Arab World English Journal
INTERNATIONAL PEER REVIEWED JOURNAL ISSN: 2229-9327

Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on Artificial Intelligence, No. 3. 2026. Pp.88-101
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/AI3.6

AI in Literary and Non-Literary Discourse: A Systematic Review of Human and Machine Authorship, and Style and Perception

Noor Ahmed Khedr
College of Education for Women, University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq
Corresponding Author: noor.khedr1903@coeduw.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Nawal Fadhil Abbas
College of Education for Women, University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq
Email: nawal.fadhil@coeduw.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Received:10/13/2025 Accepted:12/16/2025 Published:01/24/2026

Abstract
Artificial intelligence has quickly invaded the realms of both creative and information-based writing, raising new questions about human originality, authorship and style. Despite its ability to produce writings that are coherent and stylistically varied, there are still concerns over the uniqueness and cultural neutrality of AI programs such as ChatGPT. This review covers significant recent advancements with artificial intelligence applications in both the literary and non-literary fields. It analyzes 35 recent studies contrasting authorship and creativity, or stylistic considerations and impressions, between human and AI texts. These studies range from poetic and fictional writing through essay, news article and academic publications. Six main topics emerged: Reconfiguring Authorship and Creativity in AI-Generated Literature; Disentangling Human and AI Authorship in informative and Creative Writing; Cultural Stereotyping, Stylistic Homogenization and Creative Constraints in AI-Generated Literary Content; Audience Perception, Misidentification and Heuristics in Informative Discourse; Educational Applications and Authorship Detection in AI-Generated vs. Human Texts; and Integration of AI into Special Research Fields such as Law, Criminology, Literature Reviews and Social Media. In particular, it was determined that though AI may have the ability to mirror humans on the basis of grammar, structure and at times a degree of creative literacy, it does not possess the capacity to address matters of deep emotional resonance and cultural context. However, at times humans cannot easily discern between texts written by AI and those authored by humans themselves, calling confidence and authority into question. Future studies could focus on how cultural background impacts the responses of people to AI-generated content, particularly in educational environments of colleges and universities.
Keywords: Academic writing, artificial intelligence, audience perception, authorship, bias, ChatGPT, creativity, cultural bias, human-written, literary discourse, machine creativity, stylistic analysis

How to cite: Khedr, N. A., & Abbas, N. F. (2026). AI in Literary and Non-Literary Discourse: A Systematic Review of Human and Machine Authorship, and Style and Perception. *Arab World English Journal, Special Issue on Artificial Intelligence,* (3):88-101.
https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/AI3.6

Introduction

The development, distribution and evaluation of writings in the literary, professional and educational domains are all impacted by artificial intelligence (AI), which has become ingrained in contemporary writing methods. One of the latest technologies utilized in academic courses is writing aids driven by artificial intelligence (AI). AI writing tools frequently use Natural Language Processing (NLP) that is trained on human-written material (Ginting & Barella, 2022; Nazari et al., 2021; Perkins, 2023, as cited in Aljuaid, 2024). These resources are often praised for assisting users in navigating linguistic complexity, especially in cases where English is not their first language. Scholars caution that these systems may "generate unique and logical content that can evade detection by current technologies" (Perkins, 2023, as cited in Aljuaid, 2024), raising concerns about originality and academic integrity. Beyond scholarly assistance, AI is now involved in creation itself. Large language models can be used to create essays, news articles, poems and fictional stories with increasing coherence and stylistic sophistication. The debate has expanded from whether AI can assist with writing to whether it can entirely replace, alter, or transform both literary and nonliterary discourse. Much less focus has been placed on how AI impacts creativity, narrative depth, stylistic identity, or audience perception outside of academic writing contexts, despite research in academic writing raising concerns about students' over-reliance on AI tools and the risk of weakening essential skills like analysis, argumentation and material synthesis (Schillings et al., 2023, as cited in Aljuaid, 2024; Teng & Wang, 2023, as cited in Aljuaid, 2024). Meanwhile, the emergence of AI-generated literature has raised serious questions about bias, ethics and cultural neutrality. Concerns about audience trust and the ability to discern between human and machine authorship have grown as AI-generated writing becomes more prevalent in public communication, disinformation and persuasive messages. Despite the quick growth of AI research, there is still a clear gap: To the best of the researcher's knowledge, no comprehensive review has examined the differences between AI and human writing in both literary and nonliterary genres. This gap inspired the current review. This study defines whether AI just mimics human writing or radically reconfigures originality, meaning-making and genre conventions through the combination of literary and non-literary evidence.

Literature Review

A recent study has looked into how artificial intelligence (AI) reshapes educational practice and digital communication, which provides valuable context for the current analysis. Ivanytska et al. (2024) investigate the "didactic properties of social networks and AI as information and communication technology (ICT) tools" (p. 306) in foreign language training at Ukrainian institutions using ChatGPT and Instagram as test platforms. Their SWOT analysis indicates that AI-supported tasks can "significantly enhance vocabulary retention, language proficiency and student engagement" (Ivanytska et al., 2024, p. 306) and increase students' "cognitive activity" and "creative potential" (Ivanytska et al., 2024, p. 315). However, they caution that these tools may undermine academic integrity, reinforce bias and contribute to the "democratization of plagiarism" (Ivanytska et al., 2024, p. 306), emphasizing the need for their ethical and responsible usage. Ivanytska et al. (2024) generally describe AI as a helpful learning tool rather than a self-sufficient writer. Outside of educational environments, researchers have looked into AI's broader communication role. Saheb et al. (2024) conducted a bibliometric and qualitative analysis of 1540 papers on AI–social media convergence (AISoMe) and found ten major themes. According to their findings, there are significant advantages but also significant "ethical, privacy and transparency

concerns" (Saheb et al., 2024, p. 12) and they suggest "collaborative human-AI systems that align technology capabilities with ethical standards and clinical competence" (Saheb et al., 2024, p. 12). A related systematic review by Sapuan et al. (2025) claims that artificial intelligence (AI) has evolved from a theoretical invention to a practical tool in English language teaching (ELT), requiring rigorous ethical standards while providing writing support, adaptive instruction and personalized learning. Recent studies conducted in Iraq, such as Al Qaradaghi (2025), which examines the ethical and pedagogical ramifications of students' increasing dependence on ChatGPT, have brought up similar issues. From computational linguistics, where AI has been used to model Arabic morphology (Alzyudi & Alfugara, 2024), to the health sciences (Ali et al., 2022; Mijwil & Shukur, 2022), other systematic evaluations demonstrate the integration of AI across professional and disciplinary domains. AI is also widely used in higher education for assessment, profiling and adaptive learning, as reported by Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019). By concentrating on AI as a stylistic and textual actor, the current review expands upon these contributions. It provides an overview of recent studies on cultural bias, audience perception, AI authorship and the stylistic features of AI-generated literature in both literary and nonliterary genres. By using data from poetry, fiction and essays, this analysis hopefully closes a gap in the assessment of AI-generated literature in terms of creativity, genre conventions and authorship.

Methodology

Search Method

The review attempts a thematic synthesis of the empirical and analytical research that places the literary and non-literary writing of AI up against human production, especially with regard to stylistic, narrative, perceptual and ethical implications. A comprehensive and systematic search was conducted between August and October 2025 across multiple open-access and academic platforms, including Google Scholar, ResearchGate, Academia.edu, ScienceDirect, AWEJ, SpringerLink and other digital repositories. The search terms were used in combinations or alone, such as: "AI vs human writing", "ChatGPT authorship", "machine-generated literature", "AI on literature", "AI creativity", "fiction and AI" and "AI text reception/perception". After the initial search, 100 samples were retrieved. The aim was to encompass a balanced corpus of both academic and literary treatments from diverse methodological standpoints.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion Criteria

1. Studies must be published in the English language or translated into English.
2. These are reviewed journal articles, MA/PhD theses, or edited book chapters.
3. Studies that analyze stylistic, narrative, reception, cultural, or ethical issues.
4. Equal treatment should be guaranteed on academic prose versus the literary genres (fiction, poetry, stories).

Exclusion Criteria

1. Review or conceptual/theoretical works that lack original textual analysis.
2. Technical developments in the field of AI for which language or writing output is not central.
3. Studies to which full access is denied.
4. Opinion papers or editorials that are devoid of either empirical or textual support.

Following the initial screening process, 80 studies were selected for a detailed full-text review. Papers that failed to offer analytic clarity were eliminated, distilling the list down to 50. From these, a final set of 35 core studies was selected for deep thematic analysis. This study used filtering and selection techniques akin to those used by Abbas et al. (2025), who carried out a systematic evaluation of YouTube-based EFL learning, in order to preserve methodological consistency with recent systematic reviews in linguistics.

Authenticated Sources and Traceability

For the final 35 studies, PDFs of the papers were downloaded and then sorted manually by genre (academic or literary). Most sources were obtained from verified academic databases or author-posted archives from ResearchGate and university repositories. When a journal had a restricted access, preprint version was accessed. All secondary citations, such as "as cited in," were noted and verified.

Table 1.*Multistage filtering process for study selection*

No.	Category of Reduction	Number of Articles
1	Total articles identified initially by using the search terms	100
2	Studies with general or technical AI themes were excluded if there was no text comparison included	80
3	Duplicates were removed and those considered too weak in their textual analysis were ignored	50
4	Final set of studies thematically analyzed in this review	35

Results

This section presents the key themes developed from the systematic review of 35 studies selected for the study. Six main themes emerged from various methodological approaches. Each theme will be covered in detail in the following sub-sections, along with the common themes, important problems and methodological tendencies that the researchers found in the chosen studies.

Reconfiguring Authorship and Creativity in AI-Generated Literature

Throughout these several studies, a recurring topic is the evolving notion of literary authorship in the era of AI-generated literature. Instead of replacing human writers, AI seems to affect the creative process. Essentially, it is a matter of how we have come to understand creativity, authorship and writing. The originality, fluency and adaptability of two plays, one written by a human and the other by AI, were compared in a study by Elias et al. (2024). In this study, every rating scale gave the human-written play the highest rating. However, the AI play remained remarkably inventive and it scored similarly to the human one in terms of quality. Essentially, this made a significant point: While machines are not as creative as humans currently, they are not so far away either. Here is where some more profound philosophical ideas enter the picture. Recent stylometric evidence further supports this notion. O'Sullivan (2025) proved that although AI-

generated fiction is fluent and stylistically consistent, its writing nevertheless forms tightly uniform clusters that differ considerably from the greater stylistic variation of human work. In other words, AI creativity may be growing rapidly, but it has not fully captured the diversity and distinctiveness of human artistic expression. The same line of thinking was continued by Coeckelbergh (2025) (as cited in Colella, 2025), who revisited the ideas of creation and responsibility. He claimed that authorship now takes place in a familiar realm that combines human interpretation with machine unpredictability. Colella moved much farther in 2025, when he introduced the idea of entangled agency through several collaborative projects, including I Am Code, ReRites and The Inner Life of an AI and by drawing on critical theory. In short, in the process of creating literature, human agency is intertwined with AI agency. In his work, Marche stated: "I am the creator of this work, 100 percent...but on the other hand, I didn't create the words" (as cited in Colella, 2025, p. 12). In his comments on AI-augmented writing, Danesi (2025) raised the question of machine authorship. He claimed that conventional ideas of authorship and creativity are challenged by generative AI. Deep problems about interpretation, meaning-making and the role of humans in literary composition may arise from this. Finally, van Heerden and Bas (2021) argued that if we want AI to "get" literature better, we need literary theorists. They contended that machine learning should take into account concepts such as symbolism, emotions and literary form. Therefore, it is not only about giving the machines greater training data; it is also about teaching them to understand what makes literature "literature". Thus, there are significant changes occurring here in general: creative writing is starting to emerge as a collaborative effort between humans and computers rather than a solitary act on the part of the authorial subject. As a result, more significant issues are raised regarding originality, purpose, voice and even what is considered "literary" (Colella, 2025; Danesi, 2025; van Heerden & Bas, 2021). Many strategies have been used by academics to address these issues. Van Heerden and Bas (2021) advised incorporating literary theory into AI research to improve AI's comprehension of ambiguity and emotion. On the other hand, Colella (2025) investigated how human writers use paratextual framing, editing and prompting to mediate AI-generated works and clarify the limits of meaning and authorship.

Disentangling Human and AI Authorship in Academic and Creative Writing

Many studies have examined how authorship shifts once AI creates a piece. In academic and artistic writing, the more significant question is whether machines can truly mimic or even compete with the human voice. It is also necessary to address the issue of perception vs misperception. For example, Amirjalili, Neysani and Nikbakht (2024) contrasted English literary essays authored by humans versus those created by ChatGPT. The researchers found that this kind of work seems to lack the depth, precision and reference abilities observed in human-written articles, even if ChatGPT provided some fairly relevant insights. Beguš (2024) used an experimental combination of narratology and statistics to characterize storytelling. The researcher concluded that although AI-generated stories introduce gender roles that are not stereotypical, they lack creativity and rhetorical flair after comparing 80 AI-generated stories with 250 human-written ones. They lack any human-intentional originality, but they are structurally sound. A significant advancement is the application of sentiment analysis and stylometry by Culda et al. (2025). They looked at more than 2,121 human-written and AI-generated works, such as BloomZ, Qwen and GPT-Neo. Their findings show that while AI can imitate form, it still struggles with authentic narrative depth. Additionally, Sears and Weisberg (2024) tried to ascertain if readers could tell the difference between stories that are generated by ChatGPT and those that are written by humans in a set of extensive readings. The majority of participants were unable to tell two-thirds of the stories

apart from three-quarters. However, stories that were thought to have been created by humans, even when they were not, received higher ratings. This suggests a psychological bias that affects how we evaluate quality and set expectations. All things considered, these investigations prove an important point: while AI can imitate human behavior, it cannot completely replace the human equivalent. Although they are frequently duped, readers are not always persuaded. There are still some nuances, subtleties, or emotional flares in academic and narrative domains that AI is unable to understand fully.

Cultural Stereotyping, Stylistic Homogenization and Creative Constraints in AI-Generated Literary Content

A small number of recent studies have examined the cultural and structural limitations that AI-generated poetry and literary texts face. They list a few drawbacks, including a flattened narrative and stylistic rigidity or ingrained biases. In the majority of these instances, it appears that AI-generated literature has compromised authenticity, depth and diversity in favor of more fluid grammar. Should there, then, be legitimate questions about its ever being able to emulate human creativity or even replace it? These concerns appear justified especially in some genres where the unconscious cultural import becomes explicitly expressed: fiction, poetry and narratives. In one investigation, Rettberg and Wigers (2025) reported that a total of 11,800 stories were generated from 236 countries through GPT-4o-mini. The results, to their surprise, showed that the performed task failed to produce stories of various cultural narratives; instead, the stories were so close in kind to one another. They mostly had nostalgic themes about the bliss of small-town life and a bit on communal tradition. According to the authors, such "narrative homogenisation" (Rettberg & Wigers, 2025, p.1) represents a newer breed of AI bias, one that stresses stability and nostalgia at the expense of conflict and cultural specificity. The same pattern appeared again in an experimental study by Köbis and Mossink (2020). They compared poetry created by an AI to poetry crafted by humans. Readers would occasionally mistake AI poetry for human creation when the decision relied on the better instances. However, generally speaking, they liked human poetry. There may be a subconscious detest of machine-generated poetry because even those who were not aware of the author's identity were more loyal to the human production. Sardinha (2024) approached the issue differently. Using Biber's (1988) classification, he carried out a multifaceted analysis of works authored by humans versus AI. Significant differences were found in the analysis and AI samples displayed unusual distributional patterns. Sardinha (2025) claims that some of the differences, especially the pragmatic and stylistic ones, showed that AI continues to produce immediately recognizable, sometimes restrictive language. Recent studies have broadened the topic to include social, economic, cultural and demographic biases in AI-generated narratives. Lucy and Bamman (2021) found that GPT-3 perpetuates long-standing gender stereotypes by equating male characters with intelligence and power and portraying female characters as family-focused and appearance-focused. An et al. (2025) showed that modern LLMs consistently disadvantage Black male candidates, giving them much lower scores than their equally qualified peers. This shows how AI systems can perpetuate deeply ingrained racial hierarchies rather than acting as culturally neutral evaluators. This worry was taken further by Salinas et al. (2024), who showed that GPT-4 consistently disadvantaged names associated with women and racial minorities, with Black women obtaining the worst results in a variety of scenarios. Venkit et al. (2021) discovered nationality bias in GPT-2, where stories concerning countries with lower economic position or fewer internet users received a more negative assessment even with neutral

prompts. Previous computational research by Kurita et al. (2019) found that contextual models such as BERT promote gender relationships in work circumstances. Collectively, these investigations show how algorithmic storytelling reinforces patriarchal, racial and nationalist biases under the pretense of creative neutrality, reproducing hierarchical ideologies. All things considered, these results help us comprehend the limitations of AI writing. However, since the technology is continually developing, future versions may gradually improve these features.

Audience Perception, Misidentification and Heuristics in AI-Generated Informative Discourse

The challenge of recognizing AI-generated informational content (news stories or personal statements) by human audiences has been a current topic of discussion. People seem to be susceptible to deceptive cues. This brings up additional issues around manipulation, media literacy, trust and the moral use of AI. Unlike creative writing, informative material should be factual and reliable. For this reason, misidentifying an author can have serious consequences. Jakesch et al. (2023) carried out six extensive trials with 4,600 participants. Their study sought to determine whether humans could discriminate between brief AI-generated self-presentational texts. These materials comprised descriptions of hospitality services, dating profiles and professional biographies. The findings were unambiguous: most participants were unable to identify the AI-generated texts. The secret was to rely on cues that are simple for a language model to provide, like contractions, first-person pronouns, or family allusions. The researchers describe this as generating language that appears “more human than human” (Jakesch et al., 2023, p. 1). They appropriately dubbed these linguistic clues "intuitive but wrong" and they suggested potential fixes, such as adding an "accent" to AI content to make it easier for viewers to recognize that it was created by a machine. Another study by Gilardi et al. (2024) examined how people responded to news stories that were either entirely or partially written by AI or human authors. Five hundred ninety-nine people from Switzerland volunteered for the investigation. They gave the articles ratings based on their knowledge, readability and credibility. Oddly enough, the AI and AI-assisted news received scores that were comparable to those of the human-written news. Gilardi et al. (2024) found that while AI disclosure increased participants’ immediate willingness to continue reading, it did not lead to a greater long-term interest in AI-generated news. This suggests that rejection is present on a deeper level, perhaps in the subconscious or in the mind. From a more cultural perspective, Baptista et al. (2025) examined four hundred forty-four journalism students from Portugal and Spain, comparing student responses to news produced by artificial intelligence (AI) with news written by humans. These AI pieces, however, were frequently of a greater quality, particularly when evaluated by Spanish readers. Once again, these findings contradicted the notion that experienced readers would necessarily become more skeptical of AI writing. According to Baptista et al. (2025), "students generally rated news generated by ChatGPT-3 as being of higher quality than news written by journalists" (p. 1). When the three studies are compared, a very distinct pattern becomes apparent; there is a notable gap between what consumers perceive to be human writing and what artificial intelligence is capable of producing. By doing this, it demonstrates the vulnerability of public trust when it is founded on superficial clues, framing strategies and general cultural views.

The use of generative AI technologies in education has recently become the subject of research. A group of studies posed scientific queries, such as how we may prove that students use AI to create their content. These inquiries extend beyond the technology's capabilities. Instead, the researchers discussed more general scholarly topics. For instance, the goal of Schmitz and Sonnleitner (2025) was to investigate how GPT-4 is used in Luxembourg to create reading comprehension passages for large national exams. They combined Prompt engineering and the Text Analysis Cognitive Model technique. In terms of quality, both types of texts appeared comparable. However, human writers typically produced richer narratives, while AI appeared to produce informative writings more consistently, particularly in situations with a single suggestion. Overall, the study concluded that while GPT-4 is a potential drafting partner, human interaction is necessary to maintain coherence with educational contexts, particularly in multilingual environments. Tran et al. (2024) aimed to determine if a paragraph was created by AI or by humans. The researchers used machine-learning algorithms along with other features such as verb ratios, sentence length and paragraph-length variance. A Random Forest classifier obtained 98.3% confidence. Google Gemini was used to build the AI articles using BERTopic-sourced prompts. The study's primary finding was that both AI and human texts leave their unique stylistic imprints. Durak et al. (2025) compared BingAI, Gemini and ChatGPT. It was discovered that texts created by humans had a more diversified vocabulary, longer sentences and were more complicated. AI-generated sentences, on the other hand, were noticeably more predictable. In fact, classifiers like Extra Trees and BERTurk were able to distinguish between the two with nearly 95% accuracy. This points to a larger issue, namely the increasing demand for frameworks that protect academic integrity and creativity. Additionally, Ifelebuegu et al.'s (2023) investigation of AI Chabot in education expanded the field. They categorize their findings into three groups: good, bad and ugly. They discovered that while AI fosters personalization and teamwork, it also poses moral concerns, including false information and job loss. The authors advocate for fair frameworks that prioritize human education while safeguarding AI's interests. Ajalo et al. (2025) examined the usage of AI by 564 medical students from four public universities in Uganda in yet another extensive study. More than three-quarters of those students were already employing AI tools. Their most used platform is ChatGPT. Students utilize it to complete homework, study for tests, get emotional support and have informal conversations. According to the study, teachers should reevaluate their teaching methods by assuming that their pupils are already utilizing AI. Alhamam (2025) investigated localized perspectives on the use of ChatGPT by Saudi college students learning English as a second language. The study found that there was little exposure to AI, little institutional support for the use of ChatGPT and only superficial interaction with the technology. Students appreciated ChatGPT's ease of use and vocabulary assistance. They were concerned, however, about an impending over-reliance and they did not fully trust ChatGPT's response in some cases. They also believed that using it deters them from actively learning. According to Alhamam (2025), AI tools can only be integrated into language education if appropriate access, pedagogy, AI literacy and culturally grounded instructional methodologies exist. Similarly, Al Omari et al. (2024) found that nursing students in ten Arab nations, including Iraq, had a generally favorable attitude toward AI. These studies show how rapidly AI is entering the field of education, highlighting how vital it is to have tested detection methods and careful integration. After all, it is not just about the potential AI has provided; it is also about how we can use it to benefit a new generation. Educators and policymakers must work together to develop ethical principles that encourage transparency, truthfulness and accountability. AI tool developers have a significant

amount of responsibility. They should make sure that these technologies not only produce accurate content, but also uphold ethical standards. Without these precautions, the long-term risks of overreliance or misuse may outweigh the immediate advantages. This is consistent with recent empirical research, which showed that using AI tools enhanced the quality of educational services and student engagement (Farhan et al., 2024).

Integration of AI into Special Research Fields: Law, Criminology, Literature Reviews and Social Media

The use of AI in software has expanded beyond simple query response and general writing. It is extending into specialist domains like social media analysis, literature reviews, criminology and law. Starting with the legal field, several studies illustrated how AI is changing legal writing and reasoning. According to Tu et al. (2024), practitioners have been using language models to prepare legal arguments and conduct quicker case searches. However, an over-reliance on AI could undermine creative legal thinking, highlighting the necessity of ongoing human monitoring. Otherwise, they risk losing sight of legal nuances or factual specifics. Recent Iraqi research has similarly used AI in legal and forensic applications. According to Mihna et al. (2024), machine learning models can enhance investigative effectiveness and assist in crime prediction while upholding the moral defense of citizens' rights. Similarly, Mohammed et al. (2024) demonstrated the usefulness of AI in antimicrobial resistance management by improving diagnoses and enabling more robust healthcare decision-making across entire public health systems. In the area of criminology, AI is rapidly being applied to study and predict criminal patterns (AlAbdouli et al., 2024). Moving to digital communication, Moving on to digital communication, Bai et al. (2025) showed that big language models can produce political communications that are compelling and have the power to change public opinion. According to the study, the impacts of human-generated and LLM-generated communications were "comparable in size" (Bai et al., 2025, p.6), suggesting that LLMs may already be as convincing as regular authors. Participants regarded human-generated communications as "more unique" and dependent on "more vivid story-telling" (Bai et al., 2025, p.7), however AI-generated messages seemed "more logical, better informed and less angry" (Bai et al., 2025, p.7). These results imply that, despite using different rhetorical strategies, AI-generated messages can affect audiences with an efficacy comparable to human communication. De la Torre-López et al. (2023) investigated AI's role in literature reviews. These authors surveyed 34 studies and found that AI can help in filtering texts, labeling ideas or reducing early-workload. However, human reviewers are still required to ensure methodological clarity. Even in the classroom, AI remains another hot topic. These studies painted a picture of AI from both perspectives: one of being helpful and the other of being risky. Across all these areas, it seems that AI is doing more than assisting. It is affecting the way experts research, write and communicate. Nevertheless, all evidence seems to point out that whether it is teaching law, analyzing crime, writing reviews, or moderating content, human judgment still matters. Even though the tools are getting better and better, they still do not compare to humans when it comes to deep thought or empathy.

Discussion

The collection of 35 papers illustrates the impact of artificial intelligence on the distinction between human and machine authorship. Such themes support the primary goal of this research, which is to find out if AI changes writing activities along with the concepts of authorship and

originality in literature and informative genres. Although AI technologies produce results that are coherent, fluent and stylistically mimicking, they still do not capture the richness and depth of human culture and emotions (these qualities being the main characteristics of human creativity). The assessed pieces of writing suggest that while AI's stylistic uniformity improves the superficiality of fluency, it still poses the danger of voice standardization and loss of originality in student and creative writing. The results support Coeckelbergh's (2025) concerns that AI casts doubt on the conventional notions of originality and the author's intention. The examined literature shows that AI technology is not only very significant but also quite beneficial in writing classes when it is applied, making the entire topic both pedagogical and ethical at the same time. Similar to Alhamam (2025) and Ifelebuegu et al. (2023), this review highlights the significance of institutional support and AI literacy for transparent moral engagement with generative technologies. Furthermore, the emergence of racial, gender and cultural biases in texts produced by AI (Lucy & Bamman, 2021; Salinas et al., 2024) indicates that algorithmic authorship continues to support the dominant viewpoints. This supports the broader argument that AI-driven innovation is historically constrained despite not being fully autonomous. Finally, the review demonstrates that in both literary and nonliterary genres, human creativity preserves moral and interpretive elements that AI cannot replicate. Further investigation into culturally grounded reactions to AI-generated literature and the ethical frameworks that ought to regulate its use is suggested by the interplay between human agency and algorithmic competence. When taken as a whole, these themes demonstrate AI's dual role as both an agent for linguistic creativity and a mirror reflecting human biases, cultural frames and interpretive constraints.

Conclusion

This systematic review examined how AI-generated and human-produced texts function across multiple discourse contexts, based on 35 selected studies, pertaining to informative as well as creative writing. In support of the results are six central ideas. Covering both literary and non-literary genres, the review suggested that AI performs well in reproducing the structure, fluency and coherence of a piece, sometimes missing out on interpretive angles, cultural connotations and emotional undertones, which are primarily associated with human writings. On the other hand, the perception of the reader, intertwined with perceived confidence, often relies on erroneous heuristics; therefore, this generates some difficulty in drawing a concrete line between human and machine authorship. As a result, important pedagogical concerns arise, especially as AI becomes a double-edged sword in educational contexts. AI can pose risks to academic honesty, which calls for the immediate development of frameworks for AI literacy and policy. However, in light of these significantly changing circumstances, this review promotes ethical writing practices and argues in favor of maintaining human scientific judgment and creativity. Notably, the literature studied reveals that while recent studies have explored gender and racial bias in AI-generated texts computationally or systematically, linguistic research on some concepts such as characterization and its relation to feminist issues and patriarchy is still limited. It is recommended that future research examine how characterization and gendered representations appear in texts produced by AI. Despite including references from both Western and non-Western authors equally, this review's primary shortcomings are its absence of direct cultural analysis. Future research can be channeled into understanding how people from different cultures perceive AI content and respond to it, especially in schools and universities.

Funding: This paper is not funded.

Conflict of interests: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
Artificial Intelligence Statement: The authors used Grammarly to improve the readability of the language. The author then reviewed and edited the content, taking responsibility for its integrity.

About the authors
Noor Ahmed Khedr is an MA candidate studying English Language and Linguistics at the Department of English, College of Education for Women, University of Baghdad. Her major is Linguistics. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-0447-6544

Nawal Fadhil Abbas has a PhD in English Language and Linguistics. She is teaching at the Department of English, College of Education for Women, University of Baghdad. Her research interests include but not limited to Pragmatics, Discourse Analysis, Stylistics, Corpus Linguistics and Applied Linguistics. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2608-6909

References

Abbas, N. F., Awad, Z. E., & Mohaisen, A. K. (2025). YouTube as a Learning Tool Among EFL Learners: A Systematic Review. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on CALL (11)*:96-110. https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/call11.6

Ajalo, E., Mukunya, D., Nantale, R., Kayemba, F., Pangholi, K., Babuya, J., Akuu, S. L., Namiiro, A. M., Nsubuga, Y. B., Mpagi, J. L., Musaba, M. W., Oguttu, F., Kuteesa, J., Mubuuke, A. G., Munabi, I. G., & Kiguli, S. (2025).Widespread use of ChatGPT and other artificial intelligence tools among medical students in Uganda: A cross-sectional study. *PLoS ONE, 20*(1), Article e313776. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0313776

Al Omari, O., Alshammari, M., Al Jabri, W., Al Yahyaei, A., Aljohani, K. A., Sanad, H. M., Al-Jubouri, M. B., Bashayreh, I., Fawaz, M., AlBashtawy, M., Alkhawaldeh, A., Qaddumi, J., Shalaby, S. A., Abdallah, H. M., AbuSharour, L., Al Qadire, M., & Aljezawi, M. (2024). Demographic factors, knowledge, attitude and perception and their association with nursing students' intention to use artificial intelligence (AI): A multicentre survey across 10 Arab countries. *BMC Medical Education, 24*(1), Article 1456. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-06452-5

Al Qaradaghi, A. (2025). Infallible or fallible for students' use? Interdownload and confessions with OpenAI's ChatGPT. *Alustath Journal for Human and Social Sciences, 64*(2), Article 1. DOI: 10.36473/2zaxcp93

AlAbdouli, S., Alomosh, A., BouNassif, A., & Nasir, Q. (2023). Artificial intelligence systems' importance in the analysis of crimes and their patterns. *Al-Adab Journal, 145*, 455-470. https://doi.org/10.31973/aj.v2i145.3962

Alhamam, A.A. (2025). Investigating the role of AI tool interactions in enhancing English language acquisition among Saudi college students. *Arab World English Journal, 16*(3), 426-440. https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol16no3.26

Ali, O., Abdelbaki, W., Shrestha, A., Elbasi, E., Alryalat, M. A. A., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2022). A systematic literature review of artificial intelligence in the healthcare sector: Benefits, challenges, methodologies and functionalities. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 8*(1), Article100333. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2023.100333

Aljuaid, H. (2024). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence Tools on Academic Writing Instruction in Higher Education: A Systematic Review. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)* Special Issue on ChatGPT, 26-55. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/ChatGPT.2

Alzyudi, M., & Alfugara , S. A. (2024). Modeling morphological structures with artificial intelligence: Derivatives and their meanings in the poem Burdah as an example. *Al-Adab Journal*, *150*, 275-300. https://doi.org/10.31973/kywmgr22

Amirjalili, F., Neysani, M., & Nikbakht, A. (2024). Exploring the boundaries of authorship: A comparative analysis of AI-generated text and human academic writing in English literature. *Frontiers in Education, 9,* Article 1347421.https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1347421

An, J., Huang, D., Lin, C., & Tai, M. (2025). Measuring gender and racial biases in large language models: Intersectional evidence from automated resume evaluation. *PNAS Nexus*, *4*(3). https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgaf089

Bai, H., Voelkel, J. G., Muldowney, S., Eichstaedt, J. C., & Willer, R. (2025). LLM-generated messages can persuade humans on policy issues. *Nature Communications*, *16*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-025-61345-5

Baptista, J. P., & Gradim, A. (2025). Human-made news vs AI-generated news: A comparison of Portuguese and Spanish journalism students' evaluations. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *12*(1), Article 567. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-04872-2

Beguš, N. (2024). Experimental narratives: A comparison of human crowdsourced storytelling and AI storytelling. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 11*, Article 1392. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03868-8

Biber, D. (1988). *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge University Press

Colella, S. (2025). "The language of the digital air": AI-generated literature and the performance of authorship. *Humanities, 14*(8), Article 164. https://doi.org/10.3390/h14080164

Culda, L. C., Nerişanu, R. A., Cristescu, M. P., Mara, D. A., Bâra, A., & Oprea, S. V. (2025). Comparative linguistic analysis framework of human-written vs. machine-generated text. *Connection Science*, *37*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/09540091.2025.2507183

Danesi, M. (2025). AI-generated literature: Whither literary creativity? In P. Hacker (Ed.), *Oxford intersections: AI in society*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/9780198945215.003.0120

De la Torre-López, J., Ramírez, A., & Romero, J. R. (2023). Artificial intelligence to automate the systematic review of scientific literature. *Computing, 105*(19), 2171–2194.https://doi.org/10.1007/s00607-023-01181-x

Durak, H. Y., Eğin, F., & Onan, A. (2025). A comparison of human-written versus AI-generated text in discussions at educational settings: Investigating features for ChatGPT, Gemini and BingAI. *European Journal of Education, 60*(1), Article e70014. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70014

Elias, S., Alshammari, B. S., Alfraidi, K. N., & Karam, K. M. (2025). Rethinking literary creativity in the digital age: a comparative study of human versus AI playwriting. *Humanit Soc Sci Commun 12*, Article 689. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-04999-2

Farhan, N. D., Sadiq, B. H., Zwayyer, M. H., & Arnout, B. A. (2024). The impact of using artificial intelligence techniques in improving the quality of educational services/case

study at the University of Baghdad. *Frontiers in Education*, *9*, Article 1474370. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1474370

Gilardi, F., Di Lorenzo, S., Ezzaini, J., Santa, B., Streiff, B., Zurfluh, E., & Hoes, E. (2024). Willingness to read AI-generated news is not driven by their perceived quality. *arXiv*. .https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.03500

Ifelebuegu, A., Kulume, P., & Cherukut, P. (2023). Chatbots and AI in education (AIEd) tools: The good, the bad and the ugly. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching, 6*(2). https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.2.29

Ivanytska, N., Koliasa, O., Kovalevska , T., Matsera, O., & Tkachuk, T. (2024). Analyzing the Possibilities of Implementation of AI and Social Networks in Teaching Foreign Language Students: Ukrainian Universities Case Study. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)* Special Issue on ChatGPT, 306-318. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/ChatGPT.21

Jakesch, M., Hancock, J. T., & Naaman, M. (2023). Human heuristics for AI-generated language are flawed. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *120*(11), Article 2208839120. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2208839120

Köbis, N., & Mossink, L. D. (2020). Artificial intelligence versus Maya Angelou: Experimental evidence that people cannot differentiate AI-generated from human-written poetry. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *114*, Article 106553. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106553

Kurita, K., Vyas, N., Pareek, A., Black, A. W., & Tsvetkov, Y. (2019, August). *Measuring bias in contextualized word representations.* In M. R. Costa-jussà, C. Hardmeier, W. Radford, & K. Webster (Eds.), *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Gender Bias in Natural Language Processing* (pp. 166–172). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W19-3823

Lucy, L., & Bamman, D. (2021, June). Gender and representation bias in GPT-3 generated stories. In N. Akoury, F. Brahman, S. Chaturvedi, E. Clark, M. Iyyer, & L. J. Martin (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Narrative Understanding* , 48–55. Association for Computational Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.nuse-1.5

Mihna, F. K. H., Habeeb, M. A., Khaleel, Y. L., Ali, Y. H., & Al-saeedi, L. A. E. (2024). Using Information Technology for Comprehensive Analysis and Prediction in Forensic Evidence. *Mesopotamian Journal of CyberSecurity*, *4*(1), 4-16. https://doi.org/10.58496/MJCS/2024/002

Mijwil, M. M., & Shukur, B. S. (2022). A scoping review of machine learning techniques and their utilisation in predicting heart diseases. *Ibn Al-Haitham Journal for Pure and Applied Sciences*, *35*(3), 175–189. https://doi.org/10.30526/35.3.2813

Mohammed, A. M., Mohammed, M., Oleiwi, J. K., Osman, A. F., Adam, T., Betar, B. O., Gopinath, S. C. B., & Ihmedee, F. H. (2025). Enhancing antimicrobial resistance strategies: Leveraging artificial intelligence for improved outcomes. *South African Journal of Chemical Engineering*, *51*, 272–286. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sajce.2024.12.005

O'Sullivan, J. (2025). Stylometric comparisons of human versus AI-generated creative writing. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *12*(1), Article 1708. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05986-3

Rettberg, J. W., & Wigers, H. (2025). AI-generated stories favour stability over change: Homogeneity and cultural stereotyping in narratives generated by GPT-4o-mini. *Open Research Europe, 5*, Article 202. https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.20576.1

Saheb, T., Sidaoui, M., & Schmarzo, B. (2024). Convergence of artificial intelligence with social media: A bibliometric & qualitative analysis. *Telematics and Informatics Reports, 14*, Article 100146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teler.2024.100146

Salinas, A., Haim, A., & Nyarko, J. (2024). What's in a name? Auditing large language models for race and gender bias. *arXiv.* https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.14875

Sapuan, W.N.M., Sulaiman, N. A., & Mohamad, M. (2025). The trends in the integration of AI technologies in English language teaching: Systematic literature review. *Arab World English Journal*, *16*(3):259-269. https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol16no3.15

Sardinha, T. B. (2024). AI-generated vs human-authored texts: A multidimensional comparison. *Applied Corpus Linguistics*, *4*(1), Article100083. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acorp.2023.100083

Schmit, L., & Sonnleitner, P. (2025). Evaluating AI-generated vs. Human-written reading comprehension passages: An expert SWOT analysis and comparative study for an educational large-scale assessment. *Large-Scale Assessments in Education*, *13*(1), 1-29. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-025-00255-w

Sears, S., & Weisberg, D. S. (2024, November). *Bot or not: Can people tell the difference between stories written by a human or by an AI system?* [Paper presentation]. Annual Meeting of the Psychonomic Society, San Diego, CA, United States. https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/jkh6p_v3.

Tran, V. H., Sebastian, Y., Karim, A., & Azam, S. (2024). Distinguishing human journalists from artificial storytellers through stylistic fingerprints. *Computers*, *13*(12), Article 328. https://doi.org/10.3390/computers13120328

Tu, S. S., Cyphert, A., & Perl, S. J. (2024). Artificial intelligence: Legal reasoning, legal research and legal writing. *Minnesota Journal of Law, Science & Technology*, *25*(2), 105–142. https://scholarship.law.umn.edu/mjlst/vol25/iss2/11

van Heerden, I., & Bas, A. (2021). AI as author – Bridging the gap between machine learning and literary theory. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research, 71*, 175–189. https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.1.12593

Venkit, P. N., Gautam, S., Panchanadikar, R., Huang, T.-H., & Wilson, S. (2023, May 2–6). *Nationality bias in text generation.* In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (pp. 116–122). Association for Computational Linguistics.

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic Review of Research on Artificial Intelligence Applications in Higher Education – Where Are the Educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *16*(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0