UNIVLORA SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL

Munir, S., et al , DOI: 10.63871/unvl.jsuv2.1.28
UniVlora Scientific Journal 2026, no.II, volume I

Review

From Tool to Co-Author: A Review of Artificial Intelligence and Human Expression

Shanza Munir[1], Zunaira Munir[2], Ghadah Al Murshidi[3]

[1]Government Graduate College, Pakistan.
[2]Government College Women University Faisalabad (GCWUF), Pakistan.
[3]United Arab Emirates University (UAEU), United Arab Emirates.

Corresponding author: s.munir.0120@gmail.com

Article Type: Review Article
Received: March 2026 | Accepted: May 2026 | Published: June 2026

Abstract

The growing combination of generative AI systems in creative and communicative processes has challenged the traditional lines between human and machine voices. This review paper examines how AI-based NLP (natural language processing) and text generation technologies are changing authorship, creativity and linguistic identity. The study focuses on three major research questions: (1) How do current AI tools reshape human linguistic and artistic expression? (2) What ethical and epistemological challenges emerge from AI-assisted creativity? (3) In what ways do human–machine collaborations redefine concepts of authorship and authenticity?. This paper uses a systematic literature review approach, combining findings from recent researchers in linguistics, digital humanities and media studies. The review of these studies showed three major trends: the increasing acceptance of AI as a creative partner rather than a tool; growing ethical concerns over authorship, bias, and intellectual ownership; and the emergence of hybrid genres combining human and algorithmic voices. The paper concludes that AI-generated words need a redefinition of creativity as a distributed and co-constructed process, where agency and authorship are negotiated across humans and machine boundaries. The implications for the paper include the need for updated ethical guidelines that should clarify authorship, responsibility, and transparency in AI-assisted creativity. It also put an emphasis on the importance of AI literacy across disciplines, as human-machine collaboration is re-defining creativity into a shared and distributed process.

Review

Keywords: *Generative AI, Natural Language Processing, Authorship, Linguistic Identity, Human–Machine Collaboration, Digital Humanities.*

Introduction

The advancements in the field of Artificial Intelligence have introduced the innovative ways in which language is produced, interpreted and circulated. Recent developments in NLP (Natural Language Processing), specifically large language models, capable of generating sleek and smooth contextual appropriate and diverse linguistic tests have expanded the role of AI. These roles are developing beyond computational assistance into areas and domains that were at one time regarded as pure humanistic like creative writing, artistic expression and communication. (Floridi and Chiriatti, 2020; Holzner et al., 2025). Consequently, AI systems are not just supporting human expressions but are participating increasingly in meaning making.

Previously, writing tools and communication were seen as extensions of human intention that provided expressions without challenging the notion of human authorship. AI generative systems are trained on a large scale of textual data that shows a qualitative shift rather than simplifying the linguistic production. These AI systems are generating content, imitating literary styles and are combining linguistic patterns. (Bender et al., 2021). It is often argued by the scholars that this shift marks a transition from AI as a neutral instrument to AI as a creative collaborator, that prompts the reassessment of how agency and intention are distributed within the creative processes (Shneiderman, 2020; Linares-Pellicer et al., 2025).

These given transformations and shifts have increased the debates about authorship, creativeness and linguistic identity. Traditional models of creativity often emphasize originality, intentionality and individual genius and authorship has long been rooted in human mind and accountability. As a result, creative processes are appearing not only as a singular human act but also as a co-constructed process that emerges from human-machine interaction (Devis et al., 2015).

In this light, this review papers aims to examine the evolving relationship between AI and human intelligence regarding creativity and use of language styles. The research is systematic review in nature and the study blends research from linguistics, digital humanities, media studies, and AI ethics to answer research questions: (1) How do current AI tools reshape human linguistic and artistic expression? (2) What ethical and epistemological challenges emerge from AI-assisted creativity? (3) In what ways do human–machine collaborations redefine concepts of authorship and authenticity?

After observing main trends and analytical frameworks, this paper argues that generative AI reflects a transition from tool based assistance to more collaborated and co-authored expression. It argues that in the era of AI creativity should be seen as a collaborative process and it calls for stronger ethical frameworks across different disciplines (Holzner et al., 2025; Linares-Pellicer et al., 2025).

Methodology

This research article uses literature review methods that are systematic in nature and answers how generative artificial intelligence recreates human authority, style of language and creativeness. In order to provide clear, rigorous and reproducible research from multiple disciplines, a systematic review approach is used. Given the conceptual and ethical nature of research questions, this review focuses on qualitative and theoretical patterns rather than statistical meta-analysis. The review integrates research from linguistics, digital humanities, and media studies, and AI ethics, that reflects the interdisciplinary nature of AI-mediated creative processes.

Results and Discussion

The analysis revealed major trends that collectively address the study's research questions and demonstrate a shift toward understanding AI-mediated expression as a distributed and co-constructed process.

From Tool to Creative Partner: Redefining Creativity

Among the reviewed studies, a consistent finding is the re-conceptualization of AI from a functional tool to a creative partner. AI systems not only assist with linguistic tasks but actively contribute to ideation, stylistic variation, and narrative development. Research in the computational department and human interaction with computers has created outcomes emerging from interaction of humans with AI systems. (Devis et al., 2017)

These findings suggest a theoretical shift away from human-centric models of creativity to collaborative frameworks in which work is shared. These systematic reviews indicate that AI-enhanced is most effective when humans retain control, which reinforces the view that AI extends human creativity rather than AI replaces human creativity. (Holzner et al., 2025). This challenges the traditional assumption that creativity is only a human trait.

Empirical studies further demonstrate that generative AI can support early-stage creative processes by offering alternative perspectives and expanding the space of possible ideas. For example, Chen et al. (2025) show that generative models play a significant role in conceptual design by assisting humans in redesigning problems and generating new directions in designs. Similarly, Rafner et al. (2023) argued that creativity in the era of AI is best understood as a hybrid cognitive process, where human judgement and machine-generated suggestions interact dynamically.

These perspectives support a deconstruction of creativity as a distributed process and rather than attributing creative agency solely to either humans and machines, the work shows the interaction, iteration and co-construction.

The literature demonstrates that generative AI has a vital impact on linguistics and artistic expression. Studies report that AI-generated text can replicate various range of genres, registers and stylistic conventions, and it often archives the levels of fluency that can be compared to human-authored texts (Floridi and Chiriatti, 2020) This capacity has seen increased integration of AI into creative writing, journalism, academic communication, and digital media.

However, the findings also highlight tensions between innovative methods and how to standardize them. Various studies warn that AI-generated language tends to reproduce dominant linguistic patterns that are embedded in training data, which can lead to stylistic homogenization and reduction in linguistic diversity. (Bender et al., 2021).

Ethical Concerns: Authorship, Bias, and Responsibility

Along with the growing acceptance of AI as a creative collaborator, ethical concerns emerge as a dominant theme in the literature. One of the most important challenges is authorship and responsibility in creative work that is assisted by AI. The literature examining perceptions of AI-generated writing revealed significant uncertainty regarding the issue whether AI can or should be considered an author, and how the responsibility for content should be assigned (Formosa et al., 2025)

Systematic reviews further highlight the ethical risks associated with bias and representational harm in generative AI systems. Afreen et al. (2025) demonstrate that generative models often reproduce social, cultural, and linguistic biases that are embedded in their training data, raising concerns about fairness in the outputs produced by AI.

In educational and creative contexts, transparency has emerged as a key principle. A hybrid systematic review by Arar et al. (2025) emphasizes

the need for clear exposure of the AI environment in research and writing to maintain trust, accountability and research integrity.

Emergence of Hybrid Genres and Co-Constructed Expression

A third most significant trend observed in the review is the development of hybrid creative forms that blend human and AI voices. Research in creative and professional work shows that AI is now a regular part of files like literature, design, and the arts. The new generated genres are difficult to distinguish as human authored or machine authored (Tsao et al., 2025)

These hybrid forms after development questions the standards of originality and authenticity. As the line between human and machine voicing has become unclear and blurred, creativity is now seen as a mixture of technology, culture, and institutional contexts rather than an individual act.

Synthesis: Creativity as a Distributed and Co-Constructed Process

The review studies, when blended together, show that algorithmic expression requires the basic reconsidering of creativity, authorship, and agency. AI does not replace human mind and creativity; instead it has given us the collaboration between humans and machines. This point of view is supported by the range of empirical studies, systematic reviews, and conceptual analysis. These studies in the collection highlight collaboration, negotiation, and shared responsibility.

The significance of this interpretation is both practical and theoretical. Practically ethical approaches and institutional policies are required on urgent bases. These policies clarify authorship, responsibility, and transparency in a work created by AI. From a theoretic perspective, the creative process should be considered a shared process among humans and machines.

Conclusion

This review which is systematic in nature observes the role of generative AI in creative and linguistic practices. It also considers the aspect of human-machine co-working. It considers how this collaboration redefines creativity, authorship, and ethical responsibility. The findings clearly show a change in scholar's perception of creativity. Creativity is now seen as a shared process rather than as human capability and it is molded by the interaction of humans with machines.

At the same time, the review also demonstrates continuous ethical and epistemological issues. In the legal and in

stitutional frameworks, the questions of authorship, intellectual ownership, and accountability are still unsolved. The major significance of human-AI cooperation is represented by the development of hybrid creative genres. As the collaboration between human and machine are intertwining frequently, the traditional distinctions like author and tool, originality and derivation no longer fully hold up. This shift highlights the need for updated views about creativity as thoughtful, rational, process-oriented and shaped by wider socio-technical systems.

On the whole, the review article suggests that gen AI does not reduce human creativity but it reshapes it into something more collaborative and negotiated. Future research should focus more on empirical studies. These studies should include the creative process, how the audience reacts to it and how various cultures engage with these changes in order to understand how human intelligence and creativity are evolving in this increasingly algorithmic world.

References

Afreen, J., Mohaghegh, M., & Doborjeh, M. (2025). Systematic literature review on bias mitigation in generative AI. *AI and Ethics, 5*(5), 4789–4841.

Arar, K. H., Özen, H., Polat, G., & Turan, S. (2025). Artificial intelligence, generative artificial intelligence and research integrity: A hybrid systemic review. *Smart Learning Environments, 12*(1), 44.

Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 610–623).

Chen, L., Song, Y., Guo, J., Sun, L., Childs, P., & Yin, Y. (2025). How generative AI supports humans in conceptual design. *Design Science, 11*, e9.

Davis, N., Hsiao, C. P., Popova, Y., & Magerko, B. (2015). An enactive model of creativity for computational collaboration and co-creation. In T. X. Bui & R. Sprague (Eds.), *Creativity in the digital age* (pp. 109–133). Springer.

Doshi, V., & Li, M. (2025). *Writing in symbiosis: Mapping human creative agency in the AI era* (arXiv:2512.13697). arXiv.

Floridi, L., & Chiriatti, M. (2020). GPT-3: Its nature, scope, limits, and consequences. *Minds and Machines, 30*(4), 681–694.

Formosa, P., Bankins, S., Matulionyte, R., & Ghasemi, O. (2025). Can ChatGPT be an author? Generative AI creative writing assistance and perceptions of authorship, creatorship, responsibility, and disclosure. *AI & Society, 40*(5), 3405–3417.

Holzner, N., Maier, S., & Feuerriegel, S. (2025). *Generative AI and creativity: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis* (arXiv:2505.17241). arXiv.

Liao, Q. V., Gruen, D., & Miller, S. (2020). Questioning the AI: Informing design practices for explainable AI user experiences. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1–15).

Linares-Pellicer, J., Izquierdo-Domenech, J., Ferri-Molla, I., & Aliaga-Torro, C. (2025). *We are all creators: Generative AI, collective knowledge, and the path towards human-AI synergy* (arXiv:2504.07936). arXiv.

Pappas, N. (1989). Authorship and authority. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 47*(4), 325–332.

Rafner, J., Beaty, R. E., Kaufman, J. C., Lubart, T., & Sherson, J. (2023). Creativity in the age of generative AI. *Nature Human Behaviour, 7*(11), 1836–1838.

Ramos-Zaga, F. A. (2025). Reconceptualizing human authorship in the age of generative AI: A normative framework for copyright thresholds. *Laws, 14*(6), 84.

Shneiderman, B. (2020). Human-centered artificial intelligence: Reliable, safe, and trustworthy. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction, 36*(6), 495–504.

Tsao, J., Liang, C. X., Nogues, C., & Wong, A. (2025). Perceptions and integration of generative artificial intelligence in creative practices and industries: A scoping review and conceptual model. *AI & Society*, 1–20.

Zafar, M. B., Ali, H., & Yasin, T. (2025). Reimagining human creativity and learning in the age of generative AI: A multi-method meta-thematic synthesis. *Next Research*, 100802.