Journal of Literature and Linguistics Studies
ISSN: 3078-4832
DOI: 10.61424/jlls
Journal Homepage: www.bluemarkpublishers.com/index.php/JLLS

JLLS
BLUEMARK PUBLISHERS

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Ethical Paradox of AI-Generated Texts: Investigating the Moral Responsibility in Generative Models

Parvaiz A. Ganai[1] and Irshad A. Naikoo[2]
[12]Department of Foreign Languages, College of Arts and Humanities, Jazan University, Jazan, Saudi Arabia
Corresponding Author: Parvaiz A. Ganai **E-mail**: pganai@jazanu.edu.sa

| ABSTRACT
The rapid growth of large language models (LLMs) has transformed natural language processing, enabling the creation of text that is almost close to human writing. However, the increasing integration of AI-generated content has raised serious ethical challenges, particularly when we talk about the attribution of moral duty. The questions arise about accountability for misinformation, bias, and harmful outputs because LLMs operate without true agency or intent. This study critically examines the ethical paradox of AI-generated texts. It explores the roles and responsibilities of developers, users, and policymakers in mitigating risks associated with generative models. The study emphasizes the need for ethical frameworks that make fairness, transparency, and human oversight a priority. Furthermore, this research aims to contribute to current discussions on the moral and societal consequences of AI-generated language. The study offers a framework for responsible and ethically aligned AI development.

| KEYWORDS

Large Language Models (LLMs), Ethical Concerns, Accountability, Ethical Frameworks, AI-generated Content

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 21 April 2025 **PUBLISHED:** 08 June 2025 **DOI:** 10.61424/jlls.v3.i2.329

1. Introduction

Digital content creation has undergone a radical change due to the generative artificial intelligence (AI). It has sparked significant ethical challenges and concerns [1]. Large Language Models (LLMs) constitute a transformative advancement in the field of natural language processing (NLP) that pushes the boundaries of machine-generated text to unparalleled levels. These models, which have been trained on extensive and varied textual datasets, demonstrate exceptional ability in producing text that is human-like, opening up applications in a variety of fields. These models, which have been trained on extensive and varied textual datasets, demonstrate exceptional ability in producing text that is human-like, opening up applications in a variety of fields. Notable applications span multiple domains, including sentiment analysis [4, 5], question answering systems [2,3], and automated text production [6]. The versatility of LLMs has made them invaluable in both business and academic applications. But their proliferation has unearthed both potential and perils that demand a deeper exploration.

The tendency of LLMs to produce biased content is one of the most serious issues they face [7, 8, 9, 10]. These problems result from the models relying on substantial datasets that may inadvertently contain offensive content. As LLMs can replicate or resemble copyrighted content, their use poses serious concerns about intellectual property rights violations [11, 12]. The possibility of LLMs being misused for insensitive purposes, such as producing and spreading propaganda, digitally manipulated or fabricated texts, and disinformation, is equally concerning [13, 14]. These ethical and societal implications highlight the urgent need for frameworks to regulate the proper use of LLMs.

To answer these issues, using AI-generated text as a solution has gained popularity. Yet, the quick progress of LLMs has made it harder to differentiate between AI-generated content and human-written content. As a result, noticing the differences between AI-created and human-written text can help to create more effective and trustworthy AI outputs, but at the same time, it makes the task of detecting more complicated. In recent years, experts have devised many ways to identify AI-generated text, from looking at numbers to using machine learning tools [15, 16, 17]. This work has added to what we know, but it further shows how the problem keeps changing as LLMs get better.

In recent years, generative AI has shown amazing abilities to create text, pictures, music, videos, and even fake data that looks like it came from humans [18]. This AI includes many different technologies, from deep learning models like GANs to the newest large language models, and the systems that work with multiple types of input. These novel concepts have led to big changes in several fields. For example, making education fit everyone, helping artists be more creative, finding health problems, and doing scientific studies. Undoubtedly, these AI systems lead to novel ideas, but at the same time, they also pose risks. These systems carry significant risks: potential misuse, inherent biases, dissemination of misinformation, unauthorized replication of copyrighted work, and complex ethical dilemmas. Current regulatory frameworks struggle to match the rapid pace of technological advancement in this field [19].

The ethical implications of generative AI cannot be ruled out for a range of issues like data security, privacy concerns, copyright infringement, the spread of misinformation, and the increasing biases [1]. The most concerning issue is ability of generative AI to create deepfakes—fabricated media that is hard to distinguish whether the content is fake or authentic. As a result, it has sparked significant debate among the masses about its impact on truth, trust, and the integrity of democratic societies [20].

Furthermore, using generative AI to produce fabricated data raises ethical questions concerning consent, privacy, and the limits of ethical data utilization [21]. Equally important is the issue of inherent biases embedded within AI models, which often originate from the datasets used to train them. Considering all this, there is an urgent need for the development of equitable and fair AI systems to avoid these existing societal inequalities [22].

This study aims to explore the ethical challenges caused by generative AI in detail. A systematic literature review will be employed to identify and analyze the main issues that are debated across several fields. The review provides a comprehensive understanding of the ethical landscape of generative AI by adopting an interdisciplinary approach. It draws attention to the intricate interplay among technology, society, and ethics. It seeks to catalog existing ethical concerns and evaluate proposed solutions and frameworks to address these challenges. Through this analysis, the paper contributes to the ongoing discourse on responsible AI development, offering insights and recommendations for policymakers, technologists, and researchers involved in shaping the future of generative AI [23].

The way generative AI technologies show rapid growth and integrate into various fields of daily life, the need for ethical considerations seems urgent. This study aims to foster a more comprehensive understanding of these issues by advocating for a dynamic approach to ethical AI development—one that prioritizes human rights, fairness, and transparency. By doing so, it seeks to pave the way for responsible innovation that aligns with societal values and mitigates potential risks.

2. Overview of Generative AI Technologies and Features

Neural Machine Translation Generative AI technologies are leaders in artificial intelligence research and application for the exceptional capacity to produce unique material and creative solutions. It serves the purpose of creating new content or solutions that mimic data distributions found in the real world. In comparison to other discriminative models, which predict outcomes based on existing data, generative models have the unique capability to generate entirely new data instances. As a result, vast possibilities are created across diverse fields, including art, music, literature, science, and technology.

Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), which were introduced by [24], are a key pillar of generative AI. GANs include two neural networks: the generator and the discriminator. These networks operate competitively and dynamically. The generator produces data that is different from real data. On the other hand, the discriminator verifies the authenticity of the generated data. This process allows the model to learn the basic data distribution effectively and enables it to create new instances that closely resemble the original dataset [25].

Variational Autoencoders (VAEs), which were introduced in 2013 by [26], are another foundational technology in generative AI. VAEs encode input data into a latent space representation, from which new data instances can be generated. VAEs excel in generating new data points that are similar to the original dataset. It is done by maximizing the lower constraint on the likelihood of the data, which makes them especially useful for applications like image production and reconstruction.

Applications, such as Generative Pretrained Transformer (GPT) and DeepSeek, of generative AI are vast and transformative across numerous domains. For example, GANs have been used to create realistic images and artworks in art and design, blurring the lines between human and machine creativity. On the other hand, generative models are being explored for drug discovery and personalized medicine due to their ability to generate molecular structures and simulate patient data. In the entertainment industry, groundbreaking developments with AI-generated music and video content are being witnessed. As a result, it offers new opportunities for creative expression and audience engagement [27].

Generative AI technologies, such as GANs and VAEs, are redefining the boundaries of innovation that made science fiction a reality. These technologies develop further to unlock new creative possibilities and address complex challenges across a wide range of fields.

3. Ethical Concerns of Generative AI

3.1. Authorship and Academic Integrity in the Age of Generative AI

There have been significant ethical discussions triggered by the emergence of generative AI in academia, particularly regarding authorship and the erosion of academic integrity. Traditional boundaries have been blurred, and the lack of clarity has highlighted major concerns. As a result, distinguishing between original content and AI-generated material has become increasingly difficult. AI has exceptional accuracy in duplicating human writing. It is a serious problem since it encourages plagiarism and makes it possible for people to claim the work they didn't own. In addition to violating academic standards, this unethical conduct diminishes the sincere efforts of hardworking students whose labor is unjustly eclipsed by others who take advantage of AI for expediency [28]. To address these challenges, educational and publishing institutions need to develop more advanced detection mechanisms that are capable of making a difference between human- and AI-generated content accurately. Traditional detection methods like plagiarism checkers often fail to identify AI-generated text that doesn't copy existing sources.

Emerging approaches, including machine learning algorithms and explicable AI, have shown promise in identifying subtle linguistic patterns characteristic of AI-generated content. Such measures are essential to ensure proper attribution of students' and researchers' contributions and to uphold the integrity of academic work [29].

Furthermore, academia must address the practical challenges of identifying and preventing dishonest activities made possible by generative AI. Because AI can create content that evades these algorithms, traditional plagiarism detection technologies are not capable. Therefore, educational institutions need to make investments in more advanced technology that can not only detect plagiarism but also unethical cooperation. It could assess students' genuine comprehension in ways that AI cannot. However, it is important to scrutinize AI-generated content for biases and inaccuracies because AI models may unintentionally reinforce inaccurate information or reflect biases present in their training data [30].

To protect the value of academic learning and the integrity of scholarly communication, two critical needs must be addressed: the creation of new instruments and the improvement of current procedures. These tools must be successfully incorporated into educational settings to serve as protections against AI abuse and guarantee that academic achievements accurately represent a student's knowledge and abilities. Additionally, institutions must foster ongoing discussions on ethical practices, adapting to the rapidly evolving capabilities of AI. This approach is important to preserving the core principles of academia, which are increasingly challenged in this digital era [31, 32].

3.2 Intellectual Property Rights, Copyright Issues, Authenticity, and Attribution

The existing studies show the quick growth of generative AI presents serious ethical questions about copyright infringement and intellectual property rights (IPR), especially when it comes to AI-generated works, [25, 33 ,34, 35]. Traditional concepts of ownership and authorship become increasingly complex when AI produces content that is virtually indistinguishable from human-created works. Scholars like Zhang and Zhong have underscored these challenges, emphasizing the intricate legal dilemmas that arise when attempting to apply copyright protections to AI-generated outputs [25, 33, 34, 35].

There are serious debates over the issues of originality, creativity, and fair use in AI-generated content. The question arises whether an AI system can be regarded as the creator of a piece of writing or not? If yes, how should such works be treated by concepts like public domain or fair use? Furthermore, there are financial implications to consider; allowing AI-made works to be copyrighted could hurt innovation, limit knowledge sharing, and encourage monopolies. [36] emphasizes how crucial it is to develop new legal frameworks to deal with these issues, making sure that the rights of human producers and the general welfare are balanced. Similarly, [37] draws attention to how challenging it is to ascertain copyright ownership for AI-generated works. The autonomous nature of AI disrupts traditional copyright frameworks, which are inherently centered on human authorship. It is crucial to distinguish between purely AI-generated content and works with significant human input is essential. This guarantees safeguarding creators' rights and ensures proper recognition and compensation.

Besides, the existing frameworks of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) are increasingly ineffective in accommodating the peculiar features of works produced by AI. These problems originate from the part AI plays in the creative task, which alters traditional ideas of creation and originality. [38] advocated for a change in IPR frameworks because of the advancement of AI, noting the obvious losses of innovation accompanying the restrictions. However, they contended that providing copyright to AI-produced works may unduly diminish competition and create negative economic consequences. The management of licenses and royalties associated with works produced by AI further complicates the economic picture.

Concerns about the accountability, openness, and authenticity of AI-generated information, as examined by [32, 39], increase these problems. Those researchers have noted that artificial intelligence (AI) can create content that is almost identical to human-produced works, like deepfakes and synthetic media, making it difficult to confirm the veracity of information. Because AI may produce and distribute incredibly lifelike but wholly fake content, the study cautions against the possibility of abuse.

These challenges are intensified by the lack of transparency in the creation and distribution of AI-generated materials, making accountability difficult to establish. Robust verification mechanisms are required to differentiate between real and AI-generated content. There is also a need to ensure that creators and distributors of AI-generated information are held accountable for their outputs. Improving transparency depends on both technological solutions, such as traceability features embedded within AI systems, and policy measures that mandate disclosure of AI's role in content creation.

It is essential to develop comprehensive legal frameworks and ethical guidelines to effectively navigate these challenges. Safeguarding the rights and interests of all stakeholders, such frameworks must be flexible and adaptive, capable of keeping pace with the rapid evolution of AI technology. To establish these frameworks, need for collaboration among technologists, legal experts, policymakers, and the broader community to ensure that AI's potential is harnessed responsibly. Society can maximize the benefits of AI-generated content by promoting ethical AI practices. However, it must also mitigate the risks of misuse, thereby preserving the integrity of information and maintaining public trust in an increasingly digital world.

3.3 Privacy, Trust, and Bias in Diverse AI-Driven Domains

The rapid implementation of artificial intelligence (AI) in various fields, including healthcare, education, and the automotive sector, has opened revolutionary opportunities, transformed techniques, and improved outcomes. However, several ethical and practical issues are raised by this technical development, particularly in the areas of bias, privacy, and trust. In healthcare, the use of large language models (LLMs) and generative AI for medical data analysis underscores the critical importance of safeguarding patient privacy through robust anonymization and encryption techniques. [40] underscores the importance of robust data protection measures, including advanced encryption techniques, secure data storage systems, and stringent access controls. Despite these initiatives, there is still a possibility of privacy violations, which could result in identity theft and damage to an individual's or an organization's reputation. The healthcare industry must adopt comprehensive security strategies to mitigate these risks. These strategies should integrate technological safeguards, employee training, and proactive incident management.

Beyond privacy, using AI in healthcare brings up significant issues about data integrity and patient trust. The data used to train AI systems must be managed carefully to ensure their accuracy and maintain the trust of patients whose information is utilized. In case of any lapse in these areas could undermine the transformative potential of AI in healthcare, such as advancements in diagnostics, personalized treatment, and improved patient outcomes. As noted in [41], AI models might worsen existing biases if training data is not thoroughly checked and selected to ensure fairness. Privacy is a major issue too, as the extensive data collection required for AI development can sometimes cross ethical boundaries, necessitating strict data governance policies. [42] further emphasizes the environmental toll of AI systems, driven by the significant energy consumption required to train and operate these advanced models. To address this, energy-efficient technologies and sustainable practices should be adopted in AI research and deployment.

Integrating AI into education has brought significant changes, like those in healthcare. With AI, we now have personalized learning platforms, automated grading systems, and virtual tutors, which offer exciting ways to enhance learning. However, these developments also bring up important issues related to privacy, trust, and fairness. AI systems in schools collect a lot of sensitive data about students, such as academic records, behaviour, and even biometric information. It is crucial to protect this data to prevent misuse. To keep student information safe, methods like anonymizing and encrypting data, which are also used in healthcare, are necessary. Despite these steps, there is a chance that someone could still identify a student, especially if data is shared with outside groups. Strong data protection, such as secure storage and access controls, is critical to ensuring compliance with regulations like FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) and GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation).

Trust is another important factor in using AI effectively in education. Students, parents, and teachers need to have confidence that AI systems are fair and accurate. For instance, if an AI grading system gives inconsistent or biased results, it might lose its credibility. Everyone needs to understand how AI makes its decisions, as this transparency helps build trust and holds the system accountable. Bias in AI is a major issue, too. If the data used to train AI reflects past racial or socioeconomic inequalities, these biases could continue. For example, AI might suggest lower expectations for certain student groups because of biased data. Developers must carefully review the training data to ensure fairness and inclusivity. Also, AI should be adaptable to different learning styles and cultural contexts. This helps ensure that all students have fair opportunities, avoiding a one-size-fits-all approach that might not suit everyone. It is crucial to address privacy, trust, and bias issues thoughtfully to use it fairly and successfully in schools, as AI offers great potential in education.

AI is changing many fields, like education, healthcare, and cars, but it brings challenges. In the automobile industry, AI introduces new technologies such as self-driving cars, predictive maintenance, and personalized in-car experiences. These developments can make driving safer and more convenient, but they also raise important ethical and practical issues, especially concerning data privacy and user safety.

With advancements in autonomous vehicles, predictive maintenance, and in-car personalization, the automobile industry is undergoing a transformation driven by AI. These innovations promise to enhance safety and convenience, but they raise significant ethical and practical challenges, too. Self-driving and smart cars collect a lot of data, including the routes, driving habits, and even sounds or videos of passengers inside. This information is valuable for improving car systems, but it poses privacy risks if not properly protected. Techniques like anonymizing data and encryption are crucial to safeguarding this information. However, because car systems are interconnected, there is a greater risk of cyberattacks, which can threaten both privacy and safety.

While addressing privacy and security concerns, building trust in AI-driven automotive technologies is equally vital to ensuring their widespread acceptance and safe integration into everyday life. People need to trust that these systems are safe and reliable. AI systems must be accurate and robust enough to handle various driving conditions, including bad weather or unexpected obstacles. AI systems need to be transparent about their decision-making processes, such as why they brake or change lanes, to ensure user trust and accountability.

Even with reliable and transparent AI systems, the issue of bias remains. Bias can impact fairness and safety in complex situations. If the AI system is mainly trained on data from specific areas, it might not perform well in different environments. Developers need to ensure that AI models are trained with diverse datasets to consider a range of driving conditions and behaviours. Additionally, AI systems in self-driving cars must prioritize safety and fairness to avoid unfairly favouring certain pedestrians or drivers during emergency scenarios.

3.4 Misinformation and Deepfakes: Challenges and Solutions

The problem of fake information made by AI is getting worse. This type of false information can fool people and be used in harmful ways. As highlighted in studies, such as [43], show that AI can create fake content that looks real and convincing. This makes it hard for us to know what is true and what is false, leading to confusion. Because of this confusion, people can be easily deceived, which harms honest conversations. Fake information can change how we think and act in negative ways. Social media spreads these fake stories quickly, which makes it even harder to control and fix the issue. This is a serious problem that affects how we see the world and how we interact with each other in daily life.

One major issue with AI-created content is that it often lacks clear authorship or is credited to the wrong person, making it difficult to identify who is responsible. This lack of accountability, as demonstrated by [44, 45], makes it challenging to hold content creators liable for their work. Addressing misinformation driven by AI requires more than just technological fixes. A complete strategy is needed, one that includes public awareness, cooperation across various fields, and establishing strong legal guidelines to control the ethical use of AI.

Deepfake technology, which uses AI to change images and sounds to produce fake content. It adds to these challenges by increasing risks of privacy breaches and identity theft. Researchers have noted that deepfakes can convincingly mimic real people, resulting in issues like harming reputations, causing emotional distress, and financial scams [46]. Additionally, deepfakes can spread false information, blurring the line between what is real and fake. Legal measures are equally critical to deter the creation and distribution of deepfakes, protect victims, and hold perpetrators accountable.

3.5 Educational Ethics: Navigating the Integration of Generative AI Tools

The incorporation of generative AI tools in the educational system is a complex blend of opportunity and ethical issues. Though they are very convenient and powerful, overuse can depreciate the learning process, as Ref. [47] states, citing dangers like abuse of AI during exams, leading to academic misconduct and greater plagiarism [47, 31, 48, 49]. Overreliance on AI also stands to cancel out the capacity of students for independent thinking and problem-solving since the convenience of recourse to AI-generated solutions may discourage them from engaging in genuine investigation of learning content. To prevent the occurrence of such risks, schools need to create certain policies and guidelines that focus on academic integrity and the ethical use of AI, like designing exams that assess students' knowledge and application of concepts, thereby building critical thinking skills. Also, upholding ethical academic culture involves training students and teachers in the right use of AI tools. Security and privacy are equally important concerns, with Ref. [50] noting ensuring student privacy through proper consent processes, anonymization of data, and robust security measures [50]. Lastly, addressing bias in AI algorithms, typically emerging from poor-quality training data, needs to focus on inclusive data sets, transparent methods, and regular audits to ensure fairness and justice in learning solutions.

3.6 Transparency and Accountability in diverse AI-Driven Domains

Transparency and accountability are underlying values in the use and deployment of AI systems across various fields. The two values ensure that AI technologies are used ethically and responsibly and in such a way that they maximize public trust. The following is an exploration of transparency and accountability in various AI-based fields with an emphasis on their importance and the challenges faced.

Transparency and explainability lie at the heart of AI applications in healthcare, particularly because such technologies have a direct bearing on patient care and outcomes, as argued by research in [51], which describes the catastrophic consequences of black box AI systems on patient autonomy, one of the fundamental principles of modern medical ethics [52, 51]. When patients are deprived of access to intelligible and understandable information about AI-based components of their treatment or diagnosis, their ability to give informed consent is undermined, raising relevant questions of accountability and legal liability in the case of negative consequences of AI-generated recommendations. This demand for transparency is not only within the patient encounter itself but has broader social implications, with Ref. [53] describing the risks of algorithmic opacity, such as systemic bias and discrimination, that can entrench inequalities and put power in the hands of those who possess AI technologies. To address such challenges, regulatory co-production offers a potential way of bringing together technologists, ethicists, and regulators with the public to co-design governance arrangements mediating AI's different implications that support innovation and ethical, equitable deployment by societal values [32].

For example, in finance, credit scoring models, fraud detection models, or trading models that use AI must be interpretable when deciding to notify customers when AI is deciding, such as approving a loan or recommending investments, while banks and financial institutions must achieve regulatory compliance and eliminate racial or gender bias by regularly auditing for fairness and accuracy. Similarly, in criminal justice systems, AI predictive policing, AI risk assessment, or AI sentencing must be explainable in prediction and data analysis in open-source algorithms and public availability to facilitate fairness, whereas law enforcement and judicial systems must allow for accountability and appeal mechanisms to facilitate individual rights. When it comes to self-driving cars, transparency is transparency in the explanation of AI decision-making, particularly in crash or near-crash situations, by way of open data of AI perception and action and regulatory explanation with allegation of liability for AI breakdown. In content and social media moderation, recommendatory and content filtering AI algorithms need to be explainable and inform users when content is removed or marked as such, without having to blow hateful content out of proportion or censor free speech, and independent auditing is in their interest. In education, AI grading software, adaptive learning, or student tracking must indicate how they work so that students and teachers know what they are doing, but developers and institutions should not be biased and must include measures to correct errors or discriminatory outcomes. In employment and human resource management, AI applicant rating software or AI resume screening software must reveal algorithms and criteria and inform candidates of AI use, whereas employers must eschew discrimination as well as conduct periodic audits and bias testing. In environmental monitoring and climate science, climate forecasting models utilized for climate prediction, disaster relief efforts, or resource distribution must be transparent in terms of data sources and assumptions, and open access to datasets and models will promote collaboration, while accuracy and dependability must be guaranteed by governments and organizations, and misuse must be prevented through regulation. Finally, in retail and e-commerce, AI uses in product recommendations, prices, or inventory management must be transparent in their treatment of customer data, informing customers regarding AI-driven pricing or product availability, while retailers must not discriminate and have open policies towards customer complaints and redressals.

Despite the importance of transparency and accountability, there are several challenges, including the inherent opacity of complex AI models, particularly deep learning systems that are referred to as "black boxes," and the difficulty of balancing transparency with data privacy, particularly where private data must be protected. Moreover, regulatory gaps in most geographies offer large opportunities for abuse, and it takes ongoing checking and intervention for AI systems to be bias-free. Best practice in response consists of creating XAI systems, which provide explanations for the choices they make understandable to humans, and regular audits and checks for AI systems concerning bias, correctness, and conformance to ethical requirements. Engaging with various groups of stakeholders, such as end-users, in AI system design and deployment can also ensure fairness and inclusivity, while establishing strong regulatory frameworks and making ethical considerations the cornerstone of AI design are necessary steps. By prioritizing transparency and accountability, stakeholders in AI-driven industries can ensure these technologies are being utilized responsibly and in the public interest. This approach helps cultivate public trust and mitigate risks associated with AI misuse, bias, and unintended consequences.

3.7 Social and Economic Impact of Generative AI

Generative AI has met with significant economic and social repercussions that demand an appropriately attuned policy response to exploit its potential as well as mitigate its threats. Possessing its ability to produce content and enable work automation, generative AI can reshape work in the jobs market, according to popular opinion, as well as responsibility in AI-grounded decision-making. In the employment sector, generative AI is a double-edged sword, providing enhanced efficiency and innovation but at the same time presenting a risk to traditional employment. Decision-makers must prioritize the creation of new employment opportunities by initiating targeted reskilling and upskilling programs and aligning these activities with the nascent demands of the generative AI sector for transitioning workers into jobs that are less susceptible to automation, such as AI development, data science, and cybersecurity, and thereby creating a robust and nimble labour market [32].

In addition, the ability of generative AI to produce compelling content increases the risks of misinformation, necessitating effective regulation policies that oblige content creators and hosting sites to be accountable, with emphasis on simplicity and transparency of verification of information. Policymakers can ensure public trust and democratic processes by strictly enforcing oversight and penalties for disseminating false information [54]. Transparency in generative AI systems is also necessary to maintain public trust and morality, calling for policies that encourage the development of transparent and interpretable AI, enabling users to comprehend the rationale behind AI-driven decisions. These steps can include requiring disclosure of data sets and algorithms, defining explainability requirements, and demanding third-party audits of AI systems so that generative AI is socially controlled, and its responsible and equitable use is encouraged [32, 54].

4. Proposed Solutions to Ethical Concerns in Generative AI

The rapid development of generative AI holds reevaluating potential with accompanying ethical issues that require careful resolution. Scholarship integrity is saved through AI-driven tools that can find low-quality writing and balance the automated output. Disclosure norms, author attribution, and stakeholder participation are applied to safeguard intellectual property. Privacy, bias, and trust are protected with secure protection, transparency, and human oversight. Misinformation and deep-fakes are verified with AI detection tools, fact-checking, and media literacy campaigns. Ethical AI application within the education system is facilitated through policy redefinition, training, and curriculum implementation. Transparency and accountability are ensured by open policies, moral training, and auditing at regular intervals. Social and economic impacts are addressed by re-skilling, regulating misinformation, and open AI systems for responsible and fair AI integration. Based on these strategies, the following sections cover specific solutions to reduce the ethical problems of generative AI.

4.1. Authorship and Academic Integrity

The application of AI-powered bibliometric software in scholarly publishing is a crucial milestone in protecting the integrity and quality of scholarship. By leveraging the power of artificial intelligence, such software scours scholarly work for indicators of poor quality, plagiarism, or deviance from mainstream scientific conventions by a linguistic feature examination, checking of citation correctness, and coherence of argument logic [39]. If suspicious content is identified, the AI systems report it for evaluation to ensure an even more sceptical review process without actual rejection and to preserve the validity of academic papers. Additionally, the tools check the credibility of the sources quoted, including the reliability of the journals, the impact factors, and histories of controversies or retractions, to provide research based on a sound and credible foundation [39]. However, it should be noted that AI should complement, not replace, human specialization. Although AI can perform a better job of initial screening and analysis, the nuanced, context-dependent judgment of human reviewers remains essential, as specialists have a depth of knowledge and interpretive ability that AI cannot provide. The synergy of AI and human judgment is required to guarantee the high standards required in academic research [39]. This forward-looking strategy battles issues posed by the large body of data and sophisticated methods of disinformation, making scholarly programs of the best quality and a lasting resource to scholars, students, and policymakers. The success of this strategy, therefore, relies on a harmony of automated technology and human instincts, holding academic honesty intransigently [39].

4.2 Intellectual Property Rights, Copyright Issues, Authenticity, and Attribution

Large generative AI models (LGAIMs) are in a complex and multifaceted regulatory and legal landscape, with priority areas of direct regulation of users and deployers, non-discrimination obligations, and special content moderation rules to ensure ethical standards and legal adherence [55, 56, 57, 58, 59]. Direct regulation sets a model of organizations using and implementing LGAIMs that will be governed by data protection laws, ethical guidelines, and best practices to ensure that the advantages of AI are balanced in the public interest and do not cause harm. Non-discrimination clauses must be included to prevent the potential for AI to replicate social biases so that content created by LGAIM is not discriminatory based on race, gender, religion, or other protected status, ensuring equity and fairness as well as adherence to the law. Content moderation policies specifically target the prevention of illegal or injurious content, e.g., violence-inciting or misinformation, by requiring deployers and users to maintain effective tools and procedures for filtering out such content, protecting public interest, and complying with regulations. Cumulatively, these policies create the ground on which innovation is responsible so that LGAIMs can serve society and mitigate risks.

In addition to the question of proximate issues, the debate also includes intellectual property rights, privacy, and liability issues since LGAIMs present unique problems, from producing content most likely to infringe on copyright to dealing with vast amounts of personal data used for the training of AI. Harmonization of such legal factors constitutes a sensitive undertaking with the goal of not undermining personal and public mores against innovation. Achieving such equilibrium needs to involve joint work with professionals, stakeholders, and citizens when crafting regulations to address questions of the time while also being reactive to the cutting-edge advances occurring in technologies. Since LGAIMs evolve, governance systems must also evolve so that such revolutionary tools form part of human development while alleviating risks [55, 56, 57, 58]. Multi-faceted action must exist to respond to the challenges of attribution and genuineness of AI content, such as devising transparency guidelines, applying authorship attribution methods, and debates among stakeholders [60]. These actions confirm AI material as correctly labelled, correctly attributed, and responsible, and preserve intellectual property rights as well as ethical standards.

Transparency rules must be made to enable users to distinguish between content generated by human beings and AI, because naming correctly matters in conveying information about its nature and origin. For example, in media, labels can separate stories written by human beings from those produced by AI, and in art, transparency may be characterized by disclosing the level of intervention of AI in generating works. These measures are critical to obtaining the credibility and trustworthiness of online information and allowing consumers to make informed decisions. Clear guidelines for firm transparency need to be formulated through interagency collaboration between AI developers, content providers, and regulatory agencies to set reasonable and enforceable standards [60]. Authorship attribution solutions mitigate the challenges in crediting creations that involve machine and human collaborations, since AI capabilities to create works of sophistication challenge the identification of authorship. Technologies like digital watermarking and metadata tagging can track content back to its source, either a person, an organization, or an AI system. For example, watermarking by computer can assign research to researchers for findings enabled by AI in scientific studies, and metadata tagging in media gives credit for AI input into movies or songs. Such systems are intellectual property rights-compliant and enable ethical use of AI in creative work [60]. Stakeholder dialogue is also needed in addressing the broader ethics, law, and social issues of AI-created content. Involving artificial intelligence developers, content creators, lawyers, policymakers, and civil society representatives, stakeholder debates allow for the identification of emerging problems and the co-creation of solutions reconciling innovation and ethics. For instance, debates in the healthcare industry might delve into the ethics of AI-generated diagnostic tools, while those within education might deliberate on the way AI impacts scholarship honesty. It is critical to achieve a consensus on levels of transparency and credit so that regulations evolve to cater to emerging technology and societal demand [60].

4.3 Privacy, Trust, and Bias in Large Generative AI Models (LGAIMs)

To tackle the pressing privacy, trust, and bias concerns in large generative AI models (LGAIMs), there is a call for a unifying and multi-dimensional solution that introduces superior privacy protection capabilities, robust auditing procedures, and a harmonious partnership between human intelligence and AI systems [61].

Privacy protection measures like anonymization and data encryption help enable privacy on the user side by discouraging direct connection of personal data to an individual and discouraging misuse of data. Obtaining express consent from users before collecting and processing data ensures total user trust and aligns with legislation like the GDPR, respecting the sanctity and privacy of user data [61]. Reliability in LGAIMs also relies on transparency and explainability, making AI processes accessible to their users and enabling them to make optimal choices. Further, independent audit procedures are just as crucial in the identification and rectification of biases to enable a fair and equitable system operation. Continuous evaluation and enhancement of such systems minimize biases, making possible a more equitable and fairer technology environment [61]. Since human evaluators and subject-matter experts are what provide the high-level judgment and contextual understanding necessary to solve multi-dimensional ethical problems, their feedback is another essential element of the ethical application of LGAIM. Involving humans ensures AI output is ethical and conforms to societal norms and standards, anticipates issues, and solves them before they arise [61].

4.4 Misinformation and Deepfakes: Challenges and Strategies

Fighting disinformation and deepfakes in the age of the internet requires a multi-faceted approach that combines technological innovation with pedagogical action. The centre of such an approach is the development of AI-based detection tools that are of utmost importance for flagging and tagging fake content. These are supported by collaborative efforts with fact-checkers, initiatives to promote media literacy, and stimulating innovation using public domain resources [43, 62]. Together, these measures represent an all-rounded antidote against disinformation to arrest its dissemination and impact, as well as empower the users with the ability to reach and believe high-quality information.

AI detection systems are a sophisticated technology solution to deepfakes and disinformation, using machine learning and deep learning models to analyse content and identify original and manipulated media. Having been trained on enormous databases of authentic and fake materials, such systems can pick up subtle differences that are imperceptible to humans, enabling early detection of potentially misleading content and preventing its spread. However, with deepfakes and disinformation-making techniques becoming more sophisticated, such detection systems must keep changing with updates and upgrades to be effective [43]. In addition to such technical interventions, engagement with fact-checking organizations adds a critical degree of scepticism, as the human element copes with the subtleties and nuances that automated machines might fail to address, enabling an enhanced process of verification. Combining AI detection and human fact-checking is a robust and comprehensive defence against misinformation [62]. Another vital component in this multi-faceted strategy is building media literacy among the citizenry to allow them to critically analyse content by identifying media biases, detecting manipulated content, and fact-checking with trusted sources. Enhancing media literacy not only facilitates the direct identification of misinformation but also fosters a wiser and more resistant society [43]. In addition, innovation using public domains offers a unique approach to combating misinformation since such resources offer rich sets of data for AI detection system training as well as improve the information environment by fostering openness and accuracy [63].

4.5 Educational Ethics: Promoting Ethical AI Use in Education

To promote the ethical use of AI in universities, a multi-pronged strategy must be employed. It must include reviewing ethics policies, initiating training programs on responsible use of AI, cooperating with AI developers, and incorporating ethical values in curriculum design [63].

The first critical move towards confronting the challenges of AI to education is refining institutional integrity and ethics policies to create cut-and-dry regulations that ensure both teachers and students use AI technology in a way that is respectful of academic honesty and integrity traditions. Such policies should address concerns such as plagiarism, unauthorized use of AI in assignments, and the responsible use of AI tools in research, avoiding potential misuse while encouraging healthy AI integration [63]. Equipping teachers and students with the knowledge and skills to use AI ethically and effectively is also important, achieved through training sessions that cover the ethical implications of AI, critical evaluation of AI-generated content, and strategies for using AI to enhance learning without compromising academic integrity, as well as data privacy and ethical handling of personal data [63]. Working with AI developers is at the centre of rendering AI systems pedagogic-value-driven since direct involvement enables institutions to engage in the development of tools that are specific to educators' and learners' needs in a way that fosters critical thinking as well as the upholding of ethical values. Collaborative work can also help to devise open and comprehensible AI tools that are attractive for educational goals [63]. Finally, incorporating ethics into the course materials is essential to fostering a deeper understanding of how AI works in society and encouraging students to critically examine the role that technology plays, its effects, and why being a responsible user of AI is important. Not only does this prepare students to use AI technologies ethically, but it also teaches them about critical thinking, whereby they will have to address advanced ethical challenges in their business careers and personal decisions [63].

4.6 Transparency and Accountability in AI

There should be a universal system to ensure transparency and accountability in the utilization of AI. This system should include the establishment of open policies and procedures, training on ethical issues, improvement of integrity across all professional sectors, and continuous review and auditing of AI systems. These are measures that help to ensure that AI technologies are applied ethically and responsibly by societal values and expectations [60, 31].

Formulated policies and regulations and their implementation are crucial to the ethical use of AI, as they define the rightful uses of AI in different contexts such as schools, workplaces, healthcare, and public services. For instance, in education, the policy can specify the proper application of AI for assignments and tests; in workplaces, the policy can establish the application of AI for decision-making; and in the healthcare sector, the policy can set acceptable uses of AI for diagnostics and patient information management. By clearly defining responsible AI use, organizations can prevent abuse, reduce data privacy problems, establish ethical decision-making frameworks, and have procedures in place to deal with AI-related incidents, thereby allowing stakeholders to cope with the complexity of AI [31]. It is also necessary to create awareness among stakeholders like developers, users, and regulators on ethical matters to remind them how AI can spread biases, violate privacy, and impact decisions. Awareness campaigns, such as professional certification courses, public awareness programs, workshops, and seminars, allow stakeholders to assign greater significance to ethical aspects of AI design and deployment [60]. It is also important to encourage integrity across disciplines since it encourages AI tools to support work and research without undermining basic principles of honesty, fairness, and accountability. For instance, regulations need to end AI misuse in academia, business, or health care, protecting the legitimacy and value of professional and academic work in an AI world [31]. For transparency and accountability, AI systems need to undergo frequent reviews and audits to assess performance against ethical criteria, uncover bias or unexpected outcomes, and test stakeholder impact. These audits, ranging from scrutinizing patterns of decisions, analysing diagnostic tools, or taking feedback from customers, assure conformity to ethical norms and public expectations and allow continuous improvement by adaptation to emerging data or novel circumstances [60].

4.7 Social and Economic Impact of Artificial Intelligence

Striving for the social and economic consequences of artificial intelligence (AI) demands implementing strategic policy action to absorb the intricate issues brought by the upsurge of technologies at lightning speed. Key areas where policy intervention can yield startling outcomes include promoting the creation of work opportunities, mitigating disinformation, and ensuring AI system transparency [32, 54].

Policy interventions to support job creation need to target re-skilling and up-skilling programs to offset the disruptions in the labour market caused by AI and automation, which have the potential to render many traditional jobs obsolete. Governments and institutions must make investments in sound training programs that equip workers to take up new employment in AI development, data science, cybersecurity, and other high-growth areas, and interdisciplinary training in AI ethics, regulatory affairs, and system support roles. In addition to addressing the risk of unemployment, these initiatives ensure that the workforce aligns with the needs of a transforming, AI-driven economy, fostering resilience and adaptability.

The second area where policy must act urgently is in controlling misinformation, since AI has facilitated the creation and spread of false information, undermining public trust and social stability. Policymakers can address this by holding content producers and platforms accountable through measures such as demanding transparency in content origin, setting up fact-checking protocols, and mandating penalties for knowingly spreading false information, particularly in public health messaging. Such regulations safeguard public communication against disinformation and enable citizens to make informed decisions based on accurate information [54]. Also, encouraging the development of explainable AI systems is paramount from the perspective of accountability and justice, since explainable AI designs enable users to see how decisions are made, which breeds trust and ensures decisions are accountable and fair. Policy measures would include establishing explainability requirements for financial services, forcing healthcare AI developers to make data and algorithms transparent, and creating independent review processes for AI systems in the criminal justice system. These measures would ensure that AI technologies are used responsibly and ethically, safeguarding human rights and democratic values [32, 54].

5. Theoretical and Practical Implications of Research in AI Ethics

Research into the ethics of artificial intelligence (AI) carries profound and far-reaching theoretical and practical implications, influencing how we comprehend, engage with, and regulate these technologies. Central to this exploration is the development and refinement of ethical frameworks tailored to AI across diverse domains, which is essential for embedding ethical considerations throughout the lifecycle of AI technologies, from design to deployment. The insights derived from these studies provide a robust foundation for aligning technological progress with ethical principles, ensuring the responsible development and application of AI. This work not only aids in formulating ethical guidelines but also enriches our theoretical understanding of the moral imperatives within the AI landscape. Simultaneously, research in AI ethics holds significant practical implications, extending across policy formulation, industry standards, technological advancement, educational programs, and corporate accountability. By offering a comprehensive framework for the responsible integration of AI into society, this research bridges the gap between theoretical ethics and real-world applications, ensuring that AI technologies are developed and deployed in ways that uphold ethical standards and societal values.

5.1 Theoretical Implications

Examining the moral issues raised by AI and offering workable solutions deepens our understanding of AI ethics, providing insights into problematic issues like privacy, autonomy, and the ethical obligations of AI developers and users. By offering theoretical perspectives on addressing these issues, research in AI ethics equips stakeholders with a richer conceptual toolkit, enabling them to navigate the intricate moral terrain of AI and fostering the creation of technologies that are both innovative and ethically aligned. In addition to the development of ethical frameworks, this study also extends theory in regulation by exploring governance structures that attempt to align suitable governance mechanisms with the development and application of AI with ethics and societal values. These structures are an outline towards the application of regulations and legislation that will be a match for the unique problems that AI generates towards creating a legal and ethical framework that will direct AI to valuable contributions to society. In addition, theoretical analysis of the socio-economic impact of AI promotes critical introspection of technological advancement's collateral effects, from labour markets to the reshaping of social norms, to foster prudent debate over the role of technology in structuring our world and the imperative for policies addressing harmful effects while optimizing the value of AI. Secondly, studying the ethical and social implications of AI deepens our theoretical knowledge of the complex relationship between technology and society, confronting us with the determinants of the adoption and social implications of AI. The latter is especially central to anticipating and managing social changes as well as enhancing the discussion of technology's contribution toward human progress. Together, these theoretical reflections underscore the need to transplant ethics into AI functionality and design and require a profusion of responses ranging from formulating ethical codes to speculating about regulation and critically examining the impact of technology to ponder how technology constructs society. This type of intervention ensures that AI is being developed in a good and ethically sound way, and the interests and values of human beings remain safeguarded while we tread through this epoch of revolutionary technology.

5.2 Practical Implications

On a policy-making scale, the implications of AI ethics research are needed in an attempt to implement rigid rules that guide the deployment and use of AI technologies. Policymakers are informed more adequately on topics such as bias, privacy, and accountability, thereby being well-placed to make regulations that monitor the ethical use of AI in a way that facilitates technological innovation along with societal principles and ethical imperatives. This is equivalent to a regulatory environment that encourages innovation with the assurance that ethical standards are fulfilled. Ethical AI research will also be an integral part of creating industry-specific best practices and guidelines, leading organizations through the ethical aspects of AI adoption, and ensuring their practice is ethically aligned and risk-managed. By following these best practices, organizations can establish the reputation of their AI systems and a responsibility-centered ethical culture, which is indispensable to maintaining public trust in AI technologies in the long term. Besides, the discovery of ethical issues by research not only eliminates threats but also promotes technology. By integrating ethics such as transparency, accountability, and fairness at the development stage, developers and researchers can develop AI systems that are trustworthy and socially accountable, making the field develop in a manner that is innovative and ethics-oriented. Training in AI ethics is also necessary, raising awareness among stakeholders like developers, researchers, policymakers, and end-users of the ethical application of AI. With the inclusion of ethical considerations in training programs, such training transfers skills in the ability to respond to the ethical dimensions of AI, and a technologically qualified and ethically conscious society is established. This ensures that everybody is properly equipped to manage AI responsibly, creating a society where ethical thinking drives technological progress. Finally, research in AI ethics gives companies a clear roadmap on how to fulfill their moral responsibilities in AI technology innovation and application. Through this, companies can embed moral decision-making and accountability in their processes, ensuring that their AI projects satisfy societal norms and ethical principles. By adopting such practices, companies can avoid falling into traps and become leaders in developing AI responsibly, gaining consumers' and stakeholders' trust and confidence.

6. Future Research Directions: A Comprehensive Outlook

The future of AI research is poised at a turning point where social, ethical, and technological questions intersect to impact the direction of artificial intelligence research and its use in our lives. As AI technologies advance at a rate without precedent, their potential for transforming industries, economies, and societies is vast. But such a pace also gives rise to a host of complex challenges that must be addressed before AI can be designed and implemented to be not only accountable, but also beneficial to human civilization. Creating advanced detection and response algorithms for low-quality or misleading information is crucial in managing information generated by AI systems, like context-specific detection tools able to tell apart fact error and satire, based on the implementation of interdisciplinary studies and cognitive science in deciding on the mode of distribution of disinformation. The control of big generative AI models (LGAIMs) is tough to navigate, balancing innovation and ethics, and public safety. Research must consider legislation and regulations that introduce equity, non-discrimination, and accountability without holding back progress. It should also bring to the forefront international collaboration in establishing global standards, as seen in initiatives like the EU's Artificial Intelligence Act, the U.S. NIST's risk management framework, and China's AI development plan. In healthcare, AI systems must prioritize patient privacy, trust, and bias minimization against accuracy and low false positives, adopting design principles for transparency, fairness, and usability, and balancing between AI recommendations and human expertise. As misinformation and deepfakes improve in sophistication, AI detection systems will have to scale, get more accurate, and be real-time-enabled, including understanding subtleties like irony and humour that are popularly employed in attacks through misinformation. AI use in education is a silver lining that presents challenges, like the maintenance of academic integrity, and necessitates studies on combined integrity policy, training, and school-AI producer partnerships. Trust mandates openness and accountability of work done by AI, most urgently in academia, with policy and regulation dictating the source and percentage of AI-generated work. Tangible authorship attribution and content authenticity models are required to be developed as AI-created content sweeps through the media, requiring stakeholder discussion to achieve transparency and trust. Socio-economic impacts of AI, like automation, loss of jobs, and wealth inequality, need serious analysis, and forthcoming studies indicate policy interventions to boost employment generation and regulate disinformation, taking on equitable sharing of benefits of AI. Effective human-AI partnership is central, with studies exploring hybrid designs that combine human expertise and experience with AI to enhance decision-making, creativity, and problem-solving, as embodied in the emerging field of human-machine teaming. Finally, the long-term ethical influence of AI technologies requires ongoing examination, anticipating shifting societal values, technological breakthroughs, and unforeseen consequences to guide AI development in consonance with human values and societal good. By tackling these spheres, the scientific community can guarantee that AI develops in an innovative but also morally responsible way, protecting the interests and values of humanity during this revolutionary time.

7. Conclusion

The record rapid advancement of Large Language Models (LLMs) and generative AI technologies has certainly revolutionized the natural language processing field by offering unprecedented capabilities in text generation, content creation, and problem-solving across disciplines. However, as this paper has explored, these advances are also accompanied by record-breaking ethical, social, and technical challenges that need to be addressed to enable the safe and productive deployment of AI to society. The paradox of AI-generated text—surface coherence in contrast to deeper logical and narrative incoherence—mirrors the limitations of current AI technology and indicates the need for continued research and development to bridge the gap between human- and machine-produced content.

Generative AI raises difficult ethical issues, such as authorship, intellectual property, privacy, bias, disinformation, and transparency, which need to be addressed through group-based, multidisciplinary consideration. The potential of AI to reflect biases, intrude on privacy, and create harmful or misleading content undermines social trust and stability. These challenges are exacerbated by the speed of AI technological advancement that precedes the advancement of regulatory and ethical standards. Therefore, robust governance frameworks are needed to weigh innovation against ethical issues such that AI systems are maintained to be transparent, accountable, and aligned with societal values.

This article has proposed some of the steps to be taken against such challenges, e.g., designing advanced AI output detectors, more robust regulation mechanisms, and integrity in education. By making ethical concerns part of AI system design and deployment, we can curb harm and build trust in AI technology. Transparency and accountability take centre stage, with stringent guidelines for the assignment of authorship, originality of content, and ethical application of AI in sensitive sectors such as medicine, education, and criminal justice. Public awareness campaigns and media literacy programs are also made a requirement to facilitate individuals in evaluating AI-generated content critically and combat the spread of disinformation.

The socio-economic impact of generative AI, e.g., on employment, distribution of wealth, and public debate, underscores the need for taking proactive policy actions even more seriously. Governments, industry partners, and researchers must collaborate in creating fair and balanced frameworks for job support, preventing disinformation, and ensuring fair and equitable redistribution of AI benefits to society. With ethical responsibility and co-design, we can unlock the potential of AI to change lives and minimize its undesirable impact.

Future work ought to be dedicated to AI technology that develops in ways that promote human values as well as society. This includes helping to develop stronger and more complex AI detection strategies, improving upon transparency tools, and studying the trends of symbiotic human-AI collaboration based on synergistic sets of strengths. Long-range ethics, such as the environmental impact of AI, as well as potentially unknown effects, must be thought about so that the development of AI will be stable and ethical.

The AI text paradox reflects the broader challenges and opportunities of generative AI. The technologies have immense potential to revolutionize sectors, redefine creativity, and solve hard problems, yet their social and ethical implications need to be responsibly analysed and responded to constructively. By addressing challenges like logical coherence, narrative coherence, and responsibility, we can create AI systems that not only become historical contributions but also cogent, just, and veracious to human ideals of the highest order. Responsible AI development is a powerful, ongoing challenge—one that will demand scientists, legislators, business constituents, and ordinary people to join forces to make AI a force for good in our fast-digitalizing world.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-8797-3406

References:

[1] Weaver, W. (1955). *Translation*. *Machine Translation and Linguistics*, 14, 15–23.

[2] Hutchins, W. J. (2003). ALPAC: The (in)famous report. In S. Nirenburg, H. L. Somers, & Y. A. Wilks (Eds.), *Readings in machine translation*. MIT Press.

[3] Nagao, M. (1984). A framework of a mechanical translation between Japanese and English by analogy principle. In A. Elithorn & R. Banerji (Eds.), *Proceedings of the International NATO Symposium on Artificial and Human Intelligence* (pp. 173–180). Elsevier North-Holland.

[4] Wang, H. (2006). Multi-strategy machine translation. In Y. Q. Cao & M. S. Sun (Eds.), *Frontiers of Chinese information processing* (pp. 45–52). Tsinghua University Press.

[5] Bahdanau, D., Cho, K., & Bengio, Y. (2015). Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, May 7–9, 2015, San Diego, USA.

[6] Sutskever, I., Vinyals, O., & Le, Q. V. (2014). Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.

[7] Dong, D., Wu, H., He, W., Yu, D., & Wang, H. (2015). Multi-task learning for multiple language translation. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)* (pp. 1723–1732). Association for Computational Linguistics.

[8] Pouliquen, B. (2017). WIPO Translate: Patent neural machine translation publicly available in 10 languages. In *Machine Translation XVI*.

[9] Wu, Y., Schuster, M., Chen, Z., Le, Q. V., Norouzi, M., Macherey, W., Krikun, M., Cao, Y., Gao, Q., Macherey, K., Klingner, J., Shah, A., Johnson, M., Liu, X., Kaiser, Ł., Gouws, S., Kato, Y., Kudo, T., Kazawa, H., Stevens, K., Kurian, G., Patil, N., Wang, W., Young, C., Smith, J., Riesa, J., Rudnick, A., Rudnick, A., Corrado, G., Hughes, M., & Dean, J. (2016). Google's neural machine translation system : Bridging the gap between human and machine translation.

[10] Gehring, J., Auli, M., Grangier, D., Yarats, D., & Dauphin, Y. N. (2017). Convolutional sequence to sequence learning. *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 70, 1243–1252.

[11] Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. A., Kaiser, Ł., & Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is all you need. In *Proceedings of the 31st Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2017)*, Long Beach, CA, USA.

[12] Lample, G., Conneau, A., Denoyer, L., & Ranzato, M. A. (2017). Unsupervised machine translation using monolingual corpora only. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) 2018*, Vancouver, BC, Canada.

[13] Artetxe, M., Labaka, G., & Agirre, E. (2019). An effective approach to unsupervised machine translation. *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2019)*, Florence, Italy.

[14] Song, K., Tan, X., Qin, T., Lu, J., & Liu, T. Y. (2019). MASS: Masked sequence to sequence pre-training for language generation. *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2019)*, Long Beach, CA, USA.

[15] Kato, Y. (1995). The future of voice-processing technology in the world of computers and communications. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (PNAS)*, 92(22), 10060–10063.

[16] Tomita, M., & Tomabechi, H. (1990). SpeechTrans: An experimental real-time speech-to-speech translation. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 26(4), 663–672.

[17] Sumita, E., Shimizu, T., & Nakamura, S. (2007). NICT-ATR speech-to-speech translation system. In *Proceedings of the 45th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2007)*, Prague, Czech Republic.

[18] Fügen, C., Kolss, M., Paulik, M., Stüker, S., Schultz, T., & Waibel, A. (2006). Open domain speech translation: From seminars and speeches to lectures. In *Proceedings of the TC-STAR Workshop on Speech-to-Speech Translation*, Barcelona, Spain.

[19] Moser-Mercer, B., Künzli, A., & Korac, M. (1998). Prolonged turns in interpreting: Effects on quality, physiological, and psychological stress (pilot study). *Interpreting*, 3(1), 47–64.

[20] Wang, H., Wu, H., Hu, X., Liu, Z., Li, J., Ren, D., & Niu, Z. (2008). The TCH machine translation system for IWSLT 2008. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Workshop on Spoken Language Translation (IWSLT 2008)*, Waikiki, Hawaii.

[21] Nakamura, S., Markov, K., Nakaiwa, H., Kikui, G., Kawai, H., Jitsuhiro, T., & Yamamoto, H. (2006). The ATR multilingual speech-to-speech translation system. *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing, 14*(2), 365–376.

[22] He, H., Boyd-Graber, J., & Daumé, H. III. (2016). Interpretese vs. translationese: The uniqueness of human strategies in simultaneous interpretation. In *Proceedings of the 15th Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL-HLT 2016)* (pp. 1117–1126). Association for Computational Linguistics.

[23] Raffel, C., Shazeer, N., Roberts, A., Lee, K., Narang, S., Matena, M., Zhou, Y., Li, W., & Liu, P. J. (2020). Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of Machine Learning Research, 21*(140), 1–67.

[24] Ma, M., Huang, L., Xiong, H., Zheng, R., Liu, K., Zhang, B., He, Z., Liu, H., Li, X., Wu, H., & Wang, H. (2019). STACL: Simultaneous translation with implicit anticipation and controllable latency using prefix-to-prefix framework. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2019)* (pp. 3025–3036). Association for Computational Linguistics.

[25] Zhang, J., & Zong, C. (2020). Neural machine translation: Challenges, progress and future. *Science China Technological Sciences, 63*(10), 2028–2050.

[26] Edunov, S., Ott, M., Auli, M., & Grangier, D. (2018). Understanding back-translation at scale. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP 2018)* (pp. 489–500). Association for Computational Linguistics.

[27] Hochreiter, S., & Schmidhuber, J. (1997). Long short-term memory. *Neural Computation, 9*(8), 1735–1780.

[28] Bengio, Y., Simard, P., & Frasconi, P. (1994). Learning long-term dependencies with gradient descent is difficult. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks, 5*(2), 157–166.

[29] He, W., He, Z., Wu, H., & Wang, H. (2016). Improved neural machine translation with SMT features. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI 2016)* (pp. 3023–3029). AAAI Press.

[30] Tu, Z., Lu, Z., Liu, Y., Liu, X., & Li, H. (2016). Modeling coverage for neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2016)* (Vol. 1, pp. 76–85). Association for Computational Linguistics.

[31] Cheng, Y., Shen, S., He, Z., He, W., Wu, H., Sun, M., & Liu, Y. (2016). Agreement-based joint training for bidirectional attention-based neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI 2016)* (pp. 2761–2767). International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization.

[32] Koehn, P., & Knowles, R. (2017). Six challenges for neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the First Workshop on Neural Machine Translation* (pp. 28–39). Association for Computational Linguistics.

[33] Sennrich, R., Haddow, B., & Birch, A. (2016). Improving neural machine translation models with monolingual data. *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (Vol. 1, pp. 86–96). Association for Computational Linguistics.

[34] Poncelas, A., Shterionov, D., Way, A., Maillette de Buy Wenniger, G., & Passban, P. (2018). Investigating backtranslation in neural machine translation. *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Conference of the European Association for Machine Translation* (pp. 269–278). European Association for Machine Translation.

[35] Conneau, A., & Lample, G. (2019). Cross-lingual language model pretraining. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2019)* (pp. 7059–7069). Curran Associates, Inc.

[36] Ren, S., Wu, Y., Liu, S., Zhou, M., & Ma, S. (2019). Explicit cross-lingual pre-training for unsupervised machine translation. *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019)* (pp. 770–779). Association for Computational Linguistics.

[37] Wu, H., & Wang, H. (2007). Pivot language approach for phrase-based statistical machine translation. *Proceedings of the 45th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (pp. 856–863). Association for Computational Linguistics.

[38] Wu, H., & Wang, H. (2009). Revisiting pivot language approach for machine translation. *Proceedings of the Joint Conference of the 47th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 4th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (ACL-IJCNLP 2009)* (pp. 154–162). Association for Computational Linguistics.

[39] Cohn, T., & Lapata, M. (2007). Machine translation by triangulation: Making effective use of multi-parallel corpora. *Proceedings of the 45th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (pp. 728–735). Association for Computational Linguistics.

[40] Johnson, M., Schuster, M., Le, Q. V., Krikun, M., Wu, Y., Chen, Z., Thorat, N., Viégas, F., Wattenberg, M., Corrado, G., Hughes, M., & Dean, J. (2017). Google's multilingual neural machine translation system: Enabling zero-shot translation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 5*, 339–351.

[41] Tan, X., Lu, Z., Sun, H., & Liu, Q. (2019). Multilingual neural machine translation with language clustering. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP 2019)* (pp. 963–973). Association for Computational Linguistics.

[42] Arivazhagan, N., et al. (2019). Massively multilingual neural machine translation in the wild: Findings and challenges. *arXiv:1907.05019*.

[43] Fan, A., et al. (2020). Beyond English-centric multilingual machine translation. *arXiv:2010.11125*.

[44] Shimizu, H., et al. (2014). Collection of a simultaneous translation corpus for comparative analysis. In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation* (pp. 4577–4584). European Language Resources Association (ELRA).

[45] Toyama, H., et al. (2004). CIAIR simultaneous interpretation corpus. In *Proceedings of Oriental COCOSDA* (pp. 104–109). New Delhi, India.

[46] Sandrelli, A., & Bendazzoli, C. (2004). Tagging a corpus of interpreted speeches: The European Parliament interpreting corpus (EPIC). In *Proceedings of LREC 2004* (pp. 745–748). European Language Resources Association (ELRA).

[47] Di Gangi, M. A., et al. (2019). MuST-C: A multilingual speech translation corpus. In *Proceedings of the 17th Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL-HLT 2019)* (pp. 2019). Association for Computational Linguistics.

[48] Xiong, H., et al. (2019). DuTongChuan: Context-aware translation model for simultaneous interpreting. *arXiv:1907.12984*.

[49] Bansal, S., et al. (2018). Pre-training on high-resource speech recognition improves low-resource speech-to-text translation. In *Proceedings of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL 2018)* (pp. 301–312). Association for Computational Linguistics.

[50] Weiss, R. J., et al. (2017). Sequence-to-sequence models can directly translate foreign speech. In *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association* (pp. 1465–1469). International Speech Communication Association (ISCA).

[51] Anastasopoulos, A., & Chiang, D. (2018). Leveraging translations for speech transcription in low-resource settings. *Proceedings of the 19th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association*, 2018, 365–376.

[52] Bérard, A., et al. (2016). Listen and translate: A proof of concept for end-to-end speech-to-text translation. *Proceedings of the 30th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2016, 1–10.

[53] Liu, Y., et al. (2019). End-to-end speech translation with knowledge distillation. *Proceedings of the 20th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association*, 2019, 1–5.

[54] Anastasopoulos, A., & Chiang, D. (2018). Tied multitask learning for neural speech translation. *Proceedings of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 2018, 82–91.

[55] Sperber, M., Neubig, G., Niehues, J., & Waibel, A. (2019). Attention-passing models for robust and data-efficient end-to-end speech translation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7, 313–325.

[56] Liu, Y., Zhang, J., Xiong, H., Zhou, L., He, Z., Wu, H., Wang, H., & Zong, C. (2020). Synchronous speech recognition and speech-to-text translation with interactive decoding. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(05), 8417–8424.

[57] Jia, Y., Weiss, R. J., Biadsy, F., Macherey, W., Johnson, M., Chen, Z., & Wu, Y. (2019). Direct speech-to-speech translation with a sequence-to-sequence model. *Proceedings of the 20th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association*, 2019, 1–5.

[58] Kano, T., Sakti, S., & Nakamura, S. (2021). Transformer-based direct speech-to-speech translation with transcoder. *Proceedings of the IEEE Spoken Language Technology Workshop*, 2021, 1–5.

[59] Vinyals, O., Toshev, A., Bengio, S., & Erhan, D. (2015). Show and tell: A neural image caption generator. *Proceedings of the 2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2015, 3156–3164.

[60] Lu, J., Xiong, C., Parikh, D., & Socher, R. (2017). Knowing when to look: Adaptive attention via a visual sentinel for image captioning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)* (pp. 375–383).

[61] Anderson, P., He, X., Buehler, C., Teney, D., Johnson, M., Gould, S., & Zhang, L. (2018). Bottom-up and top-down attention for image captioning and visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)* (pp. 6077–6086).

[62] Xu, Y., Li, M., Cui, L., Huang, S., Wei, F., & Zhou, M. (2020). LayoutLM: Pre-training of text and layout for document image understanding. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining* (pp. 1192–1200). ACM.

[63] Papineni, K., Roukos, S., Ward, T., & Zhu, W. J. (2002). BLEU: A method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (pp. 311–318). Association for Computational Linguistics.

1. Dr. Irshad Ahmad Naikoo has pursued his doctorate (PhD) from the Department of Linguistics, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, India. He has presented/published many research papers at various national and international platforms. He has also published many articles on English, Kashmiri, and Balti languages. He has been associated with the Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore, and Urdu Teaching and Research Centre, Lucknow (Ministry of HRD, Govt of India). Previously, he was teaching at the Department of English, Government Degree College (Boys), Baramulla, Kashmir. He has been teaching at the Department of Foreign Languages, College of Arts and Humanities, Jazan University, Jazan, Saudi Arabia, since 2014. He is a member of the Translation and Quality & Accreditation Committee at Jazan University.

2. Dr. Parvaiz Ahmad Ganai has pursued his doctorate (PhD) from the Department of Linguistics, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, India. He has presented/published many research papers at various national and international platforms. He has also published many articles on English, Kashmiri, and Kohistani languages. He has been associated with the Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore, and Urdu Teaching and Research Centre, Lucknow (Ministry of HRD, Govt of India). He is a reviewer of the Journal of Language, Literature and Education (JELLE). Previously, he was teaching at the Department of English, Government Degree College for Women, Baramulla, Kashmir. He has been teaching at the Department of Foreign Languages, College of Arts and Humanities, Jazan University, Jazan, Saudi Arabia, since 2014. He is a member of the Planning and Development, Re-evaluation, and Quality Assurance and Development Unit at Jazan University.