



Impact of artificial intelligence on creative writing: Transformations, challenges, and academic implications

Dr. Balvirchandra B. Rajurkar*

Department of English, Late Baburao Patil Arts and Science College, Hingoli, Maharashtra, India

Abstract

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI), particularly in text generation and natural language processing, has significantly influenced creative writing methodologies. AI-powered tools that help with inspiration, drougting, and style improvement are having a more and bigger impact on creative writing. It used to be assumed that creative writing was only a human endeavor that required imagination, emotional depth, and linguistic understanding. This essay examines the impact of artificial intelligence on creative writing through a comprehensive study of recent academic research. It looks at how AI changes the way people create things, affects the author's voice and uniqueness, and raises moral and teaching challenges in higher education. The research posits that while AI may enhance creativity and productivity, it simultaneously poses a threat to the standardization of expression and the complexity of authorship concepts. It accomplishes this by utilizing interdisciplinary study from literary studies, digital humanities, and educational scholarship. The article's conclusion advocates for a balanced and morally aware adoption of AI in order to retain human creativity while correctly utilizing technology innovation.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, creative writing, authorship, generative AI, literary studies

Introduction

People have always thought of creative writing as a highly human activity that comes from personal expression, imagination, and real-life experiences. Literature, poetry, and narrative fiction have long been connected to human consciousness and emotional intelligence. But the growth of artificial intelligence, especially generative language models, is starting to challenge these ideas. These models let robots write sentences that make sense, are artistically complex, and fit the context (Pescapè, 2024) ^[37].

AI writing tools are becoming more common and can be used for more than just technical or factual writing. They can also be utilized for poetry, fiction, screenwriting, and experimental literature (Begum, 2025) ^[8]. This alteration makes us question who wrote something, how creative it is, and how original it is. The integration of AI into writing tasks has intensified discourse on ethical utilization, academic integrity, and the evolving responsibilities of writers and educators in educational contexts, especially in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

The primary objective of this essay is to examine the impact of artificial intelligence on creative writing processes, with particular focus on its implications on higher education, authorial voice, and creativity. This study seeks to enhance the ongoing academic discourse in literary and interdisciplinary studies by integrating prior scholarly research and clarifying the possibilities and limitations of AI-assisted creative writing.

Conceptual Framework

1. Artificial Intelligence in Language Generation

The fundamental things that make artificial intelligence work in creative writing are natural language processing (NLP) and machine learning. Generative language models can find stylistic norms, narrative structures, and linguistic patterns since they are trained on enormous amounts of text. These systems use probabilistic text generation to provide

outputs that are often read like human writing in terms of coherence and fluency.

The capacity of AI systems to replicate creative expressions challenges traditional notions of creativity, despite their absence of mind and intent (Runco, 2023) ^[40]. Increasingly, scholars regard AI as a tool operating under human-established parameters rather than as an independent creator.

2. Theories of Creativity and Authorship

Traditional views of creativity say that originality, intentionality, and emotional engagement are important traits that set creative work apart. From this perspective, human agency and lived experience are fundamentally connected to writing (Gondek, 2021) ^[17]. Conversely, studies in computational creativity indicate that invention may emerge from algorithmic processes that reconfigure existing materials in novel manners. The convergence of diverse perspectives has led to a redefinition of authorship as a collaborative endeavor including both human writers and AI systems. This transformation makes traditional literary frameworks that rely on a single human author more difficult (Carrol, 1995) ^[10].

3. Human-AI Collaboration in Writing

Recent research increasingly depicts AI as a collaborative entity rather than a replacement for human authors. In creative writing, AI can help with drougting, style, or ideation. This collaborative model shows that AI is a useful tool instead than an independent creator by stressing the importance of human oversight, editorial control, and ethical accountability (Holzinger *et al.*, 2025) ^[21].

Review of Related Literature

In the last 10 years, literary studies, digital humanities, cognitive science, and educational research have all added to the academic discussion about artificial intelligence and

creative writing, which has developed a lot. The literature currently available extensively examines AI's role in creative processes, its impact on originality and authorial voice, its educational applications, and the ethical and philosophical dilemmas it presents (Begum, 2025) ^[8]. This section summarizes the most important findings from these thematic areas.

1. Artificial Intelligence and Creative Processes

A lot of research has been done on how AI technology affects the process of creative writing itself. Research on computational creativity indicates that AI systems mostly assist in the generative and exploratory stages of writing, encompassing ideation, plot development, and style experimentation (Ocak & Olur, 2024) ^[34]. Scholars assert that AI functions as a creative stimulant by offering novel verbal formulations and narrative opportunities that writers would not readily investigate.

According to research in the digital humanities (Zhao, 2025) ^[49], AI-assisted writing tools can make cognitive work easier by automating simple tasks like rearranging sentences and fixing grammar. This allows writers to focus more on the symbolic meaning, the flow of the story, and the depth of the themes. According to empirical studies with student writers (Chen & Gong, 2025) ^[12], AI-assisted drafting can help unskilled or second-language writers become more fluent and confident in their writing.

But the literature also makes it obvious that AI doesn't create creative intent. Instead, it works within probabilistic frames that come from text that already exists. So, instead of machines being able to act on their own, innovation in AI-assisted writing comes from how people and machines work together.

2. Impact on Originality, Voice, and Creative Diversity

A significant focus in contemporary research is the apprehension over authorial voice and originality. Literary theorists assert that creative writing is profoundly connected to individual perspective, cultural context, and emotional experience—attributes that AI systems cannot genuinely embody. Various studies indicate that AI-generated literature often mimics prevailing stylistic standards included in its training data, potentially reinforcing conventional narrative structures (Sardinha, 2024) ^[41].

Quantitative and qualitative analyses of AI-assisted writing outputs indicate a propensity for stylistic convergence, particularly when writers predominantly depend on generative tools with minimal correction. Scholars characterize this phenomenon as "creative homogenisation," wherein algorithmic predictability may diminish distinctive authorial voices (Tuvy, 2015). This has made people worry about how AI would change the variety of literature and the way people write creatively throughout time.

Some experts, on the other hand, say that AI involvement shouldn't be the only thing used to judge originality. Instead, they propose evaluating creative agency by examining how authors select, modify, and contextualise information generated by AI (Watkins & Barak-Medina, 2024) ^[44]. This perspective posits that uniqueness is maintained when human authors exercise editorial control and intentionality.

3. Artificial Intelligence in Creative Writing Education

A lot of scholars have been talking about using AI to teach creative writing. Research on education investigates the

utilisation of AI tools for draughting, feedback, and revision in undergraduate and graduate writing courses. Research indicates that AI can improve learning by presenting students with many narrative formats and providing immediate language feedback (Jegade, 2024) ^[23].

But scholars also point out the risks to teaching that come with using AI without thinking about it. Relying too much on AI-generated content could make it harder to learn basic writing skills like how to structure a tale, try out different styles, and critique your own work critically. Studies indicate that students may passively accept AI-generated outputs without supervised instruction, thereby diminishing their reflective engagement in the writing process (Berrett & Pack, 2023).

Consequently, educational frameworks have emerged that depict AI as an instrument for reflective learning rather than a generator of material. These techniques compel students to critically assess AI-generated writing, identify its deficiencies, and implement substantial improvements to their own work. Research indicates that managed integration may enhance creative originality and elevate metacognitive awareness (Efklides, 2014) ^[16].

4. Ethical, Legal, and Philosophical Perspectives

Another significant area of the literature is the ethical implications of AI and creative writing. Intellectual property, authorship attribution, and transparency in AI-assisted literary writing are topics of discussion among academics (Abdulwahhab, 2025) ^[1]. There are concerns about originality, ownership, and possible infringement when AI systems produce text based on preexisting corpora. Philosophical debates also explore whether writing produced by AI may be meaningfully regarded as creative or if creativity is still a uniquely human quality. The majority of academics concur that although AI may mimic artistic forms, it lacks moral responsibility, consciousness, and intentionality. Therefore, human authors who use AI techniques must be held ethically accountable.

Researchers support clear disclosure of AI use in scholarly and creative writing in academic settings. Many people believe that maintaining trust in the literary and educational communities and upholding academic integrity depend on transparency.

5. Synthesis of the Literature

When considered collectively, current research offers a complex picture of AI's function in creative writing. AI presents issues with originality, authorship, and ethical responsibility even as it provides quantifiable advantages in terms of efficiency, accessibility, and creative stimulation. The literature continuously highlights the significance of pedagogical control, human agency, and critical engagement in AI-assisted writing processes (Kershen & Johnson, 2025) ^[25].

This synthesis emphasizes the necessity for well-rounded strategies that acknowledge AI as a potent but constrained tool—one that, when used carefully, can improve creative writing but, when used carelessly, can limit it.

Methodology

This study investigates how artificial intelligence affects creative writing using a qualitative systematic literature review methodology. A literature-based method is suitable for combining current empirical findings, theoretical

discussions, and pedagogical analyses without introducing speculative or manipulated data because of the topic's conceptual and multidisciplinary nature (Hägg & Gabrielsson, 2020) ^[20].

1. Research Design

Based on the principles of a systematic literature review, the study employs a qualitative, descriptive, and analytical design. The study critically examines previous research to find trends, convergences, and discussions on AI and creative writing rather than producing original empirical data (Yang & Kyun, 2022) ^[47]. This design is frequently employed in transdisciplinary and humanities research where the goals are to analyze academic discourse, evaluate theoretical advancements, and consolidate knowledge.

Examining how academics perceive creativity, authorship, and human–AI interaction from literary, pedagogical, and technological viewpoints is made possible by the qualitative approach's interpretive depth.

2. Data Sources

Academic sources were gathered from reputable scholarly databases and archives that are frequently utilized in research in the social sciences and humanities (Prins *et al.*, 2016) ^[39]. Peer-reviewed journals, edited scholarly books, and conference proceedings with an emphasis on

- Literary studies and creative writing
- Media studies and digital humanities
- Natural language processing and artificial intelligence;
- Writing instruction and higher education (Wessels, 2025) ^[45]

To guarantee legitimacy, dependability, and scientific rigor, publications from respectable academic publishers and indexed journals were given priority.

3. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

During the source selection process, precise inclusion and exclusion criteria were used to preserve academic legitimacy and relevance (Gusenbauer & Haddaway, 2020) ^[19].

Inclusion criteria

- Scholarly reviews, academic books, and peer-reviewed journal articles;
- Direct attention to writing, creativity, artificial intelligence, or authorship
- Research on academic, literary, or creative writing situations
- Publications mostly from the previous ten years, with a focus on current advancements

Exclusion criteria

- Opinion pieces, non-academic blogs, and media commentary;
- Sources that lack methodological transparency;
- Research unrelated to writing or creativity; and
- Speculative or unverifiable statements devoid of scholarly proof

This filtering process ensured that the study relies solely on authentic and academically sound literature.

4. Data Analysis Procedure

Thematic synthesis was used to analyze the chosen literature. Key claims, conclusions, and conceptual

frameworks pertaining to AI and creative writing were identified by examining each source. Thematic categories were created by coding and organizing recurring themes, including creative enhancement, originality, instructional influence, and ethical problems (Williams, M., & Moser, 2019) ^[46].

After that, a comparative analysis was carried out to look at both areas of scholarly agreement and disagreement. This method allowed for the recognition of prevailing patterns while maintaining the variety of scholarly viewpoints.

5. Reliability and Validity

For each theme category, a variety of sources were examined to increase trustworthiness and lessen reliance on individual research or points of view. Peer-reviewed and extensively quoted academic papers were included to increase validity and guarantee that results are based on accepted research (Lavery *et al.*, 2020) ^[27].

The study does not incorporate speculative scenarios or unsupported generalizations, nor does it extrapolate beyond the facts found in the evaluated literature. Interpretations continue to be in good agreement with published academic research.

6. Ethical Considerations

There was no need for direct ethical approval because this study is only based on secondary data. However, by faithfully conveying the views of the original writers, avoiding misunderstandings, and giving due credit in compliance with APA citing guidelines, ethical academic practice was upheld. By critically analyzing AI's function in creative writing without encouraging blind adoption or misrepresenting its capabilities, the study also complies with ethical norms around AI (Carobene *et al.*, 2024) ^[9].

Analysis and Discussion

This section synthesizes information from literary studies, digital humanities, and educational research to critically assess current scholarly results on artificial intelligence and creative writing. The conversation is on how AI changes instructional techniques, impacts authorial expression, transforms creative processes, and raises ethical issues. The analysis focuses on human–AI interaction and its consequences for literary creativity rather than treating AI as an independent creative entity (Grassini, 2023) ^[18].

1. Artificial Intelligence as an Enabling Tool in Creative Writing

Artificial intelligence is identified in a significant amount of literature as a tool that facilitates creative writing. According to academics, AI systems can help writers by providing style variants, producing prompts, and suggesting narrative continuations. These features are especially helpful in the early phases of writing, when structure planning and idea generation take place (AlAfnan & MohdZuki, 2023) ^[2]. AI-supported drafting can improve writing fluency and lessen cognitive obstacles like writer's block, according to studies done in academic writing contexts. AI makes it possible for writers to more effectively explore a variety of narrative possibilities by offering various linguistic formulations. Crucially, the literature emphasizes that when AI is employed as an additional resource rather than as the primary author, these advantages become most evident (Davenport, 2018) ^[13].

Researchers constantly stress, meanwhile, that AI does not produce creative intent. Its contributions are still limited by statistical trends found in the available textual data (Anantrasirichai & Bull, 2022) ^[6]. As a result, human selection, interpretation, and editing of AI-generated content is how originality in AI-assisted writing is created.

2. Constraints on Creative Expression and Individual Voice

Artificial intelligence has the potential to facilitate creativity, but it also has significant limitations. According to several studies AI-generated texts frequently display stylistic predictability, reflecting prevailing literary standards ingrained within training data (Amirjalili *et al.*, 2023). This predictability can lead to the erosion of individual voice when writers largely rely on AI outputs without significant intervention.

Literary academics contend that subjectivity, cultural specificity, and emotional depth—elements that AI systems are unable to truly experience—are the main sources of creative writing's value. Therefore, relying too much on AI runs the risk of creating narratives that are technically sound but emotionally shallow or culturally stereotyped (Begum, 2025) ^[8].

However, research indicates that using AI does not always result in a loss of uniqueness. Writers maintain creative agency when they actively edit, contextualize, and undermine work produced by AI. Therefore, the limitation is not in the technology per se, but rather in the way it is used during the writing process.

3. Pedagogical Implications in Higher Education

Both hope and apprehension have been raised by the application of AI in creative writing instruction. AI has the ability to help student writers by providing instant feedback, language modeling, and exposure to a variety of story formats, according to educational studies (Alqahtani *et al.*, 2023) ^[4]. AI technologies can act as scaffolding mechanisms that promote experimentation for undergraduate students, particularly those with low writing confidence.

Scholars caution that an over-reliance on AI could jeopardize the development of critical writing abilities. Students who rely on AI-generated content without reflective interaction run the risk of having their critical thinking, narrative coherence, and stylistic decision-making skills compromised (Obaje, 2025) ^[33]. At the postgraduate level, where originality and intellectual voice are crucial, this issue is especially important.

The literature promotes pedagogical methods that use AI into organized, reflective learning contexts in order to solve these issues. These models prioritize transparent recognition of AI assistance, required revision procedures, and critical assessment of AI results. According to research, AI can improve learning results without sacrificing creative autonomy when used wisely.

4. Ethical Implications and Authorship Responsibility

Scholarly debates on AI-assisted creative writing are heavily influenced by ethical issues. Authorship attribution is one of the most important topics. Because AI systems produce language using pre-existing data, concerns about creative responsibility and intellectual property are raised.

The majority of academics concur that because AI lacks awareness, intentionality, and moral culpability, it cannot be

regarded as an author in the conventional sense. Therefore, the human writer must continue to bear the ethical responsibility for their creative output. This viewpoint emphasizes how crucial transparency is, especially in settings related to academic and literary publishing (McNutt *et al.*, 2018) ^[32].

The possibility of deception is another ethical issue. Academic integrity and reader confidence are called into doubt when AI-generated content is presented as entirely human-authored without disclosure. Clear criteria that mandate disclosure of AI involvement while maintaining the validity of human innovation are becoming more and more necessary, according to the research.

5. Human–AI Collaboration as a Creative Model

The idea of human-AI collaboration as a new creative paradigm has emerged in recent studies. Researchers contend that AI can serve as a dialogic partner that encourages introspection and invention rather of portraying it as a danger to creativity (Poletti, 2024) ^[38].

This collaborative methodology divides creation between machine-generated options and human assessment. While AI adds speed, variation, and linguistic experimentation, writers maintain control over thematic direction, emotional resonance, and ethical accountability. This strategy is consistent with more general notions of augmented creativity, which place more emphasis on enhancing than replacing human creative abilities.

6. Synthesis of Analytical Findings

Overall, the data shows that creative writing is impacted by artificial intelligence in a complicated and context-dependent way. AI tools have the potential to increase creativity and productivity, but they also present hazards in terms of originality, voice, and ethical transparency. The literature constantly emphasizes that the frameworks—pedagogical, ethical, and creative—in which technology is deployed have a greater impact on outcomes than the technology itself (Jefferies *et al.*, 2007 and Matar, 2025) ^[22, 31].

The idea that artificial intelligence should be viewed as a potent but constrained instrument whose usefulness in creative writing depends on responsible human participation is supported by this synthesis.

Implications of the Study

The study's conclusions have significant ramifications for academic institutions, instructors, creative writers, and future literary and interdisciplinary studies research. This section presents theoretical, pedagogical, and practical implications that are directly drawn from previous research by elucidating the ways in which artificial intelligence interacts with creative writing activities.

1. Implications for Creative Writers

The increasing prevalence of artificial intelligence requires creative authors to reevaluate their writing techniques and creative responsibilities. According to the literature, AI can be effectively used as a support mechanism for linguistic improvement, structural experimentation, and idea production (Chandrasekera *et al.*, 2025) ^[11]. When utilized intentionally, AI tools can broaden a writer's creative horizons by presenting different storylines and stylistic options.

But the study also emphasizes how crucial it is to preserve authorial control. AI-generated content requires writers to interact critically with it, viewing it as raw material rather than a final creative product. To maintain uniqueness and voice, active revision, contextual adaptability, and stylistic personalization are crucial. It is implied that rather than requiring less creative work, creative writing in the AI era requires writers to be more self-aware and use editorial judgment.

2. Implications for Creative Writing Pedagogy

The results have important pedagogical ramifications in educational settings, especially at the undergraduate and graduate levels. According to the studied research, outright banning AI tools could not be useful or beneficial from an educational standpoint (Kishore *et al.*, 2023) ^[26]. Rather, educators are urged to use teaching strategies that use AI while adhering to well-defined academic and ethical guidelines.

Curricula for creative writing may need to change to incorporate topics like authorship ethics, AI literacy, and critical analysis of work produced by machines. While accepting technological realities, assignments that ask students to critically edit AI-assisted drafts, justify creative choices, or record their writing process can support creative autonomy. This strategy supports the more general educational objectives of encouraging inventiveness, critical thinking, and reflective practice.

3. Implications for Academic Institutions and Policy Development

The study emphasizes the need for explicit and uniform policies at the institutional level concerning the usage of AI in academic and creative writing. The subtleties of AI-assisted authorship are frequently ignored by current academic integrity standards, especially in artistic fields where inspiration and teamwork are already difficult ideas (Pellerin, M., & Ogandaga, 2024) ^[36].

Guidelines that differentiate between acceptable AI-assisted support and unethical authorship substitution may need to be developed by universities and publishing organizations. The expanding use of AI in writing processes should be reflected in improved transparency rules, disclosure regulations, and assessment criteria. These regulations can encourage responsible innovation while preserving academic legitimacy.

4. Implications for Literary Studies and Digital Humanities

From a disciplinary standpoint, the work adds to current discussions on the nature of authorship and creativity in literary studies and digital humanities. The incorporation of AI calls into question existing critical frameworks and traditional human-centered paradigms of literary production (Le Dinh *et al.*, 2025) ^[28].

In order to account for hybrid creative processes involving both human and computational entities, scholars may need to broaden their analytical frameworks. This change places human innovation inside a technology mediated cultural environment rather than diminishing its significance. As a result, in addition to textual analysis, literary criticism may increasingly address issues of collaboration, method, and technological influence.

5. Implications for Ethical Practice

The study upholds the ethical precept that human writers must continue to bear responsibility for their creative works. Transparency in the use of AI is constantly emphasized in the literature, especially in scholarly and professional publishing. Trust between authors, readers, instructors, and institutions could be damaged if AI help is not disclosed (Onuoha, 2025) ^[35].

The results also imply that continuous discussion, rather than rigid regulations, is necessary for ethical involvement with AI. Ethical frameworks must be flexible as AI technologies advance while upholding fundamental principles like creativity, responsibility, and intellectual integrity.

6. Implications for Future Research

Lastly, the study suggests a number of avenues for further investigation. There are still gaps in longitudinal studies looking at how long-term AI use affects creative development, despite the fact that current research offers insightful information (Leite, 2025) ^[29]. Comparative research in disciplinary, linguistic, and cultural contexts may shed further light on how AI is changing creative expression around the world.

Furthermore, current theoretical and review-based studies should be enhanced by empirical research including writers' actual experiences with AI technologies. This kind of study would improve knowledge of how authors actually manage creativity, control, and teamwork (Zhang & Zou, 2023) ^[48].

Limitations of the Study

Although this study offers a thorough summary of the body of knowledge regarding artificial intelligence and creative writing, a number of limitations need to be noted. Accurately interpreting the results and placing the study within the larger academic debate depend on an understanding of these limitations.

1. Reliance on Secondary Sources

This study's main drawback is that it only uses secondary data. The study does not produce unique empirical data through surveys, interviews, or experiments because it is a systematic literature review (Zhu *et al.*, 2018) ^[50]. As a result, the analysis depends on the quality, extent, and methodological rigor of the reviewed existing studies. The synthesis may be impacted by differences in research design and analytical depth among studies, even if care was taken to use only peer-reviewed and credible academic sources.

2. Disciplinary and Methodological Diversity

There are advantages and disadvantages to the interdisciplinary nature of AI and creative writing research. Each of the evaluated fields—literary studies, education, digital humanities, and computer science—has its own methodological presumptions and analytical frameworks (Dobson, 2019) ^[15]. Although this diversity enhances the conversation, it also makes it more difficult to compare results directly. The degree to which conclusions can be consistently generalized may be restricted by variations in terminology, study goals, and evaluation standards.

3. Rapid Technological Development

Technologies related to artificial intelligence are developing at a rate that frequently surpasses the cycles of academic

publication. As a result, it's possible that some of the models and tools included in the examined literature are already undergoing substantial replacement or modification. Because of this temporal restriction, certain results might represent transitory phases of AI progress rather than long-term results. Therefore, the importance of particular observations may change over time due to ongoing technical advancements (Lund *et al.*, 2023) ^[30].

4. Limited Longitudinal Evidence

The majority of current research on AI and creative writing, especially in educational contexts, concentrates on short-term application or instant results. Longitudinal research investigating the long-term effects of consistent use of AI tools on creative development, originality, and authorial identity are conspicuously lacking (Disu, 2025) ^[14]. This restriction limits the capacity to make inferences regarding long-term pedagogical and creative effects.

5. Contextual and Cultural Constraints

Most of the scholarly literature that is currently accessible comes from particular educational and cultural contexts, frequently found in Western academic institutions (Alemu, 2018) ^[3]. Perspectives from various literary, cultural, and linguistic traditions may thus be underrepresented. This restriction implies that the results might not accurately reflect the ways in which AI affects creative writing processes in multilingual or non-Western cultures.

6. Scope of Creative Writing Genres

The variety of creative writing styles covered in the literature is another drawback. Poetry, experimental literature, and non-linear narrative genres receive relatively less attention than prose writing or academic-creative hybrids, which are the main subjects of many studies. The findings' application to all kinds of creative writing is limited by this inconsistent coverage (Kathleen, 2020) ^[24].

7. Interpretive Nature of Qualitative Synthesis

Lastly, interpretive judgment is a part of the qualitative synthesis used in this study. The order and emphasis of topics reflect the researcher's analytical choices, even if thematic analysis was carried out methodically. Despite the fact that these interpretations are supported by academic data, different readings of the same literature may provide different findings or emphasis (Walsh & Renaud, 2017) ^[43].

Conclusion

By presenting fresh opportunities and difficulties, artificial intelligence is expanding the parameters of creative writing. AI tools present important questions regarding originality, authorship, and ethical responsibility even though they can foster creativity and increase productivity. This article makes the case that careful, open, and critically informed cooperation between human writers and intelligent technologies—rather than the replacement of human creativity—is the key to the future of creative writing.

Acknowledgement

Author expresses sincere gratitude to Dr. Pankaj Singh, L. B. Patil College, Hingoli for insightful discussions on AI technologies and for technical support during this investigation.

Reference

1. Abdulwahhab Ismail I. Artificial Intelligence and the Development of Academic Authorship: Analyzing AI-Generated Content, Ethical Issues, and Intellectual Property Challenges. *Ethical Issues, and Intellectual Property Challenges*, 2025.
2. AlAfnan MA, MohdZuki SF. Do artificial intelligence chatbots have a writing style? An investigation into the stylistic features of ChatGPT-4. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Technology*, 2023;3(3):85-94.
3. Alemu SK. Meaning, idea and history of university/higher education: Brief literature review, 2018.
4. Alqahtani T, Badreldin HA, Alrashed M, Alshaya AI, Alghamdi SS, Bin Saleh K, *et al.* The emergent role of artificial intelligence, natural learning processing, and large language models in higher education and research. *Research in social and administrative pharmacy*, 2023;19(8):1236-1242.
5. Amirjalili F, Neysani M, Nikbakht A. Exploring the boundaries of authorship: A comparative analysis of AI-generated text and human academic writing in English literature. In *Frontiers in Education*. Frontiers Media SA, 2024;9:1347421.
6. Anantrasirichai N, Bull D. Artificial intelligence in the creative industries: a review. *Artificial intelligence review*, 2022;55(1):589-656.
7. Barrett A, Pack A. Not quite eye to AI: Student and teacher perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence in the writing process. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 2023;20(1):59.
8. Begum S. AI and Literature: The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Creative Writing and Narrative Forms. *Journal of Social Signs Review*, 2025;3(06):180-199.
9. Carobene A, Padoan A, Cabitza F, Banfi G, Plebani M. Rising adoption of artificial intelligence in scientific publishing: evaluating the role, risks, and ethical implications in paper drafting and review process. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (CCLM)*, 2024;62(5):835-843.
10. Carroll J. Evolution and literary theory. *Human Nature*, 1995;6(2):119-134.
11. Chandrasekera T, Hosseini Z, Perera U. Can artificial intelligence support creativity in early design processes? *International journal of architectural computing*, 2025;23(1):122-136.
12. Chen C, Gong Y. The role of AI-assisted learning in academic writing: A mixed-methods study on Chinese as a second language students. *Education Sciences*, 2025;15(2):141.
13. Davenport TH. *The AI advantage: How to put the artificial intelligence revolution to work*. mit Press, 2018.
14. Disu L. *Becoming With AI: Identity and Meaning-Making Among Graduate Students in Creative Disciplines*, 2025.
15. Dobson JE. *Critical digital humanities: the search for a methodology*. University of Illinois Press, 2019.
16. Efklides A. How does metacognition contribute to the regulation of learning? An integrative approach. *Psihologijske teme*, 2014;23(1):1-30.

17. Gondek P. Creativity and intentionality: A philosophical attempt at reconstructing a creative process. *Creativity Studies*,2021:14(2):419-429.
18. Grassini S. Shaping the future of education: Exploring the potential and consequences of AI and ChatGPT in educational settings. *Education sciences*,2023:13(7):692.
19. Gusenbauer M, Haddaway NR. Which academic search systems are suitable for systematic reviews or meta-analyses? Evaluating retrieval qualities of Google Scholar, PubMed, and 26 other resources. *Research synthesis methods*,2020:11(2):181-217.
20. Hägg G, Gabriellson J. A systematic literature review of the evolution of pedagogy in entrepreneurial education research. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*,2020:26(5):829-861.
21. Holzinger A, Zatloukal K, Müller H. Is human oversight to AI systems still possible? *New Biotechnology*,2025:85:59-62.
22. Jefferies P, Carsten-Stahl B, McRobb S. Exploring the relationships between pedagogy, ethics and technology: Building a framework for strategy development. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*,2007:16(1):111-126.
23. Jegede OO. Artificial intelligence and English language learning: Exploring the roles of AI-driven tools in personalizing learning and providing instant feedback. *Universal Library of Languages and Literatures*, 2024, 1(2).
24. Kathleen H. *The Life and Times of Plastic Chairs: A qualitative research inquiry into the active interplay of design poetry with users, designers and the objects of design* (Doctoral dissertation, Arts University Bournemouth), 2020.
25. Kershen JL, Johnson B. Becoming a teacher of writing in an AI-assisted world: Considering personal epistemologies, writing theories, and the use of AI platform technologies. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*,2025:25(1):32-58.
26. Kishore S, Hong Y, Nguyen A, Qutab S. Should ChatGPT be banned at schools? Organizing visions for generative artificial intelligence (AI) in education. *Rising like a Phoenix: Emerging from the Pandemic and Reshaping Human Endeavors with Digital Technologies*, 2023.
27. Lavery MR, Bostic JD, Kruse L, Krupa EE, Carney MB. Argumentation surrounding argument-based validation: A systematic review of validation methodology in peer-reviewed articles. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*,2020:39(4):116-130.
28. Le Dinh T, Le TD, Uwizeyemungu S, Pelletier C. Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: A Framework for Systematic Literature Reviews. *Information*,2025:16(3):240.
29. Leite H. Artificial intelligence in higher education: Research notes from a longitudinal study. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*,2025:215:124115.
30. Lund BD, Wang T, Mannuru NR, Nie B, Shimray S, Wang Z, *et al.* 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*,2023:74(5):570-581.
31. Matar S. The Development of Educational Technology and Artificial Intelligence and Their Impact on the Future of Education: Opportunities and Risks. *Journal of Posthumanism*,2025:5(7):1271-1292.
32. McNutt MK, Bradford M, Drazen JM, Hanson B, Howard B, Jamieson KH, *et al.* Transparency in authors' contributions and responsibilities to promote integrity in scientific publication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,2018:115(11):2557-2560.
33. Obaje TA. Advancing Critical Thinking in Higher Education: The Transformative Role of Artificial Intelligence, 2025.
34. Ocak G, Olur B. Creative Writing and Storytelling: Investigating How Generative Artificial Intelligence Technologies Can Aid in the Creative Writing Process, Encouraging Students to Develop their Storytelling Abilities. *Generative Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: A Handbook for Educational Leaders*, 2024, 95.
35. Onuoha CE. Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on the Quality, Efficiency, and Transparency of the Scholarly Publishing Process, 2025.
36. Pellerin M, Ogandaga M. Rethinking Academic Integrity and Plagiarism for a New AI Era, 2024.
37. Pescapè A. Exploring the current state and future potential of generative artificial intelligence using a generative artificial intelligence. In *Mind, Body, and Digital Brains*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024, 37-56.
38. Poletti G. AI: Learning with the paradigm of dialogue. In *ICERI2024 Proceedings*. IATED, 2024, 4964-4973.
39. Prins AA, Costas R, van Leeuwen TN, Wouters PF. Using Google Scholar in research evaluation of humanities and social science programs: A comparison with Web of Science data. *Research Evaluation*,2016:25(3):264-270.
40. Runco MA. AI can only produce artificial creativity. *Journal of Creativity*,2023:33(3):100063.
41. Sardinha TB. AI-generated vs human-authored texts: A multidimensional comparison. *Applied Corpus Linguistics*,2024:4(1):100083.
42. Turvy A. *Platformed Cultural Production: Constraints and Creativity in Memetic Practices on TikTok and Instagram* (Doctoral dissertation, Tulane University), 2015.
43. Walsh I, Renaud A. Reviewing the literature in the IS field: Two bibliometric techniques to guide readings and help the interpretation of the literature. *Systèmes d'information & management*,2017:22(3):75-115.
44. Watkins R, Barak-Medina E. AI's Influence on Human Creative Agency. *Creativity Research Journal*, 2024, 1-13.
45. Wessels B. Developing an AI framework for learning in higher education: a humanities perspective from English Literature. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*,2025:22(1):65.
46. Williams M, Moser T. The art of coding and thematic exploration in qualitative research. *International management review*,2019:15(1):45-55.
47. Yang H, Kyun S. The current research trend of artificial intelligence in language learning: A systematic

- empirical literature review from an activity theory perspective. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*,2022:38(5):180-210.
48. Zhang R, Zou D. A review of research on technology-enhanced peer feedback for second language writing based on the activity theory framework. *Education and Information Technologies*,2023:28(6):6727-6753.
 49. Zhao D. The impact of AI-enhanced natural language processing tools on writing proficiency: An analysis of language precision, content summarization, and creative writing facilitation. *Education and Information Technologies*,2025:30(6):8055-8086.
 50. Zhu M, Sari A, Lee MM. A systematic review of research methods and topics of the empirical MOOC literature (2014–2016). *The Internet and Higher Education*,2018:37:31-39.