intellectual engagement, creativity, and critical reasoning if overused. Writers risk becoming passive consumers of AI-generated content, compromising originality and academic integrity. The creative domain presents both opportunities and challenges. AI can act as a brainstorming collaborator, offering new stylistic directions (Karanjakwut & Charunsri, 2025). Yet, Elfa et al. (2023) and Glynn (2024) caution that its outputs may lack emotional depth, authenticity, and cultural nuance, often reflecting biases embedded in training data.

Overall, Hutson (2021) advocates for a human-AI partnership, where AI functions as a supportive assistant rather than a substitute for human creativity or judgement. Transparency, ethical oversight, and human-led authorship remain essential to ensure that fluency does not replace wisdom.
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