This is my discussion topic

Reflection on Hutson

AI “robo-writers” such as GPT-3 pose the risk of generating text in a human language which calls into question authorship, accuracy and potential abuses of such technology. Hutson (2021) notes that while these models are capable of impressive feats of prose, they are known to “hallucinate”—fictitious and biased so-called facts—due to the biases entrenched within training datasets.

Highly productive email, report or summary writing at an administrative level has been noted as an efficiency AI writers provide (Zou & Schiebinger, 2021). However, from a technical standpoint there is danger: within systems where documents contain mistakes ,AI summarization can lead to documents accumulating gaps without checks leading to gaps in communication. As critiqued by Bender et al. (2021), “stochastic parrots” as we term these systems lack understanding and direct supervision when generating output rife with errors results in error propagation unchecked.

Beyond compliance risks posed by grant Proposals and Legal document drafting, productivity is scaled immensely in such defended sectors, signaled by growing adoption writing AIs . There is also concern that legal paragraphs made by artificial intelligences will ignore regulations or cross jurisdictional borders without detail. There is also concern raised by Floridi et al. (2018) stressing the need for “humans-in-the-loop” to safeguard matters of reliability focused on procedure while ethically scoped integrity. The absence of expert review results into writing devoid of accountability makes regulated domains pull in excess liability.

With modern technology there are more exciting opportunities such as co-writing poems, fiction, and even scripts thanks to AI (Manjavacas & Liddle, 2020). But creativity fundamentally intertwines with originality, voice and authenticity. Mimicking styles or tropes is all AI can do. Hutson argues robo‑writers might “mimic” instead of invent. Scholars like Veale (2016) argue that true creativity needs some level of contextual depth, novelty; which AI lacks at the moment.

Evaluating uncertainty and bias from a machine-apply learning’s criticality framework requires focus on each discrete level. Hutson’s hallucination and bias concerns interlace with Floridi's call for ethics transparency while simultaneously Bender warns us against over-trusting systems. A domain-specific designed-validator system with metadata tracking and automated human oversight is necessary for safe use. On the other side, their balance situation presents benefits: speed, scale, stimulation hence innovation-draws levels lower risk ranges but errors increase alongside loss in authorship paired with unnaturally high confidence levels.
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This is majed alzaabi answer

Hi Shaikah,

Thank you for such a comprehensive and insightful post. I appreciate how you highlighted the dual nature of AI writers—bringing efficiency yet introducing new risks, especially in legal and regulated sectors. Your point about “hallucinations” and the potential for error propagation really stood out. It’s alarming how convincingly these systems can generate inaccurate content, especially when used in sensitive areas without human review (Bender et al., 2021; Hutson, 2021).

I also found your reflection on creativity very relatable. While tools like GPT can mimic stylistic patterns, as you rightly mentioned, originality and contextual depth remain deeply human traits. Veale (2016) and Manjavacas & Liddle (2020) offer great perspectives on this. In my view, co-writing with AI can be enriching—as long as it remains a collaborative process where human judgment and voice lead the way.

Your call for domain-specific validators and human oversight is especially timely. With increasing integration of AI into writing, embedding transparency, accountability, and ethical design is essential (Floridi et al., 2018). Like you, I believe the path forward lies in responsible use—maximizing innovation while safeguarding authenticity and reliability.

Great job synthesizing these complex ideas!
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This is rayan al naqbi answer

Dear Shaikha,

I appreciate your analysis of Hutson’s work. You have showcased the functionalities and perils posed by AI ‘robo-writers’ quite well. As you have indicated, these tools provide certain advantages such as streamlining administrative tasks, however, they pose a lot of challenges in terms of accuracy, authorship, and compliance with regulations.

As Hutson (2021) points out, the risk of AI-generated ‘hallucinations’ poses a major threat in legal or technical fields where unchecked errors or biases can lead to inappropriate content. Bender et al. (2021) also note that large language models operate as ‘stochastic parrots’; reproducing formulated speech without understanding, which increases automated disinformation and unverified information being treated as the truth.

Your arguments on creativity are equally reasonable. Current AIs lack the capability to feel or understand emotional depth and context; thus while they may aid in brainstorming sessions or cloning styles, authentic inventiveness is deeply rooted in true emotional connections. As Veale (2016) has pointed out, imitation does not equate to real invention.

Human oversight needs to be built into high-risk areas, as emphasized by Floridi et al., 2018 . These machines bear risks but also hold innovation possibilities; if governed within a sound structure that merges expert validation with AI capabilities, it can ensure accountability alongside the ethical values and integrity of the system.
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This is Mohamed alzaabi answer

Hi Shaikah,

You’ve presented a compelling critique of the challenges surrounding AI-generated content, especially in high-stakes contexts such as legal, academic, and administrative writing. I agree with your emphasis on Hutson’s (2021) point about hallucination and how this can lead to compounding errors when unchecked. As you mentioned, when summarisation systems draw on flawed inputs, the result can be serious miscommunication or even legal repercussions if applied without human oversight.

To address these risks, one effective measure could be the development of domain-specific validators, as you suggested. These systems could incorporate rules-based filters and cross-reference outputs with verified databases (e.g., legal statutes or scientific citation indexes) to ensure factual accuracy and compliance. Additionally, Floridi et al. (2018) make a strong case for keeping humans "in the loop"—this is critical for both accountability and interpretability. Without that layer of expert review, responsibility for errors becomes ambiguous.

Your point about authorship and creativity also resonates deeply. Veale (2016) and Manjavacas & Liddle (2020) rightly point out that mimicking style is not the same as genuine creativity. One way to maintain authenticity is by requiring AI contributions to be disclosed in creative or academic work—similar to how editors or research assistants are credited—to prevent the erosion of authorial integrity.

Altogether, your post underscores the need for transparency, validation mechanisms, and continuous human oversight in AI writing applications. These steps would not only reduce risk but also promote a more ethically grounded integration of AI in society.
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Summary post

Thanks so much for taking the time to reply to my original post. Your comments have added depth to the conversation about AI-generated writing, touching on ethical, technical, and creative angles I hadnt fully considered.

Majed, you struck a wise balance between excitement for new tools and a healthy pinch of caution. I liked how you flagged the chance of hallucinated outputs in sensitive fields and linked that concern to Bender et al.s warning about stochastic parrots. Seeing AI as a writing partner, not the sole author, echoes many collaborative workplaces today, and your push for clear, ethical design matches Floridi et al.s call for responsible algorithms.

Rayan, your reminder that AI lacks emotion really underscores its limits in creative writing. That shortcoming does raise red flags in law or policy, where missing context could spread misinformation. I also liked your idea of pairing AIs speed with human checks, a structure that could keep accountability front and center while still letting us experiment responsibly.

Mohamed, your idea of building validators tailored to specific topics, plus the cross-checking process behind them, stands out as practical and doable. It shows you are thinking about real-world steps we can take to keep facts straight and stay within legal lines. Your also noting that AI help should be listed much like a research assistant or editor does is a nice touch; it honors the human authors while acknowledging that bots now lend a hand.

Taken together, all three of you echo the same core point: sure, AI can write faster, open doors for new voices, and shoulder dull tasks, yet its best kept on a track that puts ethics, accuracy, and clear human eyes first. We do not want to push creative thinking or judgement aside; we want to give them a boost. Set roles, honest alerts, and steady fact Checks can turn AI into a valuable writing partner without taking away trust or fresh ideas.