

AI-Assisted Writing, Creativity, and Professional Identity

Andrew R. Sion

Poly Prep Country Day School, 1 Poly Prep Dr, Brooklyn, New York, 11228, USA; sionandrew27@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: Artificial Intelligence (AI) is rapidly changing writing-focused industries, yet its role in fields like academia and publishing remains debated. While AI supports writing in ways that improve authorship, creativity, efficiency, and the purpose of writing itself, it also raises important ethical concerns. Although AI tools offer strong advantages, they also complicate questions about originality and responsibility. As AI becomes a quiet co-author in many tasks, the purpose of writing is shifting: with more of the writing process automated, the human role centers increasingly on insight, authenticity, and critical thinking. This paper uses a qualitative review of current literature from multiple writing industries to examine these developments. It discusses the ethical and professional issues that emerge from AI adoption and considers how these changes may develop over the next decade. Overall, the paper argues that AI is creating a long-term hybrid authorship model, one that increases productivity but can sustain trust and creativity only if supported by transparency, human accountability, and fairness safeguards.

KEYWORDS: Artificial Intelligence, Authorship Ethics, AI-Assisted Writing, Authorship and Originality, Human-AI Collaboration.

■ Introduction

Throughout history, technology has steadily made writing easier and more accessible. From the printing press to the typewriter to digital word processors, each innovation reduced the time and effort needed to produce, edit, and share written work. Artificial Intelligence (AI) represents the newest step in this progression, offering tools that not only help with grammar and formatting but can also generate complete drafts of essays, reports, and stories. Yet unlike earlier tools, this shift forces a deeper reconsideration of what writing itself means, bringing major gains in efficiency and creativity while also raising broad ethical and professional concerns.^{1,2}

This paper argues that although AI greatly increases efficiency across writing-intensive fields, it also introduces ethical issues that are both urgent and far-reaching. Two problems stand out: the gradual weakening of human authorship and the limits of AI-detection systems. AI-detection systems are software tools, such as Turnitin, Copyleaks, and Originality.ai, that attempt to identify whether a piece of writing was produced by a human or generated with an AI model. The first issue challenges ideas about originality and responsibility, while the second shows a widening gap between fast-advancing generative models and the less reliable tools meant to detect them. Studies reveal that most detectors struggle to identify AI-generated material, especially from advanced models like GPT-4, which allows unacknowledged AI-written text to pass as original.³ Together, these challenges complicate the benefits of faster writing by putting the credibility of scholarship, journalism, and publishing at risk.^{1,2}

Recent research confirms that AI tools are already entering professional writing practices. One study shows that AI chatbots are used to outline arguments, refine wording, and create early drafts in scientific communication.⁴ Although the study focuses on medical writing, it reflects a trend that extends

across many writing-centered fields.⁴ Similar uses appear in most academic and professional environments, where AI lowers the barriers to producing polished text and speeds up the drafting process.^{1,5}

However, these changes are not only technical. Khogali and Mekid further show that AI's broader automation abilities intensify concerns about authorship and originality by reducing human involvement and increasing fears of declining agency and job loss.⁶ They argue that as AI takes over tasks long associated with human writers, such as crafting narratives, organizing arguments, or refining language, the human role shifts from creator to supervisor, weakening the sense of ownership tied to authorship.⁶ As AI takes over tasks such as crafting narratives, organizing arguments, and refining language, efficiency becomes inseparable from larger questions about ownership, responsibility, and communicative power.

The stakes of this transformation are significant because AI-assisted writing forces institutions to reconsider responsibility, authenticity, and human judgment in an era when machines can generate fluent text at scale. Addressing these challenges requires documenting how AI is reshaping writing today and anticipating the ethical issues that will expand as these technologies advance. Yet current academic literature still lacks broad frameworks that connect these writing changes across different industries. This study helps fill that gap by offering a more integrated view of how AI is redefining authorship, creativity, efficiency, and the purpose of writing across sectors.

■ Methods

This study used a qualitative literature review to explore how artificial intelligence (AI) is affecting writing-focused industries, with attention to both efficiency benefits and ethical implications. All sources were found through systematic

searches on Google Scholar. Searches used multiple keyword combinations to reduce the risk of missing relevant studies, including terms such as “AI,” “Writing,” “AI writing industry,” “AI and creativity,” “AI writing and ethics,” “AI and authorship,” “AI in academia,” “artificial intelligence and writing,” “generative AI and writing,” “machine learning writing and ethics,” “AI-generated writing,” “AI detection systems,” and “AI-assisted authorship.” To broaden the search, the term “AI” was also substituted with “artificial intelligence” across relevant searches to capture studies that used the full phrase rather than the abbreviation. Boolean operators were used when necessary to refine results and ensure relevance.

The selection process centered on peer-reviewed journal articles to maintain scholarly credibility. Most of the chosen sources were published within the last four years (2021–2025) to reflect current debates and developments, although earlier foundational works were included when they offered important historical context. Sources were included if they directly addressed at least one of the paper’s central themes: AI-assisted writing, authorship and originality, AI detection, creativity, professional identity, academic writing, publishing, or writing-related ethical concerns. Sources were excluded if they focused only on technical model architecture without discussing writing practices, ethics, authorship, or professional communication. Review and survey articles were also considered when they helped situate this paper within broader debates in the field.

Each source was evaluated for credibility using several criteria:

1. Reviewing author backgrounds, including their professional affiliations, expertise in AI, ethics, or writing studies, and prior scholarly work.
2. Evaluating the journals in which the articles were published, ensuring they were reputable, peer-reviewed, and relevant to technology, communication, ethics, education, publishing, or creative studies.
3. Comparing claims across multiple sources to confirm accuracy, consistency, and the avoidance of unsupported arguments.
4. Assessing the strength and relevance of the evidence by distinguishing between empirical studies, policy reviews, theoretical arguments, and opinion-based discussions. Greater weight was given to peer-reviewed empirical studies, systematic reviews, and journal policy analyses, while opinion papers were used mainly to frame debates or identify emerging concerns.

The collected literature was coded and analyzed to identify themes that appeared across writing-related industries. Coding was conducted through repeated reading of each source and note-taking on recurring claims, findings, and concerns. Initial codes included efficiency, productivity, authorship, originality, disclosure, plagiarism, AI detection, creativity, professional agency, bias, and equity. These codes were then grouped into broader themes. Three major themes guided the analysis: (1) efficiency improvements supported by AI, (2) ethical concerns surrounding authorship and originality, and (3) broader impacts on professional identity and agency. A

fourth cross-cutting area, AI detection and disclosure, was also tracked because several sources identified detection limits and transparency policies as central to debates about trustworthy AI-assisted writing. These themes were refined through repeated review and cross-comparison to build a comprehensive understanding of the topic. The purpose of this approach was to support the broader conceptual goals of the study by connecting evidence across academia, creative writing, publishing, professional communication, and related writing-intensive fields. These themes are summarized in Table 1.

■ Key Findings from the Literature

Table 1: Key Findings From the Literature on AI-assisted writing.

Theme	Main finding	Evidence base	Why it matters
Efficiency gains	AI reduces repetitive writing labor and speeds up drafting, summarizing, organizing, and reporting tasks.	Workplace adoption studies, professional writing research, medical reporting studies, and scientific writing examples.	AI is useful when it moves writers faster toward analysis, interpretation, and revision rather than replacing judgment.
Authorship, originality, and ethics	AI complicates responsibility, originality, plagiarism, disclosure, and ownership because it can shape text without being accountable for it.	Journal policy reviews, academic authorship studies, communication research, and ethical analyses.	Human authorship remains central because responsibility and accountability cannot be transferred to AI.
AI detection and disclosure	Detection systems are inconsistent, especially with advanced models, edited AI text, different genres, and non-native English writing.	Studies on AI-detection tools, false positives/negatives, model differences, and bias against non-native English writers.	Institutions should not rely only on detection software; disclosure and human review are more reliable safeguards.
Professional identity and agency	AI shifts writers from direct creators toward supervisors, editors, curators, and ethical decision-makers.	Research on creative writing, publishing, workplace automation, and professional communication.	The central issue is not just productivity, but whether human judgment, creativity, and ownership remain meaningful.

This table summarizes the main themes found across the reviewed literature: efficiency gains, authorship and ethics, AI detection, and professional identity. Overall, the findings show that AI improves productivity, but its benefits depend on preserving human judgment, transparency, and accountability.

Efficiency gains in AI-Assisted Writing:

AI-assisted writing clearly offers significant efficiency gains, with findings across different fields showing similar patterns. In academic research, large language models like ChatGPT can automate early research tasks such as scanning scholarly papers, summarizing long articles, and generating lists of research questions. These capabilities reduce the burden of early-stage writing and research tasks, allowing human writers to move more quickly toward analysis, interpretation, and revision. As shown in Table 1, efficiency gains are one of the major patterns identified across the reviewed literature.

Workplace studies show similar trends.⁷ In a survey of 300 employees from Korean companies, Kim, Blázquez, and Oh found that many workers had already begun incorporating generative AI tools into their daily routines.⁷ About 20.7% of employees reported using generative AI at work, and nearly half of these users relied on the free version of ChatGPT as their main tool.⁷ Participants also reported high levels of perceived performance efficiency (mean = 5.60) and competitive

advantage (mean = 5.31) when using AI for tasks like drafting, summarizing, and organizing content.⁷ Experimental evidence supports these self-reported workplace benefits: Noy and Zhang found that ChatGPT reduced the average time needed to complete mid-level professional writing tasks by 40% while improving output quality by 18%.⁸

The study also found that ease of use and social encouragement were the strongest predictors of AI adoption, showing that workers are more likely to use AI when it is simple to integrate and when colleagues support its use.⁷ Together, these findings illustrate how generative AI is reshaping workplace writing practices by speeding up early stages of drafting and allowing workers to shift more quickly toward deeper revision, analysis, and decision-making.⁷ This shift matters because it shows that AI's main value is not simply faster text production, but a redistribution of human labor away from routine drafting and toward judgment-based tasks. In this sense, efficiency becomes meaningful only when it strengthens, rather than replaces, the writer's role in analysis and decision-making.

The same pattern appears in high-stakes fields, where the consequences of AI-assisted writing are not only practical but also ethical. Medical examples are especially useful because they show how efficiency gains must be evaluated alongside accuracy, responsibility, and human oversight. Medical and clinical fields provide clear examples of similar benefits. In radiology, an AI-based chest X-ray triage system reduced the average turnaround time for critical results from 11.2 days to just 2.7 days.⁹ Another study found that AI-generated draft reports lowered average reporting time by 24%, from 573 seconds to 435 seconds, with no increase in significant errors.¹⁰ These results show that AI-driven drafting and triaging can improve efficiency not only in academic or business settings but also in high-stakes medical environments.

Scientific publishing and clinical research show related advantages. AI tools are already used to generate early manuscript drafts, organize literature, suggest structural improvements, and provide proofreading support. In critical care medicine, ChatGPT has demonstrated the ability to assist at each stage of manuscript development, helping streamline the writing process while leaving final interpretation to human experts.¹¹ These examples show that AI is most useful when it reduces repetitive writing labor without replacing expert judgment.

Authorship, Originality, and AI Ethics:

Although AI offers many efficiency benefits, the literature also highlights serious ethical concerns, especially regarding large language models such as ChatGPT in academic authorship. A policy review of 300 top journals found that while about 96.6% allowed AI tools to improve writing quality, 98.9% prohibited listing AI as a co-author.¹² This rule is based on the view that AI cannot take responsibility, give consent, or ensure the integrity of published research. Instead, most journals recommend acknowledging AI contributions in the methods or acknowledgments section, while a smaller number created specific AI disclosure categories.¹ These findings show that although publishers recognize AI's usefulness, they main-

tain that originality and accountability must remain human responsibilities.

Concerns about originality extend far beyond authorship rules. Cardon *et al.* found that communication instructors worry that AI-assisted writing weakens authenticity and credibility by producing polished text that may hide shallow reasoning or recycled ideas.¹³ Instructors noted that AI-generated writing can limit creativity and critical thinking, making it harder to evaluate whether a student truly understands the material.¹³ These risks increase because AI often produces generic, surface-level writing that may contain subtle mistakes requiring human oversight.¹³ Cardon *et al.* also emphasize that users cannot always explain how AI outputs are produced, raising long-term concerns about transparency, accuracy, and unintentional plagiarism.¹³

Detection challenges worsen the situation. In a 2023 study, Walters evaluated 16 AI-detection tools using essays written by ChatGPT-3.5, GPT-4, and human students, finding that while some tools, such as Copyleaks, TurnItIn, and Originality.ai, performed reasonably well, most struggled to identify text generated by GPT-4.³ This growing gap between AI writing capabilities and detection accuracy means institutions cannot rely on detectors alone, increasing the need for human oversight and transparent disclosure.

More recent studies complicate this issue by showing that detection accuracy depends on the tool, the model being tested, and the type of writing being evaluated. Weber-Wulff *et al.* found that many detection systems were inconsistent when distinguishing between human-written and AI-generated text, especially when AI outputs were edited or paraphrased.¹⁴ Elkhatat, Elsaid, and Almeer similarly found that several detectors performed better on GPT-3.5 text than GPT-4 text, suggesting that detection tools may become less reliable as generative models improve.¹⁵ Dalalah and Dalalah add that accuracy can vary by section of an academic paper, with literature review writing more likely than abstracts to be falsely flagged as AI-generated.¹⁶ Liang *et al.* extend these concerns by showing that GPT detectors can be biased against non-native English writers, with several tools falsely classifying non-native English writing as AI-generated more often than native English writing.¹⁷ These findings show that the problem is not only that detectors are imperfect, but that their reliability changes across models, writing genres, and revision methods. This instability changes the ethical problem from one of simple enforcement to one of governance. If detection tools cannot consistently identify AI-generated writing, then institutions must focus less on catching AI use after the fact and more on building transparent norms for disclosure, review, and accountability.

Lund *et al.* expand these concerns by analyzing issues related to authorship, copyright, and plagiarism. They explain that when AI generates text, ownership becomes difficult to define, and some scholars even suggest that developers or AI models might deserve credit in certain cases.² However, because AI training datasets are massive and untraceable, outputs may unintentionally reproduce copyrighted material, creating plagiarism risks and placing legal and ethical responsibility on

human authors.² Lund *et al.* further warn that AI systems can reinforce biases found in their training data, threatening fairness and the accuracy of scientific communication.²

Because simple bans on AI authorship do not fully explain how credit should work in hybrid writing, the literature increasingly points toward more flexible frameworks. These frameworks try to separate the practical use of AI from the ethical question of who deserves credit and who remains responsible. Some scholars propose more detailed authorship frameworks. Jenkins and Lin argue that authorship should depend on two factors: continuity (how much AI-generated content remains in the final work) and creditworthiness (whether the contribution would normally deserve authorship if made by a human).¹⁸ This approach is more nuanced than universal bans, but Walters's findings still show that detection tools are unreliable, making human judgment essential.³

Responsibility for errors is another major ethical concern because AI-generated text can contain inaccuracies, bias, or unsupported claims even when it appears polished. Policies reviewed by Lund and Naheem emphasize that human authors remain fully accountable for all content in a manuscript, including AI-generated text.¹ Dergaa *et al.* also stress that AI should support, not replace, human creativity and critical judgment.¹² A final concern involves fairness: researchers with greater access to advanced AI tools may gain advantages over those with limited resources, widening global inequalities in academic publishing.^{10,19}

Together, these findings show that although AI is increasingly integrated into academic writing, originality, responsibility, and authorship continue to depend on human judgment.

AI's Impact on Professional Identity and Agency:

AI-driven writing tools influence more than writing tasks; they are also reshaping the structure of professional identity and agency. In educational and workplace contexts, many worry that reliance on automated writing reduces critical thinking and weakens the authenticity of communication.¹³ Rather than simply replacing human writers, AI shifts part of the writing process toward evaluating, revising, and managing machine-generated text. This makes professional identity a question of agency: how much control, ownership, and judgment remain with the human writer?

One major aspect of this shift involves redefining creativity. Runco describes AI-generated content as a form of "artificial creativity," writing that it may appear original but lacks the intentionality and depth found in human creativity.²⁰ From this perspective, the writer's identity becomes associated with evaluating and shaping machine-generated material rather than generating ideas independently, raising questions about reduced human agency.²⁰

AI also alters human-technology relationships in creative settings. O'Toole and Horvát argue that AI disrupts traditional notions of authorship, expression, and intention, suggesting that AI-generated work may weaken the expressive authenticity central to human creativity.²¹ They also question whether AI should be seen as genuinely creative or simply as a tool that reshapes creative practices.²¹ These changes extend across

multiple industries. Dwivedi *et al.* show that although generative AI can significantly improve productivity in sectors like banking, education, and publishing, it also disrupts established practices and introduces ethical concerns related to privacy, bias, misuse, and misinformation.²² As a result, professionals may shift from producing content to overseeing AI output, managing risks, and ensuring ethical use.²²

Publishing policies reflect similar transformations. While authorship remains defined as a human responsibility, AI is increasingly becoming a standard collaborator through disclosure requirements.² Thus, professional agency becomes less about whether one uses AI and more about how its use is acknowledged and responsibly managed.²

Across writing industries, automation produces a tension between empowerment and displacement. On one hand, professionals benefit from being freed from repetitive tasks, creating more time for higher-level thinking, creativity, and decision-making. On the other hand, as AI becomes a default tool for efficiency, human contributions may be reduced to oversight rather than creation.²³ This change represents a deeper structural realignment of professional expectations.

A broader cultural perspective adds to this analysis. The dominant "creative industries" model often views creativity as an economic resource, emphasizing productivity and output over identity and labor. AI strengthens this trend by disconnecting creativity from human agency and linking it more closely to efficiency.²⁰ The concept of "everyday creativity" offers a counterpoint by highlighting individual and accessible forms of creativity, but without focusing on equity issues, this approach can overlook the structural challenges faced by those most at risk of being affected by automation.²³

Overall, these findings show that AI's structural impacts are defined by a tension between empowerment and displacement. While AI can free writers from repetitive tasks and create more time for higher-level thinking, it can also reduce visible human contribution when professionals become primarily responsible for supervising or refining automated output. The central concern is therefore not only whether AI improves writing efficiency, but whether creative ownership, fairness, and human judgment remain meaningful as writing becomes increasingly automated. This concern links the findings section to the paper's broader implications: AI's impact on writing cannot be measured only by productivity gains, because those gains also alter how writers understand their authority, creativity, and professional value. Table 2 organizes these broader implications across academic, creative, ethical, professional, and future research contexts.

■ Implications for Writing, Authorship, and Ethics

This table shows that AI's effects extend beyond faster drafting to larger questions about originality, disclosure, fairness, and professional trust. The main implication is that AI can be useful in writing-intensive fields only if institutions create clear standards for responsible use.

Table 2: Implications for AI-Assisted Writing Across Writing Fields.

Area of implication	What the review shows	Recommended response
Academic writing	AI can support scholarly drafting and research tasks, but it can also weaken originality, obscure reasoning, and create detection problems.	Academic institutions should require transparent disclosure, human verification, and writing practices that make author reasoning visible.
Creative writing	AI can expand access and support idea generation, but it may also reduce originality and push writing toward stylistic sameness.	Creative fields should treat AI as a support tool while preserving human voice, intentionality, and cultural diversity.
Authorship and ethics	AI cannot accept responsibility, even when it contributes to wording, structure, or argument development.	Authorship standards should keep accountability with human writers and clarify when and how AI assistance must be disclosed.
Professional acceptance	AI adoption is likely to grow, but trust will depend on governance, fairness, and transparency.	Writing professions should develop clear norms for disclosure, responsible use, and equitable access to advanced tools.
Future research	Existing literature documents major changes, but more empirical research is needed across writing-intensive fields.	Future studies should use interviews, surveys, workplace observation, and experiments to examine how AI changes writing practice over time.

AI’s Impact on Academic Writing:

AI’s influence on academic literature shows both acceleration and disruption. The reviewed studies suggest that AI’s value in scholarship depends on whether it supports, rather than substitutes for, the intellectual labor of synthesis and interpretation. Large language models can speed up early research tasks, but these gains matter only if human authors remain responsible for evaluating evidence, developing arguments, and preserving scholarly credibility. Kasneci *et al.* similarly argue that large language models can support educational writing by generating summaries, outlines, feedback, and personalized learning materials, but they emphasize that effective use requires critical thinking, fact-checking, awareness of bias, and continuous human oversight.²⁴ In academic writing, efficiency is therefore not automatically a benefit; it becomes valuable when it strengthens rather than weakens human judgment. Table 2 summarizes these implications by showing how AI-assisted writing affects academic, creative, ethical, professional, and research contexts.

AI-detection tools remain unreliable. This creates a policy problem rather than only a technical problem. Some perform moderately well, but many have difficulty identifying text produced by advanced models such as GPT-4.²² Because institutions cannot rely on detection software alone, the evidence points toward stronger disclosure norms, human review, and writing practices that make the author’s reasoning visible.

Authorship norms are also under pressure. Most high-ranking journals continue to prohibit listing AI as a co-author, emphasizing that responsibility, originality, and accountability must remain human obligations.^{2,12} At the same time, many journals now require authors to disclose AI use. Together, these policies suggest an emerging model of hybrid authorship: AI may contribute to language, structure, or drafting, but responsibility remains attached to the human author.

AI is also reshaping what it means to be an academic writer. Although AI outputs may appear creative, they lack the inten-

tionality and personal insight that define human scholarship.¹⁸ Scholars may increasingly shift from designing arguments to refining and curating machine-generated text. This transition aligns with trends in other fields, where professionals move from hands-on content creation to oversight, critical evaluation, and ethical decision-making.^{21,22}

In sum, AI speeds up scholarly work but also unsettles foundational concepts such as originality, authenticity, and professional identity. The challenge for academia is not simply deciding whether to permit AI, but developing frameworks that maintain human responsibility while recognizing the evolving nature of hybrid writing.

AI’s Impact on Creative Writing:

AI’s effects on creative literature echo those in academic writing but are, in some ways, even more pronounced. AI tools can generate drafts, imitate writing styles, and suggest new narrative paths.¹ Fang *et al.*’s systematic review of AI technologies used for story writing supports this point, showing that AI has already been applied to several parts of the creative writing process, including story generation, narrative support, and writing assistance.²⁵ Gero *et al.* add that creative writers’ willingness to use AI depends not only on the tool’s technical abilities, but also on the kind of support writers want, how they perceive computer-based assistance compared with peers or mentors, and the values they attach to the writing process.²⁶ These capabilities lower entry barriers and broaden participation in creative writing, allowing people who may lack certain skills or experience to produce high-quality text. However, the data-driven nature of AI means that much of its output reflects existing stylistic patterns, which may reinforce dominant cultural norms.⁶ This risks reducing originality and contributing to a more uniform literary landscape.

AI also challenges traditional understandings of creativity. Doshi and Hauser provide experimental evidence for this tension, finding that access to generative AI ideas made short stories seem more creative, better written, and more enjoyable, especially for less creative writers.²⁷ However, they also found that AI-assisted stories became more similar to one another, suggesting that AI may improve individual creative output while reducing the collective diversity of creative work.²⁷ Historically, creativity in literature is associated with original ideas and a unique authorial voice. AI complicates this model because it can generate fluent text by recombining existing stylistic patterns at high speed. While this can expand creative possibilities, it also risks narrowing originality if creative value becomes measured mainly by productivity.

Authenticity becomes another concern. Machine-generated writing may mimic human creativity but lacks personal experience and intentional decision-making.²⁰ This blurs the distinction between authentic and artificial expression and may reduce the perceived value of a writer’s individual perspective. As a result, AI-assisted creative writing raises a difficult question: whether the author remains the originator of meaning or becomes primarily the curator of machine-generated possibilities.

Similar structural shifts appear in academic writing: creative authors may be valued less for producing original content and more for their ability to revise, select, and guide machine-generated work.²² This change raises equity concerns, as access to powerful AI tools varies across regions and communities.^{1,2,12} Unequal access may widen gaps in who can publish, succeed, or profit in literary fields.

These concerns become more significant when creative writing is placed within the larger creative economy. AI not only affects individual writers' style or originality; it also changes professional workflows, expectations of expertise, and the cultural value attached to human creativity. Recent review work supports this broader shift in creative fields. Tsao *et al.*'s scoping review of 57 papers on generative AI in creative practices and industries finds that AI is changing creative labor across visual art and design, writing and literature, performing arts, and spatial design.²⁸ The study shows that creative professionals increasingly use AI for early-stage idea generation, curation, evaluation, and workflow support, while still relying on human judgment for final creative decisions.²⁸ It also identifies tensions around authenticity, expertise, professional identity, and the risk that AI may push creative work toward cliché or cultural homogenization.²⁸ However, because Tsao *et al.*'s framework focuses mainly on creative practice, the present study extends this discussion across writing-intensive sectors by connecting creative authorship to academic writing, publishing norms, professional communication, and AI-detection challenges.

Ultimately, AI forces a redefinition of authorship in creative literature. The key question becomes whether authorship is defined by generating new ideas or by skillfully managing AI-generated possibilities. The answer will shape whether AI enriches creative practice or contributes to homogenization and the commodification of creative expression.

Ethical Impacts on Authorship and Creativity:

The ethical questions surrounding AI's role in writing are among the most debated. The central problem is that AI can shape a text without being able to accept responsibility for it. The widespread refusal to treat AI as a co-author reflects the understanding that machines cannot take responsibility or make ethical decisions.^{2,12} When AI influences argumentation, phrasing, or structure, human writers must remain responsible not only for the final wording but also for the judgment, accuracy, and originality behind that wording.

The limits of detection technologies intensify these ethical dilemmas. Tools designed to identify AI-generated text often fail to reliably detect content produced by advanced models, especially GPT-4.²² If institutions cannot consistently detect AI-generated text, then academic integrity cannot depend on software alone. The stronger ethical response is to make AI use transparent and to evaluate whether the human author has provided genuine reasoning, interpretation, and accountability. Kreps, McCain, and Brundage extend this concern beyond academic writing by showing that AI-generated news can appear highly credible to readers. In three experiments on synthetic news and foreign-policy misinformation, they found that participants were often unable to distinguish between

human-written and AI-generated text, suggesting that weak detection and low transparency can also undermine public trust in journalism and democratic communication.²⁹

Hosseini, Resnik, and Holmes support this transparency-based approach by arguing that professional and scholarly communities should focus on disclosure rather than outright prohibition.³⁰ They explain that bans on AI writing tools are difficult to enforce and may encourage hidden use, while clear disclosure helps preserve trust, accountability, and attribution.³⁰ Their proposed guidelines include identifying how AI was used, citing the tool when appropriate, and keeping responsibility with the human author because AI cannot accept moral or legal accountability for the final text.³⁰ This argument shows that the ethical challenge is not simply whether writers should use AI, but how openly and responsibly they use it. This makes transparency one of the most practical solutions to AI-assisted writing because it accepts that AI will continue to be used while still protecting the human role in authorship. Disclosure allows writers to benefit from AI's efficiency without pretending that the work was created entirely without machine assistance. At the same time, it reinforces the idea that human judgment remains central, since the writer must still evaluate, revise, and take responsibility for the final product.

The opacity of AI training data adds another challenge. Because large language models are trained on massive and untraceable datasets, they may unintentionally reproduce copyrighted material or replicate bias.² This introduces risks of unintentional plagiarism, distorted attribution, and unfair representation. Some scholars suggest that instead of relying on rigid prohibitions, authorship should be guided by the amount of AI-generated content that remains in the final work and whether such contributions would normally deserve credit if created by a human.¹⁸ This framework attempts to balance ethical responsibility with the practical realities of hybrid authorship.

Authenticity is another central ethical concern. AI-generated text may appear original, but it lacks intentionality, emotional depth, and lived experience.²⁰ This blurring between artificial and genuine creativity can undermine the integrity of scholarly and literary expression.²¹ The responsibility falls on human authors to preserve originality and ensure that their work reflects genuine thought and interpretation.

Doyal *et al.* extend this concern to medical writing by explaining that ChatGPT and other AI tools can assist with drafting, editing, and organizing manuscripts, but they also create ethical risks when outputs contain inaccuracies, fabricated references, or unsupported claims.³¹ These risks are especially significant in medical and scientific writing, where errors can affect research quality, clinical understanding, and public trust.³¹ This shows that AI-generated writing cannot be accepted solely because it appears polished. Instead, human authors must remain responsible for verifying evidence, correcting errors, and ensuring that final interpretations are accurate and ethically sound.

Finally, ethical debates must include questions of equity. Access to powerful AI tools is uneven, giving advantages to well-resourced scholars and writers while leaving others at a

disadvantage.^{12,22} Those who can use AI effectively may gain a significant edge in speed, productivity, and visibility, while under-resourced communities risk exclusion from evolving writing landscapes.² In this way, AI reshapes authorship not only through creative and technical influences but also through the redistribution of communicative power.

AI Acceptance in Writing Professions:

Acceptance of AI in writing-focused professions seems likely, but the level and manner of acceptance will depend on governance and ethical standards rather than technological capabilities alone. This means that professional acceptance should be understood as a trust problem, not only an adoption problem. Writers may use AI because it is efficient, but institutions and audiences will only accept it if its use is transparent, accountable, and fair. Adoption rates across business settings already show increasing normalization: 20.7% of employees report using generative AI at work, and nearly half rely on ChatGPT for tasks such as drafting and organizing written content.⁷ Al-Bukhrani *et al.*'s study of academic researchers supports this pattern, finding that favorable attitudes and professional norms strongly shape intentions to adopt AI writing tools when users see clear benefits.³² Khalifa and Albadawy similarly argue that AI can support academic writing and research workflows, but that responsible acceptance depends on training, ethical transparency, and preserving the balance between AI assistance and human insight.³³ However, these adoption patterns show only that AI is becoming useful, not that it will automatically be trusted. Professional acceptance will depend on clear standards for disclosure, authorship, and responsible use.

Journal policies that permit AI assistance but prohibit AI co-authorship represent one form of compromise.^{1,12} Emerging authorship frameworks that evaluate continuity and creditworthiness suggest that future practices may become more flexible while preserving essential human accountability.¹⁸ Whether these approaches can maintain public and professional trust remains uncertain. If AI use is perceived as hidden or deceptive, confidence in journalism, academia, and publishing may decline. Conversely, if transparency and oversight become standard practice, AI can be integrated without undermining the value of human authorship.

Acceptance will also depend on how writers and scholars adapt to changing expectations of professional identity. As writing becomes more about curation, oversight, and interpretation rather than direct creation, some professionals may welcome the shift toward higher-level thinking. In contrast, others may perceive it as a loss of autonomy and authenticity.^{20,22} These changes may shape whether AI is seen as empowering or diminishing.

Equity remains a major factor. Uneven access to advanced AI systems may divide literary and scholarly communities, giving some writers significant advantages. In contrast, others fall behind.^{2,12,22} Acceptance will depend on addressing these disparities and ensuring fair access to AI tools. Cultural attitudes toward creativity, responsibility, and fairness will also shape how AI is received within writing professions.

Limitations and Future Research:

This review has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting its findings. First, because the study is a qualitative literature review, it synthesizes findings from existing studies rather than collecting original empirical data. Although the review includes empirical evidence from surveys, workplace research, AI-detection evaluations, and medical reporting studies, it does not conduct its own interviews, experiments, surveys, or statistical analysis. Second, although the review draws primarily on recent peer-reviewed scholarship, the search process relied mainly on Google Scholar. This may have limited the range of sources included, especially relevant industry reports, platform policies, or studies indexed in other academic databases. Third, the paper was completed within a four-month research period, which limited the amount of literature that could be reviewed in depth. This constraint is especially important because generative AI tools, detection systems, and institutional policies are developing quickly, meaning that some conclusions about authorship, disclosure, and AI detection may shift as new models and standards emerge.

Future research should build on these limitations by using longer-term and more systematic methods. Hadi *et al.*'s comprehensive survey of large language models reinforces this need by showing that future work must address not only expanding applications of LLMs, but also their technical limitations, reliability challenges, and unresolved risks across different professional domains.³⁴ Fütterer *et al.*'s study of global reactions to ChatGPT in education further supports this point by showing that public responses to AI tools are mixed, ranging from concerns about cheating and misinformation to interest in their potential as learning partners, which suggests that future research should also examine how institutional and public attitudes shape AI adoption in writing-related contexts.³⁵ Studies could use original interviews, surveys, workplace observation, or controlled experiments to examine how writers actually experience AI-assisted writing across academic, creative, medical, and professional contexts. Future work should also compare disclosure policies across institutions and test how effective they are in practice. Finally, researchers should continue studying whether AI changes professional identity, creativity, and access differently across writing-intensive fields, especially as advanced tools become more widely available.

■ Conclusion

AI is transforming writing across academia, creative industries, and professional communication by offering major gains in efficiency while introducing serious ethical and cultural challenges. Evidence across the reviewed literature shows that although AI reduces repetitive work and helps produce polished text, it also disrupts established ideas of authorship, originality, and creativity. The most important finding is not simply that AI makes writing faster, but that it changes what human contribution means within the writing process.

These changes bring both opportunities and risks. On one hand, AI can expand access to creative expression and free

writers to focus on deeper analysis, interpretation, and innovation. On the other hand, it can weaken authenticity, increase inequality, reproduce biases found in training data, and make it harder for institutions to determine when writing is genuinely human-authored. Because these issues appear across multiple writing-intensive fields, they cannot be understood through isolated discussions of academic writing, creative writing, publishing, or professional communication alone. This study addresses that gap by connecting evidence from these areas and showing that AI is redefining authorship, creativity, efficiency, and the purpose of writing across sectors.

Looking ahead, further research is needed to document how AI-assisted writing continues to develop and to anticipate the ethical challenges that will expand as generative models become more advanced. Future studies should examine the long-term effects of AI on writer identity, professional standards, detection and disclosure practices, and unequal access to AI tools. For AI to be accepted responsibly, institutions should strengthen disclosure policies, clarify authorship guidelines, and preserve human accountability as the foundation of trust in collaborative human-AI writing. By addressing these issues together, scholars and institutions can help ensure that AI strengthens rather than replaces the human dimensions of writing.

■ References

- Dergaa, I., Chamari, K., Zmijewski, P. and Saad, H.B., 2023. From human writing to artificial intelligence generated text: Examining the prospects and potential threats of ChatGPT in academic writing. *Biology of sport*, 40(2), pp.615-622
- Lund, B.D., Wang, T., Mannuru, N.R., Nie, B., Shimray, S. and Wang, Z., 2023. ChatGPT and a new academic reality: Artificial Intelligence-written research papers and the ethics of the large language models in scholarly publishing. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 74(5), pp.570-581.
- Walters, W.H., 2023. The effectiveness of software designed to detect AI-generated writing: A comparison of 16 AI text detectors. *Open Information Science*, 7(1), p.20220158.
- Kitamura, F.C., 2023. ChatGPT is shaping the future of medical writing but still requires human judgment. *Radiology*, 307(2), p.e230171.
- Anantrasirichai, N. and Bull, D., 2022. Artificial intelligence in the creative industries: a review. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 55(1), pp.589-656.
- Khogali, H.O. and Mekid, S., 2023. The blended future of automation and AI: Examining some long-term societal and ethical impact features. *Technology in Society*, 73, p.102232.
- Kim, Y., Blazquez, V., & Oh, T. (2024). Determinants of generative AI system adoption and usage behavior in Korean companies: Applying the UTAUT model. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(11), 1035.
- Noy, S. and Zhang, W., 2023. Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. *Science*, 381(6654), pp.187-192.
- Najjar, R. (2023). Redefining radiology: a review of artificial intelligence integration in medical imaging. *Diagnostics*, 13(17), 2760.
- Shen, Y., Heacock, L., Elias, J., Hentel, K.D., Reig, B., Shih, G., and Moy, L., 2023. ChatGPT and other large language models are double-edged swords. *Radiology*, 307(2), p.e230163.
- Salvagno, M., Taccone, F.S. and Gerli, A.G., 2023. Can artificial intelligence help for scientific writing?. *Critical care*, 27(1), p.75.
- Lund, B.D. and Naheem, K.T., 2024. Can ChatGPT be an author? A study of artificial intelligence authorship policies in top academic journals. *Learned Publishing*, 37(1), pp.13-21.
- Cardon, P., Fleischmann, C., Aritz, J., Logemann, M. and Heide-wald, J., 2023. The challenges and opportunities of AI-assisted writing: Developing AI literacy for the AI age. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, 86(3), pp.257-295.
- Weber-Wulff, D., Anohina-Naumeca, A., Bjelobaba, S., Foltýnek, T., Guerrero-Dib, J., Popoola, O., Šigut, P. and Waddington, L., 2023. Testing of detection tools for AI-generated text. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19(1), pp.1-39.
- Elkhatat, A.M., Elsaid, K. and Almeer, S., 2023. Evaluating the efficacy of AI content detection tools in differentiating between human and AI-generated text. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19(1), p.17.
- Dalalah, D. and Dalalah, O.M., 2023. The false positives and false negatives of generative AI detection tools in education and academic research: The case of ChatGPT. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 21(2), p.100822.
- Liang, W., Yuksekogonul, M., Mao, Y., Wu, E. and Zou, J., 2023. GPT detectors are biased against non-native English writers. *Patterns*, 4(7).
- Jenkins, R. and Lin, P., 2023. AI-Assisted authorship: how to assign credit in synthetic scholarship. Available at SSRN: 4342909.
- Lee, H.K., 2022. Rethinking creativity: Creative industries, AI and everyday creativity. *Media, Culture & Society*, 44(3), pp.601-612.
- Runco, M.A., 2023. AI can only produce artificial creativity. *Journal of Creativity*, 33(3), p.100063.
- O'Toole, K. and Horvát, E.Á., 2024. Extending human creativity with AI. *Journal of Creativity*, 34(2), p.100080.
- Dwivedi, Yogesh K., Nir Kshetri, Laurie Hughes, Emma Louise Slade, Anand Jeyaraj, Arpan Kumar Kar, Abdullah M. Baabdullah et al. "Opinion Paper: 'So what if ChatGPT wrote it?' Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy." *International journal of information management* 71 (2023): 102642.
- Ooi, K.B., Tan, G.W.H., Al-Emran, M., Al-Sharafi, M.A., Capatina, A., Chakraborty, A., Dwivedi, Y.K., Huang, T.L., Kar, A.K., Lee, V.H., and Loh, X.M., 2025. The potential of generative artificial intelligence across disciplines: Perspectives and future directions. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 65(1), pp.76-107.
- Kasneci, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E. and Krusche, S., 2023. ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and individual differences*, 103, p.102274.
- Fang, X., Ng, D. T. K., Leung, J. K. L., & Chu, S. K. W. (2023). A systematic review of artificial intelligence technologies used for story writing. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(11), 14361-14397.
- Gero, K.I., Long, T., and Chilton, L.B., 2023, April. Social dynamics of AI support in creative writing. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems* (pp. 1-15).
- Doshi, A.R. and Hauser, O.P., 2024. Generative AI enhances individual creativity but reduces the collective diversity of novel content. *Science advances*, 10(28), p.eadn5290.
- Tsao, J., Liang, C.X., Nogues, C. and Wong, A., 2025. Perceptions and integration of generative artificial intelligence in creative practices and industries: a scoping review and conceptual model. *AI & SOCIETY*, pp.1-20.
- Kreps, S., McCain, R.M. and Brundage, M., 2022. All the news that's fit to fabricate: AI-generated text as a tool of media misinformation. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 9(1), pp.104-117.

30. Hosseini, M., Resnik, D.B. and Holmes, K., 2023. The ethics of disclosing the use of artificial intelligence tools in writing scholarly manuscripts. *Research Ethics*, 19(4), pp.449-465.
31. Doyal, A.S., Sender, D., Nanda, M. and Serrano, R.A., 2023. ChatGPT and artificial intelligence in medical writing: concerns and ethical considerations. *Cureus*, 15(8).
32. Al-Bukhrani, M.A., Alrefae, Y.M.H. and Tawfik, M., 2025. Adoption of AI writing tools among academic researchers: A Theory of Reasoned Action approach. *PloS one*, 20(1), p.e0313837.
33. Khalifa, M. and Albadawy, M., 2024. Using artificial intelligence in academic writing and research: An essential productivity tool. *Computer methods and programs in biomedicine update*, 5, p.100145.
34. Hadi, M.U., Qureshi, R., Shah, A., Irfan, M., Zafar, A., Shaikh, M.B., Akhtar, N., Wu, J., and Mirjalili, S., 2023. A survey on large language models: Applications, challenges, limitations, and practical usage. *Authorea Preprints*.
35. Fütterer, T., Fischer, C., Alekseeva, A., Chen, X., Tate, T., Warschauer, M., & Gerjets, P. (2023). ChatGPT in education: global reactions to AI innovations. *Scientific reports*, 13(1), 15310.

■ Author

Andrew R. Sion is a student at Poly Prep Country Day School in Brooklyn, New York, with academic interests in artificial intelligence, ethics, and the social impacts of emerging technologies. His work focuses on how AI is reshaping creativity, authorship, and professional identity across academic and creative fields. He is particularly interested in the ethical challenges surrounding human-AI collaboration and the future of writing in an automated age.