Re: Peer Response

by Mariam Ibrahim Ismail Hasan Almarzooqi - Sunday, 19 October 2025, 3:56 PM

Hi,

Thank you for your comprehensive and thoughtful discussion on the evolving role of AI writers. Your post effectively captures the nuanced benefits and risks of integrating AI into various writing domains.

I agree with your point, referencing Hutson (2021), that while AI-generated text may appear fluent, it often lacks genuine understanding. This creates a tension between efficiency and authenticity, especially in contexts that demand critical thought and originality.

In administrative settings, as you mentioned, AI is highly effective in streamlining routine communications such as memos and meeting notes. According to Parycek, Schmid, and Novak (2024), this automation can save time and reduce workload, allowing human professionals to focus on higher-level decision-making. Since these outputs are typically low-risk and easy to verify, the efficiency gains here seem largely positive.

However, I also share your concern about professional and technical writing. While tools powered by large language models (LLMs) can enhance productivity, Li et al. (2024) caution that they may discourage critical engagement and reduce stylistic diversity. Over time, this could erode essential writing and analytical skills, particularly if AI is used as a crutch rather than a support tool.

Your insights into creative writing were especially compelling. Glynn (2024) raises valid concerns about the potential for AI to perpetuate bias and diminish originality. If writers rely too heavily on generative AI, there's a real danger that human creativity and cultural expression may be diluted.

I particularly appreciated your inclusion of Hutson's (2025) suggestion that AI should be used more ethically as a tool for brainstorming or drafting, not as a replacement for human authorship. Maintaining transparency, ensuring rigorous fact-checking, and auditing AI outputs for bias are all critical for responsible use.

Your post is a strong reminder that while AI offers many advantages, the human element in writing must remain central.

References:

Glynn, A. (2024). *Suspected undeclared use of artificial intelligence in the academic literature: An analysis of the Academ-AI dataset.* arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15218. **https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.15218**

Hutson, M. (2021). Robo-writers: The rise and risks of language-generating AI. *Nature*, 591(7848), 22–25. **https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-00530-0**

Hutson, J. (2025). Human-AI collaboration in writing: A multidimensional framework for creative and intellectual authorship. *International Journal of Changes in Education.*

Li, Z., Liang, C., Peng, J., & Yin, M. (2024, May). The value, benefits, and concerns of generative AI-powered assistance in writing. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1–25). **https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3517593**

Parycek, P., Schmid, V., & Novak, A. S. (2024). Artificial intelligence (AI) and automation in administrative procedures: Potentials, limitations, and framework conditions. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 15(2), 8390–8415. **https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-023-01212-9**

Maximum rating: -

Permalink Show parent Edit Delete Reply

Initial Post

Knowledge Base

© 2025 University of Essex Online. All rights reserved.

Site Accessibility Statement
Privacy Policy