Mickalei Lindquist

Professor Janet Ha Poirot

BIS 490: Senior Capstone Project Seminar

May 1, 2025

Responsible Use of AI:
Ethical Risks and the Imperative of Human Control

INTRODUCTION

In a July 2024 survey conducted by McKinsey Global Surveys, 78% of respondents reported using artificial intelligence (AI) for at least one business purpose or process, up from 72% in early 2024 (Singla, Alex et al.). AI tools like ChatGPT and Microsoft Copilot are revolutionizing operations across industries, including professional and proposal writing, by reshaping workflows and streamlining processes in unprecedented ways. These large language models (LLMs) have been trained with vast amounts of data to understand and respond to human input in a logical manner and process complex tasks quickly. Generative pre-trained transformers (GPTs) are a subset of LLMs designed to generate natural-sounding text in response to human input. However, GPTs' impressive capabilities come with drawbacks. This paper explores the ethical implications and societal issues created by AI-assisted writing. It focuses on the need for human oversight to ensure integrity, accuracy, transparency, originality, and to avoid bias and misinformation, particularly as it applies to professional and proposal writing.

In an *AI and Ethics* journal article entitled “Using ChatGPT-3 As A Writing Tool: An Educational Assistant or a Moral Hazard? Current ChatGPT-3 Media Representations Compared to Plato’s Critical Stance on Writing in Phaedrus,” the authors' primary discussion is whether ChatGPT should be considered favorably as an educational assistant or seen more negatively as a “moral hazard” (Loos and Radicke). In *The Phaedrus*, Plato expressed concerns about writing and how it would impact people’s memory and knowledge because it differed from the oral traditions at the time. As AI grows in popularity, many modern researchers have expressed concerns about its adoption, including ethical concerns regarding transparency, fairness, accountability, environmental sustainability, and preserving original human critical thinking skills while utilizing these technologies. Those in the professional and proposal writing field must carefully weigh the benefits and risks of utilizing AI in their writing processes as they evolve. Specifically, ethics in AI is at the crossroads of needing not only “soft law” consideration but also regulatory consideration. “If AI is implemented without due regard and consideration for its potentially harmful impacts on individuals, on specific communities, and on society as a whole (including, for example, bias and discrimination, injustice, privacy infringements, increase in surveillance, loss of autonomy, overdependency on technology, etc.) (Rességuier and Rodrigues 1)” then technology’s negative impacts could quickly outweigh its benefits.

AI use is still evolving daily, faster than scholarly research can keep up. Some references included in this research may refer to popular sources that have more current information, textbooks that offer deeper insight and more historical perspectives,

and some mainstream studies that have examined business use of AI, which are more current than most scholarly research due to the nature of the academic publication process. Also included are regulatory and government sources used to examine how the U.S. government has examined and addressed AI ethics in the legal sphere.

INTERDISCIPLINARY RATIONALE

An interdisciplinary approach involving Professional Writing, History, Philosophy, and Law encourages a complete understanding of ethical considerations for the use of AI in proposal writing. As AI continues to evolve, society may begin to see effects in how language is generated, how information is conveyed, and how humans interact with machines.

As AI adoption increases in the professional writing process, its influence is seen across technical writing, proposal writing, content creation, and other writing forms. Understanding how AI can improve writing quality and content clarity and streamline the writing process must be balanced with understanding the ethical implications of using these tools. In an article for Harvard Business Review, author Marc Zao-Sanders acknowledges the value of AI in editing, drafting, and generating ideas but cautions users to consider the risk of incorrect information output (often called “hallucinations”) and ethical concerns such as security, accuracy, and fairness. Zao-Sanders further suggests that human oversight is required to ensure high-quality, readable, and reliable content and that the best use of AI is a collaborative effort between humans and machines (Zao-Sanders).

Further understanding can be found by reflecting on history. Loos and Radicke not only compared the introduction of AI to the introduction of writing technology but

also compared its adoption to many other technological advancements in history, including fire, the wheel, the printing press, steam power, electricity, the telegraph, and computers. With each new technology came those who embraced it and also those who feared it. Loos and Radicke specifically speak to Plato's *The Phaedrus* and his thoughts on how writing would impact cognitive skills, academic integrity, and human creativity. They compare his thoughts on the change from oral tradition to writing to how modern people view AI adoption. Like previous technologies, AI can create both positive and negative outcomes. Loos and Radicke suggest that humans must strategize AI's use and adapt to the changes it will bring, just as societies have historically navigated the adoption of new technologies (Loos and Radicke).

Ethics, a branch of philosophy, is also integral to this discussion. Researchers Gao et al. consider AI ethics to have three phases when considering the field of philosophy and its branch of ethics. First, they consider the theoretical groundwork of the incubation phase, which they define as 2004-2013. In this era, researchers primarily focused on information privacy and how ethics can be applied to information sciences. In Phase II, considered by their work to be 2014-2019, the focus of ethics in AI shifted to principles like accountability, fairness, trust, and transparency. Researchers in this phase began to create frameworks for ethical AI governance, which remains a challenge today. In Phase III, which runs from 2020 until the present, ethical considerations in AI systems prioritize human-centric concerns such as well-being, fairness, trustworthiness, bias, discrimination, misinformation, and public trust/distrust. In this phase, the considerations of the effects on humans, such as job displacement and changing societal values, became more important to researchers (Gao et al.).

Lastly, a significant part of understanding ethics in AI requires familiarity with the governance and regulatory challenges involved. In *The Rise of Checkbox Ethics*, Kijewski et al. discuss how current policies and approaches to AI ethics are in the "soft law" area with no legal binding, relying primarily on voluntary guidelines without actual accountability. Safety, transparency, and accountability are paramount when working with AI, especially when private, proprietary, or sensitive information is involved in health care, finance, government (including federal proposal processes), employment, and education. Relying on unenforceable, vague frameworks and guidelines will likely allow malicious actors to proliferate while regulatory agencies struggle to find solutions.

ETHICAL CONCERNS IN AI-ASSISTED TECHNICAL WRITING

Bias in AI Systems

AI models have inherent biases due to the aggregation of data that influences their output. AI systems can amplify and replicate systemic inequalities, which can impact the fairness of the writing process when using LLMs to automate and/or assist in document creation and review. Consider, as Morgan Livingston mentions in the article "Preventing Racial Bias in Federal AI," how federal agencies might use AI to set bail, facial recognition, detect fraud, and make loan or healthcare decisions. These uses of AI often misidentify minorities, inflate their risk as offenders, charge higher loan rates, and suggest their health risks are lower than those of their white counterparts. These types of biases can be found throughout AI systems due to the system's design, poorly representative data sets, lack of diversity among developers, and insufficient safeguards during implementation. Across industries, including professional writing, AI

systems will continue to perpetuate and exacerbate racial stereotypes unless these issues of bias are addressed (Livingston).

In “Ethics of Generative AI,” Zohny, et al. discuss further ethical considerations in using generative LLM systems in academia and authorship. Professional writers and communicators will find these issues apply across industries, from academia to the public and private sectors. The researchers cite concerns about authorship verification in all forms of writing. How can authorship be determined between the human who inputs the information and the AI output? The prolific use of AI brings into question the integrity of written documents and, in the case of academia, may require a return to submitting handwritten exams in the presence of the professor to ensure authenticity. Secondly, the researchers consider the ethical concern of originality in response, specifically in the field of ethics. AI is capable of ethical argumentation but lacks depth, originality, and nuance. The same can be said for many writing topics when authors rely too heavily on AI. However, on the positive side of this article, the authors concede that using AI to assist in drafting and playing devil’s advocate could generate more ideas and points of view not previously considered. They also feel that using AI could open more global opportunities for communication due to its ability to translate across languages using natural-sounding language more effectively than other digital translators. Their research concludes that while there could be benefits to using AI in the writing process, both its benefits and risks must be considered, and human insight should be maintained for true originality (Zohny et al.).

Cui et al.’s article “AI and Procurement” discusses the ethical implications of AI in the procurement process. Much like Zohny et al. and Livingston, Cui et al. discuss the

particular ways in which AI systems can apply bias and the impact of this bias. Their study shows that suppliers tend to discriminate when negotiating with chatbot (AI-generated) buyers by offering higher price quotes to chatbots than to human buyers due to a perceived lack of expertise in product specifics and a higher willingness to pay among chatbot buyers. Suppliers also do not feel connected with chatbot buyers due to the lack of empathy and personality, and, therefore, are not motivated to create relationships with them as customers. By introducing intelligent AI recommendations, this bias is reduced. If the supplier is told that the chatbot buyer uses AI algorithms for supplier selection, they change their pricing strategy, offering lower price quotes. The authors note, however, that this experience does not apply to human buyers. Suppliers perceive that humans will not take AI recommendations as strictly as chatbots and will continue to apply their own judgment to decision-making. The suppliers, therefore, do not adjust their strategies even when informed that human buyers have AI algorithms to guide them. Interestingly, the researchers found no gender bias among business-to-business sales. In contrast, business-to-consumer settings showed female consumers being charged higher prices frequently due to perceptions of lower market knowledge. The authors of this research conclude that automation can exacerbate bias against chatbot buyers and suggest that AI should not be implemented without addressing limitations or enhancing “smartness” (Cui et al.).

How can these biases be addressed in AI systems? In 2022, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) published a Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights to introduce a framework to guide regulations for the use of AI due to bias and other ethical concerns. This white paper addresses algorithmic discrimination, which

occurs when AI and other automated systems influence decisions that negatively impact people based on ethnicity, race, sex, age, religion, disability, veteran status, genetic information, nationality, or other legally protected status. In this blueprint, the OSTP outlines five main principles to consider for regulating the use of AI: a need for safe and effective systems that have been tested and evaluated; protections against algorithmic discrimination to limit bias; data privacy, especially in sensitive domains; an emphasis on accountability and transparency so that people understand how their information is used and what decisions may impact them; and lastly, the choice to opt out of AI use and rely on traditional methods of communication, especially in sensitive areas. The OSTP, not unlike Zohny et al., maintains that human oversight and methods to fix errors are critical. While this document has no binding legal effect, it is a solid foundation for looking at the issues AI has created and will continue to create as its use increases (*Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights*).

Transparency and Accountability

A significant concern with the use of AI addressed by the OSTP's Blueprint is its lack of transparency in decision-making processes, especially when the stakes are high, as in legal documents, health, financial, employment, or educational records, or compliance reports, where mistakes are critical. Many AI developers face the challenge of disclosing the rationale behind decisions in AI models without releasing proprietary information. Secondary to the question of transparency is the question of who is responsible for AI-generated errors and biases. These issues might be addressed by designing governance frameworks to ensure transparency and accountability, such as those outlined in the OSTP Blueprint. According to Van Behr and Abrahamsson's

presentation at the 2022 IEEE 28th International Conference on Engineering, Technology and Innovation (ICE/ITMC) & 31st International Association for Management and Technology (IAMOT) Joint Conference, AI ethics research evolved from its beginning when the definition of shared ethical principles was the focus into developing practical applications and methods for implementing them (Von Behr and Abrahamsson). Governance frameworks like Shneiderman's three-level governance structure for human-centered AI have been developed to ensure reliable, safe, and trustworthy AI systems. This model includes the following levels: team-level technical practices, including validation and bias testing; organization-level strategies for creating a safety culture; and industry-level oversights, such as professional institute certifications and government regulations. Human performance is essential throughout these levels, as is a multi-level approach to ensuring transparency and accountability (Shneiderman). Other layered models include Gasser and Virgilio's model, which includes technical, ethical, and societal/legal layers while also emphasizing the need for human oversight, a common thread in much of the available AI research. Requiring ethics within the procurement process ensures a focus on choosing systems with high standards for transparency and accountability from design to use (Von Behr and Abrahamsson). The recurring theme of these articles is the need to ensure ethical considerations are a part of each step of the AI development, integration, and implementation processes to maintain transparency and accountability.

In a review of the book *Ethical Machines: Your Concise Guide to Totally Unbiased, Transparent, and Respectful AI*, Christian Goglin addresses broader ethical issues tied to AI governance, such as bias, explainability, and privacy, which are all

essential to transparency and accountability. The book emphasizes the value of explaining the mitigation of ethical risks to ensure transparency. To address accountability, the book advocates for the use of governance frameworks, ethics by design, and multidisciplinary ethics committees. The authors highlight the importance of transparency in the use of AI to reveal ethical issues. Misuse can be prevented by ensuring that content origins, decision-making processes, and biases are transparent and that accountability for harm caused by such content is considered. Clear documentation and oversight are required to ensure these outcomes (Goglin).

Executive Order 14110, issued in 2023 by President Joseph Biden, discussed the importance of addressing transparency and accountability within AI as a framework for safe, secure, and trustworthy AI use. The Executive Order intended to implement a White House AI Council to coordinate AI policy across federal agencies, with each agency tasked with its own actions, research, and guideline development (United States, Executive Office of the President [Joseph Biden]). However, with the change of administration, AI priorities were changed. In early 2025, President Donald Trump's Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions Executive Order revoked Biden's action (United States, Executive Office of the President [Donald Trump]).

Originality, Integrity, and the Role of Human Authorship

Some of the most significant ethical issues with AI come into play, especially as professional or proposal writers, when AI output is used. Where does human originality end and AI authorship begin? Returning to Loos and Radicke's article, Plato's ideas in *The Phaedrus* and concerns about AI have much in common. These researchers feel that GPT output is mediocre, perpetuates homogeneous thought, and diminishes

creativity, originality, and innovation. Like many other researchers, they emphasize the need for a human to guide the process and to utilize critical thinking when evaluating output to avoid ethical issues and ensure originality and transparency of authorship (Loos and Radicke).

Zohny et al., too, address generative AI's effects on originality, integrity, and human authorship in their article *Ethics of Generative AI*. These researchers also describe the lack of depth, nuance, and originality offered by AI, particularly when crafting articles about ethics. While AI can generate previously made arguments from readily available sources, it cannot create innovative ideas or perform qualitative research. The authors feel AI cannot yet handle high-level thought. Zohny et al. are also concerned with the integrity of authorship, particularly in academia. How can publishers know whether a human or AI truly authors an article? They reinforce the value of humans in the authorship process. While AI can help non-English speakers or replace a research partner to discuss ideas, maintaining originality and integrity in academic work is paramount (Zohny et al.).

In a Vox article about the popularity of making Studio Ghibli-style AI-generated art, Sigal Samuel argues that the "essence" of human creativity is eroded by using their artwork without permission or pay, undermining their work's integrity. While this article speaks more specifically to the arts, the principle remains the same. AI creates its output by studying existing art, literature, and information and generating responses. This author considers using artists' work without permission a "moral injury" that inflicts psychological harm. The final word in this article is that human authorship and originality should be respected, and the unchecked development of AI using copyrighted input

diminishes the unique contributions of artists and the integrity of their work (Samuel, Sigal).

Executive Order 14110, established in 2023 by President Biden, addressed these concerns about originality, integrity, and authorship. The Order emphasized a need to develop a labeling process for AI-created content, like a watermark, to ensure integrity and transparency. The idea behind this labeling is that it would allow users to differentiate between AI-generated works and human-created content. It also addressed the need to track digital provenance in order to prevent the use of AI for malicious purposes. The Order further instructs the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to design guidance for the use of AI in the inventorship process. Lastly, it seeks to create recommendations for copyright issues. Should AI-generated work be protected under copyright, and how should copyrighted works be used in AI training? Overall, this Executive Order reiterates the need for a human at the helm, especially in sensitive areas, and the need for processes that leave room for human review to ensure fairness, originality, integrity, and proper authorship are maintained. As mentioned above, this Executive Order was rescinded by the Trump administration in early 2025.

THE ROLE OF AI IN ENHANCING OR HINDERING HUMAN SKILLS

Critical Thinking and Creativity

Additional research about AI adoption reflects concerns that becoming too reliant on AI tools will hinder critical thinking, limit original thought, and lead to homogenous, shallow content among writers and creators. Researchers theorize that as we become more reliant on AI tools for writing, the insights and connections at the heart of creativity

will diminish, and overall writing skills will not be as highly developed due to the reliance on AI tools to create and connect ideas.

In *AI and Ethics*, researchers discuss how GPTs specifically hinder creativity and originality. The researchers critique the generation of dull, repetitive ideas that share existing knowledge without making new connections or fostering creativity. Due to the use of algorithms and plausibility calculations, AI tools return repetitive results and lack innovation. By continuing to use these tools and increasing the number of mediocre texts used by LLMs to learn, responses will only continue to be diluted, and groundbreaking ideas will cease to be generated. The researchers also consider the possibility that users will become dependent on AI tools over time, and their ability to synthesize, think critically, and analyze information on their own will decrease, further hindering the development of individual, creative thought. With consideration of Plato's concept of human creativity as a need to express ideas, an abundance of thoughts and materials to create with, and a process of combing through ideas to find what is useful, they express concern that AI tools cannot sift through ideas as well as humans and implement unique connections to create new points of view. They further express concerns about the ability of humans to maintain basic skills like summarizing and organizing information if they become too reliant on AI tools and lack practice. The authors feel that deeper engagement with materials is required for humans to truly develop understanding and generate new ideas rather than regurgitating the same ideas. Overall, they fear a future where humans have impaired cognitive development, diminished critical thinking skills, and a lack of skills to innovate or even understand text at a basic level without AI tool assistance (Loos and Radicke). Similarly, in an

article for *Reading Research Quarterly*, authors surveyed students and conducted focus groups to understand their concerns about using AI tools. They found a high level of concern that AI affects human creativity. Students expressed their belief that creativity is a uniquely human endeavor relying on one's emotions, perspectives, and imagination to find new ideas and ways of approaching problems. The students expressed worry that overreliance on AI tools would make it more difficult for people to create and express authenticity. Students also felt that AI-generated writing felt flat, soulless, and lacked emotional depth. They lamented the loss of personal voice in AI-generated text. Much like the researcher in the *AI and Ethics* article, these researchers are concerned that overreliance on AI tools will stunt creative growth and independent skills in writing, comprehension, and critical thinking. Students in this study particularly expressed their fear that AI could replace humans in the workforce and creative professions such as writing and the arts, which would not only eliminate human jobs in the future but also create art without meaning or depth. Most students felt that while AI has some positive uses, its use should be limited and always include human input (Higgs and Stornaiuolo).

According to Helen Thomson, concerns about cognitive offloading, or the delegation of cognitive tasks to AI tools, and its possible connection to a decline in human intelligence are not considered enough when adopting AI. She compares the atrophy of muscles when physical exercise is neglected with the effects of relying on AI for memory, problem-solving, and critical thinking and its ability to weaken neural pathways. She cites a study in the UK showing that frequent AI use correlates with lower critical thinking skills. Further, she shares that a similar study by Microsoft and Carnegie Mellon University showed improved efficiency with the use of AI but inhibited

the use of critical thinking and increased overreliance on technology in the long term. The availability of instant answers hinders the need for analysis and reflection and the ability to problem-solve. Furthermore, while AI helps users generate ideas, it may reduce diversity in those ideas and limit truly innovative ideas. Finally, she expresses concern about the long-term implications of using AI and its effects on brain development and future brain health. She emphasizes a need for engaging with AI in thoughtful ways that preserve human thinking and creativity, skills that machines cannot replace.

Societal Impact

In addition to affecting the human skills of creativity and critical thinking, students and workers in many fields have real concerns about the impact of AI implementation on their job security, particularly in creative fields such as writing, editing, and the arts. Will AI tools eliminate the need for human involvement in these roles? What are the best ways to upskill and reskill the workforce to adjust to changes in their roles due to AI implementation rather than displacing jobs? According to research from the Brookings Institution, “Existing generative AI technology already has the potential to significantly disrupt a wide range of jobs. We find that more than 30% of all workers could see at least 50% of their occupation’s tasks disrupted by generative AI (Kinder, Molly, et al.).”

In an article for *Software World*, Dawn Andre tackles the issues of the increased use of AI in the modern workplace. Andre discusses the upcoming shortage of skilled professionals who can leverage AI ethically and responsibly, particularly in procurement. Companies will need workers who can adapt quickly as the use of AI in professional contexts evolves. She suggests increased on-the-job training from the

LLMs themselves, which allows for real-time guidance and support and a reduced need for training sessions, which will add cost to businesses. The article states that 46% of global respondents believe AI adoption will lead to job displacement, and 38% of technology leaders are concerned that AI will replace their positions or teams. The article suggests a focus on learning culture, adaptation, talent acquisition adjustments, and support for employees as society adapts to the adoption of AI in a large-scale way. AI adoption is creating new positions like Chief AI Officer, altering workplace dynamics, and reshaping expectations of job security (Andre).

In the book “Introduction to AI Safety, Ethics, and Society,” author Dan Hendrycks discusses the effect of AI adoption on broader society in depth, describing outcomes he considers “highly severe or even catastrophic” (Hendrycks 3). He categorizes the societal risks of AI into four main categories: malicious use, competitive pressure, organizational risk, and rogue AI. He suggests that close examination of how AI could go wrong will allow societal risks to be minimized before they reach catastrophic levels. Within each category, the author describes specific risks in-depth. Under malicious use, he suggests we consider individuals and organizations taking purposeful actions to create threats to humanity, such as bioterrorism, dissemination of misinformation on a grand scale, the centralization of AI knowledge in the hands of a few, competitive pressure to create new arms, automated warfare, and cyberwarfare utilizing AI. He further expresses concern that the increased competition among businesses to advance may lead to a higher likelihood of rushing into the use of untested AI systems, the push to replace human intelligence with AI tools, which could lead to job displacement, encourage a loss of cognitive thinking and creativity among

humans. The author shares scenarios where AI issues could be catastrophic such as accidentally bringing a critical bug into the AI system, or the security within AI being too lax and hackers being able to access and change its behavior. Many attempts to propose ethical and safety guidelines for AI use are considered “soft laws,” which are unenforceable expectations where there is a need for enforceable regulations to keep society safe, as the technology is evolving faster than research can keep up (Hendrycks).

Lastly, often overlooked in discussions of AI ethics affecting society are the environmental issues caused by the use of AI. In their article *Sustainable AI and the Third Wave of AI Ethics: A Structural Turn*, authors Larissa Bolte and Aimee Van Wynsberghe highlight the environmental costs of AI, including carbon emissions from “training and tuning AI models (Bolte and Van Wynsberghe 3), ecological impact from manufacturing hardware, and exploiting resources and people during the AI lifecycle. The authors express concern that the techno-solutionist mindset focuses too much on technical fixes and not enough on systemic and structural problems. In “AI Ethics: A Textbook,” concerns about environmental effects include the energy consumption required to operate computer systems, the resource extraction of minerals for manufacturing hardware, and the need to integrate environmental considerations into the design of AI systems. They emphasize the need to consider environmental concerns and not simply focus on economic gains and technological advancements (Boddington).

COUNTERARGUMENTS AND RESEARCH GAPS

One must remember that historically, scholars were worried when the printing press was invented, math teachers were worried when calculators became mainstream, and the internet created fears of e-books destroying the publishing industry. However, by integrating ethics into the use of these new technologies, they became tools of empowerment. With the availability of printed materials, literacy became more widespread, with calculators, math students could learn more advanced math at younger ages, and while writing pathways expanded into online serials, self-publishing, and fan fiction sites, traditionally published books still proliferate. AI, too, has its positive aspects.

While many express concerns about AI's effects on human creativity and skill, other scholars argue that AI, especially in writing tasks, can automate tedious and repetitive tasks and free up human time for innovation and creativity rather than stifle them. In future research, AI could be used to support and facilitate human creativity rather than replace it. Many scholars insist it will continue to be necessary to have humans at the center of the appropriate and ethical use of AI.

Loos and Radicke, mentioned earlier, express concerns about using ChatGPT specifically and discuss the benefits of using AI tools. For example, they offer the availability to find information in an easier-to-access format than using search engines, they can be tailored to each user’s needs via the development of personas and well-crafted prompts, they offer feedback and suggestions to improve grammar, syntax, and vocabulary, and can reduce human workloads by automating tedious tasks (Loos and Radicke).

Many authors in mainstream discussions about AI feel that AI can benefit their work. In an *Ars Technica* article, AI is a timesaver in three main ways: AI as an oracle, meaning it can search efficiently, summarize and evaluate literature, and create new hypotheses to save time; AI as a surrogate, meaning using AI to access large amounts of data online is cheaper and faster than other methods, and AI as arbiter, meaning that journal editors can utilize AI to sift through large amounts of papers to make the grant and peer review processes more efficient (Ouellette, Jennifer). In the popular magazine *Entrepreneur*, Scott Baradell discusses the value of AI when used well. He suggests that the real power of AI lies in users leveraging it for brainstorming and outlining but not to generate full texts. He suggests that AI can help create personas, something proposal writers often do to understand their clients. However, remember to treat AI like a junior collaborator rather than an experienced writer and review everything it produces with human eyes to ensure accuracy and quality (Baradell, Scott).

In the procurement field, the U.S. Senate's Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs has released reports on the responsible use of AI in the government sphere. In their report, *Promoting Responsible Evaluation and Procurement to Advance Readiness for Enterprise-Wide Deployment (Prepared) for Artificial Intelligence Act*, as part of promoting the associated bill, S. 4495, discusses federal agencies' need for governance and procurement of AI. The report outlines how AI can improve government efficiency by allowing data-driven decision-making, improving accuracy, perfecting grammar, translating languages, summarizing, generating new ideas, and streamlining tasks. It is vital that regulations for the ethical use of AI, such as those outlined in this bill (Peters et al.), begin to make their way into the government

space to keep AI use secure and prevent catastrophes such as those outlined by Hendrycks.

Further research into the long-term effects on writing and human skills brought about by the prolific use of AI is vital. Real-world examination of how AI affects the job market and how employers and employees can upskill or reskill in ways to continue to foster human growth while utilizing AI ethically for the tasks it is best suited for while still keeping a human in the loop is essential as research progresses and AI continues to evolve.

CONCLUSION

The most important lesson in examining current research into ethical AI use, particularly in professional writing, is that there is insufficient information and that technology is progressing faster than research can adapt. What once was a glimmer of an idea of something very technical individuals could use one day is now a household tool used industry-wide in the private sector, academia, and government by adults and children worldwide. Ensuring safe, secure, and ethical guidelines are in place to protect users is important before major issues arise and create catastrophic problems.

Not only should research and experience inform soft laws or generally accepted appropriate use, but formal regulations should be implemented to criminalize this technology's darkest and most dangerous uses. In the book, “Towards Trustworthy Artificial Intelligent Systems,” the authors discuss the proliferation of AI use due to industry and business adoption but also note the addition of AI to consumers’ lives, who assume that the systems are trustworthy due to the brand recognition, and do not consider risk when using AI tools. They emphasize the need for human-centric,

sustainable, and ethical AI technology with legislative frameworks to ensure these qualities are enforceable. The frameworks should be inclusive and reflective of all people and uses, have definable accountability for AI developers, and define appropriate, ethical use for businesses and consumers (Ferreira and Tokhi).

Most importantly, any use of AI requires extensive human oversight. Zick et al. discuss the need for human oversight in government AI systems, especially when the risks of decisions are high. They emphasize the need for humans to validate AI output, a guideline expressed in both the Canadian Directive on Automated Decision-Making (CDADM) and the World Economic Forum's AI Procurement in a Box (WEF). However, it shows that even with human oversight, errors can occur because people trust the output more than they should, either from a lack of interest in doing the work themselves or because the output sounds intelligent. These authors recommend that experts be involved to avoid biases that lead to discriminatory outcomes and ensure transparency via appropriate documentation. They recommend that human oversight should be ongoing, even after the implementation of systems, as data shifts can occur, and user behavior can impact the system's performance (Zick et al.). In "AI Ethics: A Textbook," Paula Boddington discusses the need for human-in-the-loop systems to ensure humans can intervene, especially in high-stakes AI decision-making like healthcare, self-driving vehicles, and law enforcement. She insists that humans must remain accountable for the transparency of AI systems and the explainability of the decisions made by AI. Lastly, human insight is vital to ensure ethically challenging situations are handled with appropriate awareness, and that bias is not allowed to create unfairness or cause harm to marginalized groups (Boddington).

This author recommends that users proceed cautiously with AI in professional writing, proposal writing, or any industry. Be aware of ethical concerns and the high possibility of inaccurate output, and always ensure human oversight.

Works Cited

Andre, Dawn. “Bridging the AI Talent Gap: A Critical Challenge in Procurement.” *Software World*, vol. 55, no. 5, Sept. 2024, pp. 3–4. *EBSCOhost*, research.ebsco.com/linkprocessor/plink?id=540a20ad-d9de-311c-b6d6-d6d1c2ec5656.

Baradell, Scott. “If You’re Using ChatGPT This Way, You’re Doing It Wrong.” *Entrepreneur*, 18 Apr. 2025, https://www.entrepreneur.com/growing-a-business/if-youre-using-chatgpt-this-way-youre-doing-it-wrong/489366#:~:text=If%20You're%20Using%20ChatGPT%20This%20Way%20as%20a%20Marketer,thinking%20and%20fewer%20generic%20outputs.

Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights: Making Automated Systems Work for the American People. White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, Oct. 2022.

Boddington, Paula. *AI Ethics: A Textbook*. Springer Nature Singapore, 2023. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-9382-4.

Bolte, Larissa, and Aimee Van Wynsberghe. “Sustainable AI and the Third Wave of AI Ethics: A Structural Turn.” *AI and Ethics*, July 2024. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-024-00522-6.

Cui, Ruomeng, et al. “AI and Procurement.” *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, vol. 24, no. 2, Apr. 2022, pp. 691–706. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.1287/msom.2021.0989.

Ferreira, Maria Isabel Aldinhas, and Mohammad Osman Tokhi, editors. *Towards Trustworthy Artificial Intelligent Systems*. Springer International Publishing, 2022. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-09823-9.

Gao, Di Kevin, et al. “AI Ethics: A Bibliometric Analysis, Critical Issues, and Key Gaps.” *International Journal of Business Analytics*, vol. 11, no. 1, Feb. 2024, pp. 1–19. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.4018/IJBAN.338367.

Goglin, Christian. “The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: Review of Ethical Machines: Your Concise Guide to Totally Unbiased, Transparent, and Respectful AI by R. Blackman; Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: Case Studies and Options for Addressing Ethical Challenges by B.C. Stahl, D. Schroeder, and R. Rodrigues; and AI Ethics by M. Coeckelbergh.” *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 188, no. 3, Dec. 2023, pp. 623–27. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-023-05538-2.

Hendrycks, Dan. *Introduction to AI Safety, Ethics, and Society*. 1st ed., CRC Press, 2024. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003530336.

Higgs, Jennifer M., and Amy Stornaiuolo. “Being Human in the Age of Generative AI: Young People’s Ethical Concerns about Writing and Living with Machines.” *Reading Research Quarterly*, vol. 59, no. 4, Oct. 2024, pp. 632–50. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.552.

Kinder, Molly, et al. *Generative AI, the American Worker, and the Future of Work*. Brookings Institution, 10 Oct. 2024, https://www.brookings.edu/articles/generative-ai-the-american-worker-and-the-future-of-work/?utm_source=chatgpt.com.

Livingston, Morgan. “Preventing Racial Bias in Federal AI.” *Journal of Science Policy & Governance*, vol. 16, no. 02, May 2020. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.38126/JSPG160205.

Loos, Eugène, and Jan Radicke. “Using ChatGPT-3 as a Writing Tool: An Educational Assistant or a Moral Hazard? Current ChatGPT-3 Media Representations Compared to Plato’s Critical Stance on Writing in Phaedrus.” *AI and Ethics*, Apr. 2024. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-024-00470-1.

Ouellette, Jennifer. “Producing More but Understanding Less: The Risks of AI for Scientific Research.” *Ars Technica*, 6 Mar. 2024, https://arstechnica.com/science/2024/03/producing-more-but-understanding-less-the-risks-of-ai-for-scientific-research/.

Rességuier, Anaïs, and Rowena Rodrigues. “*AI Ethics Should Not Remain Toothless!* A Call to Bring Back the Teeth of Ethics.” *Big Data & Society*, vol. 7, no. 2, July 2020, p. 2053951720942541. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951720942541.

Samuel, Sigal. “AI Art Creates Risk of Moral Injury, Not Just Copyright Infringement.” *Vox*, 16 Apr. 2025, https://www.vox.com/artificial-intelligence/408786/ai-art-studio-ghibli-moral-injury-copyright.

Shneiderman, Ben. “Bridging the Gap Between Ethics and Practice: Guidelines for Reliable, Safe, and Trustworthy Human-Centered AI Systems.” *ACM Transactions on Interactive Intelligent Systems*, vol. 10, no. 4, Dec. 2020, pp. 1–31. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.1145/3419764.

Singla, Alex, et al. “The State of AI: How Organizations Are Rewiring to Capture Value.” *Quantum Black AI by McKinsey*, 19 Mar. 2025, https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack/our-insights/the-state-of-ai?utm_source=chatgpt.com#/.

United States, Executive Office of the President [Donald Trump]. *Executive Order 14148: Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions*. Federal Register, 28 Jan. 2025, https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/01/28/2025-01901/initial-rescissions-of-harmful-executive-orders-and-actions.

United States, Executive Office of the President [Joseph Biden]. *Executive Order 14110: Safe. Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence*. Federal Register, 30 Oct. 2023, https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2023/11/01/2023-24283/safe-secure-and-trustworthy-development-and-use-of-artificial-intelligence.

Von Behr, Timo, and Pekka Abrahamsson. “AI Governance and Ethics in Public Procurement: Bridging the Gap Between Theory and Practice.” *2022 IEEE 28th International Conference on Engineering, Technology and Innovation (ICE/ITMC) & 31st International Association For Management of Technology (IAMOT) Joint Conference*, IEEE, 2022, pp. 1–7. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.1109/ICE/ITMC-IAMOT55089.2022.10033173.

Zao-Sanders, Marc. “How People Are Really Using GenAI.” *Harvard Business Review*, 19 Mar. 2024, https://hbr.org/2024/03/how-people-are-really-using-genai.

Zick, Tom, et al. “AI Procurement Checklists: Revisiting Implementation in the Age of AI Governance.” *arXiv.Org*, 23 Apr. 2024, http://arxiv.org/abs/2404.14660.

Zohny, Hazem, et al. “Ethics of Generative AI.” *Journal of Medical Ethics*, vol. 49, no. 2, Feb. 2023, pp. 79–80. *DOI.org (Crossref)*, https://doi.org/10.1136/jme-2023-108909.