MOKSLO TAIKOMIEJI TYRIMAI, 2026 Nr. 22 (1), p. 113-120
eISSN 3030-1823; DOI: https://doi.org/10.59476/mtt2026.v1i22.770 / http://ojs.kaunokolegija.lt/index.php/mttlk/index

GENERATIVE TEXT AS A CHALLENGE TO CREATIVITY AND ACADEMIC ETHICS

Giedrė Paurienė

Mykolas Romeris University

Abstract. Generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools based on large language model (LLM) technology are transforming processes of creation, writing, and learning in higher education, raising questions about authorship, originality, and academic responsibility. Despite the growing body of research, existing studies mainly focus on regulation and plagiarism, while paying less attention to broader transformations in creativity and academic ethics. The aim of this article is to analyse how generative text reshapes the understanding of creative activity and academic ethics in educational and research contexts. The study adopts a qualitative, theoretical-analytical approach combining hermeneutic and discourse analysis. The analysis is based on three illustrative cases from language learning, translation practice, and academic writing, which are examined as analytical instances to explore emerging ethical and cultural tensions. The findings indicate that the key challenges associated with generative AI are primarily cultural and pedagogical rather than technological. Generative systems redistribute creative agency between human actors and algorithmic tools, transforming the role of the author into that of an editor, coordinator, and ethical decision-maker. While AI enhances productivity and linguistic accuracy, unreflective use risks diminishing interpretive depth, personal voice, and value-based reasoning. The results highlight the need to reconceptualise academic integrity as a reflective process-oriented practice and to develop educational frameworks that promote ethical literacy, transparency, and responsible authorship. The study contributes to the field by offering an integrative perspective that positions generative AI as a catalyst for rethinking creativity, authorship, and ethical responsibility in contemporary higher education.

Keywords: generative AI, academic integrity, ethical literacy, creativity, higher education

Introduction

Generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools based on large language model (LLM) technology are fundamentally transforming processes of creation, writing, and learning. These technologies are capable of producing coherent, logically grounded, and stylistically accurate texts; therefore, they function not only as supportive instruments but also as new participants in creative activity, raising questions about authorship, originality, and responsibility (Cheng et al., 2025; Watson, 2025).

In recent years, international policy documents and academic frameworks have increasingly emphasised the responsibility of higher education institutions to respond critically and ethically to technological transformation. Reports by UNESCO and the OECD highlight not only the importance of innovation and digital competence in education, but also the need for transparency, accountability, and ethical awareness in knowledge production. As digital technologies become deeply embedded in academic practices, universities are expected to ensure that technological advancement does not undermine core educational values such as critical thinking, intellectual responsibility, and academic integrity.

Generative AI intensifies these challenges by blurring established boundaries between human authorship and technological assistance. While such tools promise increased efficiency, linguistic accuracy, and cognitive support, they simultaneously disrupt traditional understandings of originality, creativity, and moral responsibility. In academic and educational environments, this creates a growing tension between productivity-oriented uses of AI and the ethical foundations of scholarly work. These tensions are not merely technical but pedagogical and cultural, as they affect how creativity is conceptualised, how responsibility is assigned, and how academic integrity is interpreted.

Despite the growing body of research on generative AI in higher education, existing studies tend to focus primarily on issues of regulation, plagiarism, and institutional control, while paying less attention to the broader transformation of creativity and academic ethics. In particular, there is a lack of integrative theoretical approaches that examine generative AI as a cultural and ethical phenomenon shaping authorship, responsibility, and meaning-making processes. **The novelty of this study** lies in its integrative and interdisciplinary approach, which conceptualises generative AI not merely as a technological tool but as a cultural and ethical phenomenon, linking it to transformations in creativity, authorship, and ethical responsibility, and emphasising the role of ethical literacy in contemporary academic practice.

The study examines the transformation of creative activity and academic ethics in the context of generative AI-assisted text production in higher education.

The aim of this article is to reveal how generative text reshapes the understanding of creative activity and academic ethics, with particular emphasis on the key challenges emerging in educational and research environments.

To achieve this aim, the following **research objectives** are formulated: (1) to analyse how generative AI influences the understanding of authorship, creativity, and responsibility in academic contexts; (2) to examine ethical challenges related to AI-assisted text production in higher education; (3) to identify the implications of generative AI for ethical literacy and academic integrity.

This article is designed as **a theoretical-analytical study** rather than an empirical investigation in the strict methodological sense. The study first examines existing research and then applies a case-based analysis to illustrate how these theoretical insights manifest in practice. It is based on a qualitative, interpretive approach that combines hermeneutic and discourse analysis. The purpose of this approach is not to generalise empirical findings, but to interpret how generative AI-assisted text production transforms understandings of creativity, authorship, responsibility, and academic ethics in higher education.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative, theoretical-analytical approach to examine how generative artificial intelligence reshapes creativity, authorship, and academic ethics in higher education. The research is interpretive in nature and does not aim at empirical generalisation, but at conceptual clarification and critical analysis. In this sense, the study is positioned within a broader tradition of interpretive and critical inquiry in educational and social research.

The methodological framework combines hermeneutic analysis and discourse analysis. Hermeneutic analysis is applied to interpret how meaning, authorship, and ethical responsibility are constructed in AI-assisted text production, with particular attention to the relationship between human agency and algorithmic contribution. Discourse analysis is used to situate generative AI within broader academic, pedagogical, and cultural contexts, examining how it is framed in contemporary scholarly debates and how these framings influence understandings of creativity and academic integrity.

The analysis is based on three illustrative cases drawn from language learning, translation practice, and academic writing. These cases are selected purposively as representative examples of AI-assisted text production in educational contexts. While they do not constitute empirical data in a statistical sense, they serve as analytically significant instances that reveal recurring patterns, tensions, and ethical dilemmas associated with the use of generative AI. The analytical process involves identifying key themes across the cases, including authorship transformation, shifts in creative agency, and challenges related to ethical transparency. These themes are then interpreted through the lens of the selected methodological approaches, allowing for a deeper understanding of how generative AI reshapes both individual practices and broader academic norms.

Through this approach, generative AI is conceptualised not merely as a technological tool, but as a cultural and ethical phenomenon that reconfigures the boundaries of authorship, responsibility, and creative practice in contemporary academia.

Literature Review

Ethical Perspectives on Generative AI in Higher Education. Meishar-Tal's (2025) empirical study conducted in Israeli higher education institutions was among the first to empirically assess how lecturers and doctoral students perceive the use of generative AI tools, such as ChatGPT, in academic writing. The survey, which included more than 400 participants from various disciplines, revealed that attitudes toward AI strongly depend on academic experience and professional status: senior researchers tend to see AI as a threat to academic ethics, while younger scholars view it as a creative and learning-enhancing resource. The author emphasises that the key challenge lies not in AI use itself, but in the degree of awareness and disclosure regarding whether academics can transparently indicate how and to what extent generative tools were used. This suggests that the ethical dilemma lies not in the technology but in the human ability to reflect upon it.

Kofinas et al. (2025) examined the impact of AI on academic integrity assessment in UK universities through a mixed-methods study combining faculty surveys and case analysis. The study revealed that even with clear institutional guidelines, many educators experience uncertainty when evaluating students' work that may have involved AI assistance. Kofinas et al. note that traditional assessment criteria such as originality, authorial voice, and logical argumentation become increasingly difficult to apply when the text is co-created with an algorithm. He proposes shifting the evaluation paradigm from authenticity as an individual product to authenticity as a reflective process, where students must justify their creative choices, including the use of AI.

A research study by Đerić et al. (2025), conducted at Croatian universities, analysed ethical attitudes and emotional responses to AI-assisted academic writing. Based on 312 survey responses, the study found that students often experience moral discomfort when using AI, even when such use is not prohibited. Many reported feelings of "guilt" or "doubt about authorship" when AI's contribution was substantial. The author argues that this emotional tension reveals a broader phenomenon, the transition of academic ethics from formal regulation to internal responsibility, as students begin to self-reflect on what it means to create honestly in a digital environment. Together, these three studies illustrate the diversity of ethical perspectives and the dependence of academic culture on context:

- In Israel (Meishar-Tal, 2025), the emphasis is on transparency and disclosure;
- In the United Kingdom (Kofinas et al., 2025), on the reorientation of assessment criteria toward process-oriented authenticity;
- In Croatia (Đerić et al., 2025), on moral self-reflection and internal ethics.

These findings show that ethical challenges related to generative AI are shaped less by technological capabilities than by academic culture and evaluative traditions. The literature indicates a shift from uniform integrity rules toward context-sensitive ethical frameworks in which responsibility, reflection, and shared creativity become central pedagogical concerns.

In addition to these national case studies, broader international research further supports the view that ethical challenges related to generative AI are deeply embedded in academic culture rather than in technological affordances alone. Bittle and El-Gayar (2025), in their systematic review of generative AI and academic integrity in higher education, argue that ethical concerns intensify in contexts where institutional policies lag behind actual academic practice. Their findings suggest that ambiguity surrounding acceptable AI use fosters both unintentional misconduct and moral uncertainty among students and staff. Rather than advocating stricter surveillance or detection mechanisms, the authors emphasise the importance of developing shared ethical norms and transparent guidance that support reflective engagement with AI tools.

Similarly, Bozkurt (2024) conceptualises generative AI as a co-creative actor within educational ecosystems, challenging traditional notions of authorship and ownership. From this perspective, ethical responsibility cannot be reduced to compliance with rules; rather, it must be understood as an ongoing negotiation among human intention, technological mediation, and institutional values. Bozkurt argues that academic ethics in the age of generative AI requires a shift from rule-based integrity to relational and dialogical ethics, in which disclosure, justification, and reflexivity become central practices in teaching and learning.

Ethical considerations surrounding authorship and responsibility are further examined by Cheng et al. (2025), who focus on AI-assisted academic writing. Their analysis highlights that the ethical use of generative AI depends not on excluding such tools but on the clarity with which their role in the writing process is articulated. According to the authors, transparency regarding AI contribution is essential for preserving scholarly trust and epistemic integrity. This aligns with Yoo's (2024) comparative review of editorial policies, which demonstrates that leading academic journals consistently reject the recognition of AI as an author while simultaneously allowing its use as a writing aid under conditions of full disclosure and human accountability.

Watson et al. (2025) extend this debate by adopting an autopoietic perspective on academic authorship. They argue that when human engagement with text production is reduced to minimal supervision of AI-generated output, ethical responsibility becomes diluted, even if formal authorship remains human. From this standpoint, the ethical risk lies not in AI assistance per se but in the erosion of reflective authorship, where scholars cease to actively shape meaning, argumentation, and epistemic positioning.

Taken together, these studies reinforce the conclusion drawn from the Israeli, British, and Croatian contexts: ethical dilemmas associated with generative AI are shaped primarily by academic values, evaluative traditions, and pedagogical expectations. Across different higher education systems, there is a visible shift from uniform integrity rules toward context-sensitive ethical frameworks that prioritise transparency, reflective authorship, and shared responsibility. This shift underscores the need to reconceptualise academic ethics not as a static set of prohibitions, but as a dynamic educational practice that evolves alongside technological change.

Generative AI in Language Learning, Translation, and Academic Practice. Recent research further confirms that integrating generative AI into language-related educational practices produces ambivalent effects that extend beyond technical efficiency. In language learning, AI-assisted writing tools support grammatical accuracy, lexical richness, and structural coherence, often enabling students to produce texts that meet formal academic standards. However, as Meishar-Tal (2025) and Bittle and El-Gayar (2025) note, such improvements may come at the cost of diminished authorial presence, as learners increasingly rely on algorithmically generated formulations rather than developing their own interpretive voice. This raises pedagogical concerns about the cultivation of reflective, value-based thinking, which remains central to language education.

From a pedagogical perspective, this shift challenges traditional assumptions about language learning as a process of meaning-making and identity construction. When students outsource formulation and stylistic decisions to generative systems, language risks becoming a neutral medium rather than a site of personal and cultural expression. As Bozkurt (2024) argues, generative AI reshapes learning environments into co-creative spaces, where responsibility for meaning is distributed between human and technological actors. In such contexts, creativity can no longer be assessed solely through linguistic output but must be evaluated through the learner's capacity to justify, reflect upon, and ethically position their use of AI tools.

Similar dynamics are evident in translation education. While AI-based translation tools significantly accelerate the translation process and improve grammatical correctness, they also tend to homogenise language and suppress contextual sensitivity. Cheng et al. (2025) and Đerić et al. (2025) highlight that AI-generated translations often prioritise semantic equivalence at the expense of pragmatic, cultural, and rhetorical nuance. As a result, the translator's role shifts from an interpretive mediator to a technical editor, potentially weakening the development of professional judgement and intercultural competence. This transformation raises important questions about how translation pedagogy should balance technological proficiency with interpretive and ethical expertise.

The implications of generative AI are equally profound in academic writing practices. As illustrated by the case involving AI detection and disputed authorship, ethical tensions frequently arise not from deliberate misconduct but from divergent understandings of acceptable AI use. Deep et al. (2025) and Yoo (2024) emphasise that detection-oriented approaches are insufficient for addressing such tensions, as they fail to engage with the underlying issue of ethical literacy. When students perceive AI primarily as a productivity-enhancing shortcut rather than as a tool that requires reflective engagement, academic integrity becomes vulnerable to erosion even in the absence of explicit rule violations.

Taken together, these observations suggest that generative AI introduces a structural tension between efficiency and reflexivity across language learning, translation, and academic practice. While AI tools undoubtedly enhance productivity and linguistic precision, unreflective reliance on them risks undermining individuality, interpretive depth, and ethical self-awareness. This tension underscores the need to reconceptualise creativity in educational contexts not as the autonomous production of original text, but as a reflective practice grounded in conscious decision-making, ethical responsibility, and transparent authorship. In this sense, generative AI does not eliminate creativity; rather, it redefines it as an ethical and pedagogical challenge that must be addressed through deliberate educational frameworks.

Authorship, Responsibility, and Ethical Transparency in AI-Assisted Writing. These practical observations align with broader academic research trends suggesting that AI use requires a new understanding of authorship and ethical transparency. Cheng et al. (2025) note that AI-assisted academic writing can be a legitimate and ethical contribution to academic literature, provided transparency is maintained. The authors emphasise that the key issue is clear disclosure of how and to what extent AI was involved in the creative process. Yoo (2024) also raises the question of accountability, arguing that AI cannot be recognised as an author because it lacks both legal and ethical responsibility. Meanwhile, Bittle and El-Gayar (2025) identify that while AI enhances academic engagement and productivity, it simultaneously increases the risk of ethical breaches when disclosure guidelines are unclear. Watson et al. (2025) further warn that there are basic ethical concerns when authors leave the text to be written by ChatGPT with very little, if any, input of their own. Taken together, these studies suggest that the core ethical issue is not the use of generative AI itself, but the erosion of reflective authorship when human engagement is reduced to minimal supervision. This positions ethical transparency and intentional human contribution as central criteria for evaluating academic integrity in AI-assisted writing.

Beyond questions of technical assistance, the integration of generative AI into academic writing fundamentally challenges long-standing assumptions about authorship as an individual, intentional, and accountable act. As Cheng et al. (2025) argue, AI-assisted writing can be considered ethically legitimate only when the human author retains epistemic control over the text and transparently discloses the role of generative tools in the writing process. In this view, authorship is not defined by the mechanical act of text production, but by responsibility for argumentation, interpretation, and scholarly positioning.

This perspective is reinforced by Yoo (2024), who emphasises that generative AI cannot be recognised as an author because it lacks both legal personhood and moral agency. While AI systems may contribute to linguistic formulation or structural organisation, they cannot assume responsibility for truth claims, ethical judgment, or the social consequences of academic knowledge. Consequently, responsibility in AI-assisted writing remains asymmetrically human, even when creative agency is partially distributed. This asymmetry underscores the need to preserve a clear distinction between tool use and authorial accountability.

However, maintaining this distinction becomes increasingly complex in practice. Bittle and El-Gayar (2025) demonstrate that ambiguity surrounding disclosure norms significantly increases the risk of ethical breaches, not necessarily through intentional misconduct, but through uncertainty about where acceptable assistance ends and unethical delegation begins. In environments where institutional guidelines are vague or inconsistent, both students and academics may unintentionally cross ethical boundaries, leading to a gradual normalisation of opaque authorship practices.

Watson et al. (2025) extend this concern by warning that minimal human engagement with AI-generated text threatens the very foundations of reflective authorship. When scholars delegate not only linguistic formulation but also conceptual development and argumentative structure to generative systems, authorship risks being reduced to post hoc supervision rather than active meaning-making. From an autopoietic perspective, such practices weaken the self-referential processes through which scholarly identity and epistemic responsibility are constituted.

Taken together, these arguments suggest that the central ethical challenge of AI-assisted writing lies not in the presence of generative technologies but in the transformation of authorship from a reflective, intentional practice into a managerial role focused on efficiency and output. Ethical transparency thus emerges as more than a formal requirement of disclosure; it becomes a pedagogical principle aimed at sustaining meaningful human engagement with knowledge production. Transparent authorship practices require authors to articulate not only whether AI was used, but how, why, and to what extent it shaped the creative and intellectual process.

In this context, academic integrity must be reconceptualised as a dynamic and educative practice rather than a static compliance framework. Evaluating integrity in AI-assisted writing involves assessing the quality of human contribution, the depth of reflection, and the ethical awareness demonstrated by the author. Such an approach shifts the focus from detecting AI use to fostering intentional authorship, integrating generative tools responsibly within the boundaries of human judgment and accountability.

Educational Implications and Emerging Trends. In the educational context, Pratiwi and Ridha's (2025) study reveals that students often perceive generative AI as a "shortcut" rather than a tool for learning, reflection, and intellectual development. Such perceptions indicate a risk that AI use may be oriented primarily toward efficiency and outcome optimisation, rather than toward deeper engagement with knowledge construction. Similarly, Meishar-Tal (2025) demonstrates that ethical attitudes toward AI vary significantly depending on academic experience: senior researchers tend to approach generative tools with caution and concern for academic integrity, whereas younger scholars are more likely to view them as innovative aids for structuring thought and improving writing. This generational difference suggests that ethical orientations toward AI are not fixed, but develop through academic socialisation and pedagogical guidance.

Taken together, these insights suggest that generative AI is not merely a technological development, but a cultural and ethical challenge that reshapes conceptions of authorship, responsibility, and the creative process in higher education. To maintain ethical balance, educational institutions must move beyond instrumental approaches that focus solely on technological competence. Instead, they must foster critical reflection on how AI influences human creativity, judgment, and moral awareness within academic practices.

On this basis, three interrelated trends can be identified. First, a transformation of authorship is evident, as human creators increasingly assume the role of editors or coordinators who oversee and contextualise algorithmic input (Cheng et al., 2025; Watson et al., 2025). Second, there is a reorientation of responsibility, with human authors retaining final accountability for content, methodology, and ethical transparency, even when generative tools are used (Yoo, 2024). Third, a broader cultural shift in academia can be observed, moving from prohibition-based responses ("AI use is banned") toward a culture of accountability that emphasises transparency, reflection, and digital literacy (Bittle, El-Gayar, 2025; Đerić et al., 2025). Together, these trends highlight the need for pedagogical frameworks that support ethical literacy and reflective engagement with generative AI across educational contexts.

Synthesis and Conceptual Implications for Higher Education. Recent studies (Bittle, El-Gayar, 2025; Watson et al., 2025; Bozkurt, 2024) emphasise that generative AI is not merely a technological innovation but a cultural and ethical phenomenon that reshapes the conditions of knowledge production in higher education. Across diverse academic contexts, the author's role is increasingly redefined from that of an independent creator to that of an editor, coordinator, and ethical decision-maker who oversees and contextualises algorithmic input. Despite the distributed nature of creative agency, human responsibility for content, interpretation, and ethical accountability remains central, underscoring the importance of ethical transparency and technological literacy.

Building on these insights, this study contributes to current discourse by integrating ethical theory, linguistic philosophy, and empirical evidence to conceptualise generative AI not merely as a technological tool but as a catalyst of epistemic and cultural transformation. Its originality lies in combining philosophical

interpretation with case-based analysis in language and translation education, demonstrating how AI-mediated co-creation reshapes established understandings of authorship, creativity, and ethical responsibility. Rather than framing AI use primarily as a compliance issue, the study highlights the need to reconsider how academic values are enacted in AI-supported practices.

From a practical perspective, the findings point to an urgent need for higher education institutions to move beyond fragmented or purely regulatory responses. Establishing transparent guidelines for AI-assisted writing, embedding ethical literacy in curricula, and redefining assessment criteria toward process-oriented authenticity are key institutional priorities. At the same time, the study acknowledges its limitations: its qualitative and interpretive focus provides conceptual depth but limits generalisability. Future research would benefit from expanded cross-cultural analyses and longitudinal studies examining how sustained AI integration influences academic identity, creativity, and ethical reasoning over time.

Taken together, the literature and analysis presented here suggest that integrating generative AI into academic practice cannot be adequately addressed by technical regulation or prohibitive policies alone. Instead, it calls for a reconfiguration of pedagogical responsibility, in which ethical reflection, transparency, and intentional authorship become central educational objectives. These considerations provide the conceptual foundation for the conclusions that follow, which address how generative AI reshapes creativity, responsibility, and academic ethics in contemporary higher education.

While the literature provides important theoretical insights into generative AI and academic ethics, there remains a need to examine how these issues manifest in concrete educational practices. The following section addresses this gap through case-based analysis.

Analysis of AI-Assisted Text Production in Educational Contexts

Building on the theoretical insights discussed above, the following section analyses three illustrative cases of AI-assisted text production in higher education. It examines how generative artificial intelligence reshapes authorship, creativity, and ethical responsibility across different educational practices, highlighting recurring tensions between efficiency and reflective engagement.

Case 1: Generative AI in Language Learning. The first case concerns foreign language learning, in which students were asked to write reflective essays on the topic "Language and Identity," with the option to use generative AI tools such as ChatGPT. The resulting texts were linguistically accurate, coherent, and structurally well-formed. However, they frequently lacked emotional depth, interpretive nuance, and a distinct authorial voice. From an analytical perspective, this case illustrates a shift in creative agency. While students remain nominal authors of the text, a significant portion of linguistic formulation is delegated to AI systems. This redistribution of agency results in a form of standardised expression, in which individual voice is replaced by algorithmically optimised language. The ethical implication lies in the tension between linguistic correctness and authentic self-expression. Although AI enhances formal quality, it risks diminishing reflective thinking and value-based meaning-making, both of which are central to creativity and language education. This suggests that creativity in AI-assisted contexts must be understood not only as textual production but also as the capacity to engage critically and reflectively with the writing process.

Case 2: Generative AI in Translation Practice. The second case focuses on translation tasks in which students were asked to translate a journalistic text from English into Lithuanian with permission to use AI tools. Most participants relied on generative AI to produce initial translations, limiting their role to editing and correction. The analysis shows that while AI-generated translations were grammatically correct and semantically accurate, they often failed to preserve cultural nuance, rhetorical intention, and contextual meaning. As a result, the role of the translator shifted from an interpretive agent to a technical editor. This case highlights a transformation in authorship and professional competence. Translation, traditionally understood as an interpretive and culturally situated practice, becomes partially automated, with human contribution reduced to post-processing. The ethical tension here emerges between efficiency and interpretive responsibility: while AI accelerates the translation process, it risks weakening the development of critical judgement and intercultural sensitivity.

Case 3: Generative AI and Academic Writing Integrity. The third case examines academic writing, in which a student submitted an essay partially generated by AI. Although AI-detection tools indicated the presence of generative content, the student claimed that AI had been used only for structuring the text. This situation revealed a divergence in ethical interpretations. The instructor emphasised the importance of transparency and explicit disclosure, while the student framed AI use as a legitimate form of support aimed at improving efficiency and coherence. Analytically, this case demonstrates that ethical challenges associated with generative AI do not arise solely from rule violations but from differing understandings of authorship,

responsibility, and acceptable academic practice. The absence of shared norms regarding AI use creates a grey zone in which ethical responsibility becomes ambiguous. This case underscores the importance of ethical literacy, understood as the ability to recognise, articulate, and justify one's use of AI in the academic writing process. Without such literacy, academic integrity risks being reduced to compliance rather than reflective practice.

Cross-Case Analysis: Emerging Patterns and Ethical Tensions. Taken together, the three cases reveal several recurring patterns. First, generative AI redistributes creative agency between human and technological actors, transforming authorship into a hybrid and negotiated practice. Second, a consistent tension emerges between efficiency and reflexivity: while AI enhances productivity and formal accuracy, it simultaneously reduces interpretive depth and individual voice. Third, the analysis highlights that ethical challenges are primarily cultural and pedagogical rather than technological. The key issue is not whether AI is used, but how it is used, understood, and disclosed within academic contexts. These findings suggest that creativity in AI-assisted environments should be reconceptualised as a reflective, ethically grounded process. Similarly, academic integrity must move beyond rule-based frameworks toward practices that emphasise transparency, responsibility, and critical engagement with generative technologies.

Conclusions

This study examined how generative artificial intelligence reshapes understandings of creative activity and academic ethics in educational and research contexts, using a theoretical-analytical, case-based approach.

In relation to the first research objective, the analysis demonstrates that generative AI significantly transforms the understanding of authorship, creativity, and responsibility in academic contexts. The examination of cases in language learning, translation, and academic writing reveals that authorship is no longer an exclusively individual act. In the language-learning case, students' authorial voice becomes increasingly standardised through AI-assisted formulation, while in translation practice, the role of the translator shifts from interpretive meaning-making to technical editing. In academic writing, authorship emerges as a negotiated practice shaped by both human intention and algorithmic contribution. These findings indicate that creative agency is redistributed, yet human responsibility is not diminished; rather, it is intensified, as the author assumes the role of an editor, coordinator, and ethical decision-maker.

Addressing the second research objective, the study shows that the key ethical challenges associated with AI-assisted text production are primarily cultural and pedagogical rather than technological. This is particularly evident in the academic writing case, where differing interpretations of acceptable AI use among students and instructors create ethical ambiguity. Across all analysed cases, the absence of shared norms regarding transparency, disclosure, and the intentional use of AI creates uncertainty about authorship and responsibility. These findings challenge control-oriented approaches based on prohibition or detection and suggest that academic integrity should be reconceptualised as a reflective, context-sensitive practice embedded within educational processes.

Regarding the third research objective, the analysis highlights the broader implications of generative AI for ethical literacy and academic integrity. The cases demonstrate that while AI enhances productivity and linguistic accuracy, it can weaken interpretive depth, individual voice, and reflective engagement. This is particularly evident in translation, where contextual sensitivity is reduced, and in language learning, where personal expression is neutralised. At the same time, the academic writing case reveals that students often lack the conceptual tools to critically assess and justify their use of AI. These findings suggest that creativity in AI-assisted environments should be understood not as efficient text production, but as the capacity for conscious and ethically grounded decision-making. Ethical literacy thus emerges as a central competence, involving the ability to recognise, articulate, and critically evaluate the role of AI in academic work.

At the same time, this study has certain limitations. Its qualitative and interpretive approach provides conceptual depth but does not allow for empirical generalisation. The use of illustrative cases enables the identification of recurring patterns and tensions, but future research could extend these insights through empirical and comparative studies across different educational contexts. On this basis, the study argues that higher education institutions must move beyond purely regulatory responses to cultivate ethical literacy. This includes integrating reflective practices into curricula, developing transparent guidelines for AI-assisted writing, and redefining assessment criteria to emphasise process-oriented authorship and critical engagement. Ultimately, generative AI should be understood not merely as a technical aid or a threat to academic integrity, but as a catalyst for rethinking authorship, creativity, and responsibility in contemporary academia.

Reference list

1. Bittle, K., & El-Gayar, O. (2025). Generative AI and academic integrity in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda. *Information,* 16(4), 296. https://doi.org/10.3390/info16040296
2. Bozkurt, A. (2024). GenAI et al.: Cocreation, Authorship, Ownership, Academic Ethics and Integrity in a Time of Generative AI. *Open Praxis,* 16(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.16.1.654
3. Cheng, A., Calhoun, A., & Reedy, G. (2025). Artificial intelligence-assisted academic writing: recommendations for ethical use. *Advances in Simulation,* 10, 22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41077-025-00350-6
4. Deep, P. D., Edgington, W. D., Ghosh, N., & Rahaman, M. S. (2025). Evaluating the effectiveness and ethical implications of AI detection tools in higher education. *Information,* 16(10), 905. https://doi.org/10.3390/info16100905
5. Đerić, E., Frank, D., & Vuković, D. (2025). Exploring the ethical implications of using generative AI tools in higher education. *Informatics,* 12(2), 36. https://doi.org/10.3390/informatics12020036
6. Kofinas, A. K., Tsay, C. H. H., & Pike, D. (2025). The impact of generative AI on academic integrity of authentic assessments within a higher education context. *British Journal of Educational Technology,* 56, 2522–2549. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13585
7. Meishar-Tal, H. (2025). Between technical assistance and authorship: Researchers' ethical considerations of using generative AI for scientific writing. *Ubiquity Proceedings,* 6(1). https://doi.org/10.5334/uproc.202
8. Pratiwi, H., Suherman, Hasruddin, & Ridha, M. (2025). Between shortcut and ethics: Navigating the use of artificial intelligence in academic writing among Indonesian doctoral students. *European Journal of Education,* 60(2). https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70083
9. Watson, S., Brezovec, E., & Romic, J. (2025). The role of generative AI in academic and scientific authorship: an autopoietic perspective. *AI & Society,* 40, 3225–3235. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-024-02174-w
10. Yoo, J. H. (2025). Defining the boundaries of AI use in scientific writing: a comparative review of editorial policies. *Journal of Korean Medical Science,* 40(23). https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2025.40.e187

DIRBTINIO INTELEKTO SUGENERUOTAS TEKSTAS KAIP IŠŠŪKIS KŪRYBIŠKUMUI IR AKADEMINEI ETIKAI

Santrauka

Generatyvinio dirbtinio intelekto (DI) įrankiai, paremti didžiųjų kalbinių modelių (LLM) technologija, keičia kūrimo, rašymo ir mokymosi procesus aukštajame moksle, keldami klausimus dėl autorystės, originalumo ir akademinės atsakomybės. Nepaisant augančio mokslinių tyrimų skaičiaus, dauguma jų daugiausia dėmesio skiria reguliavimo ir plagijavimo problematikai, tuo tarpu mažiau analizuojama platesnė kūrybiškumo ir akademinės etikos transformacija. Šio straipsnio tikslas – išanalizuoti, kaip generatyvus tekstas keičia kūrybinės veiklos ir akademinės etikos sampratą švietimo ir mokslinių tyrimų kontekste. Tyrime taikomas kokybinis teorinis-analitinis požiūris, derinant hermeneutinę ir diskurso analizę. Analizė grindžiama trimis iliustratyviais atvejais iš kalbų mokymo, vertimo praktikos ir akademinio rašymo, kurie nagrinėjami kaip analitiniai pavyzdžiai siekiant atskleisti kylančias etines ir kultūrines įtampas. Tyrimo rezultatai rodo, kad pagrindiniai su generatyviniu DI susiję iššūkiai yra labiau kultūrinio ir pedagoginio, o ne technologinio pobūdžio. Generatyvinės sistemos perskirsto kūrybinę veiklą tarp žmogaus ir algoritminių įrankių, transformuodamos autoriaus vaidmenį į redaktoriaus, koordinatoriaus ir etinių sprendimų priėmėjo. Nors DI didina produktyvumą ir kalbinį tikslumą, neapgalvotas jo naudojimas gali silpninti interpretacinį gilumą, individualų balsą ir vertybinį mąstymą. Rezultatai atskleidžia būtinybę perkonceptualizuoti akademinį sąžiningumą kaip refleksyvią ir procesinę praktiką bei plėtoti švietimo sistemas, kurios skatintų etinį raštingumą, skaidrumą ir atsakingą autorystę. Straipsnis prisideda prie mokslinės diskusijos, pateikdamas integruotą požiūrį, kuriame generatyvinis DI traktuojamas kaip katalizatorius, skatinantis permąstyti kūrybiškumą, autorystę ir etinę atsakomybę šiuolaikiniame aukštajame moksle.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: generatyvinis dirbtinis intelektas, akademinis sąžiningumas, etinis raštingumas, kūrybiškumas, aukštasis mokslas

Informacija apie autorę

Dr. Giedrė Paurienė. Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Viešojo saugumo akademija, Bendrųjų ir socialinių kompetencijų institutas, docentė. Mokslinių tyrimų kryptys: edukologija, akademinė etika, dirbtinio intelekto taikymas švietime.
El. pašto adresas: pauriene@mruni.eu
ORCID: 0000-0003-2902-2855