

Limitations of Generative AI in Content Creation: A Review

Mayur Rajaram Chavan, Prof. Abhishek Popat Bangar, Prof. S. B. Bhosale, Prof. Karad V. A.

Department of Computer Engineering
Jaihind College of Engineering, Kuran, Maharashtra, India

Abstract — Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools are now widely used to produce and support digital content such as stories, news items and social-media posts. Such tools can make a single piece of output look better, yet they also bring worries about originality, sameness across many outputs, bias, factual accuracy, creative control and ownership rights. This paper reviews five chosen scholarly works that look at creator responsibility, AI-supported story writing, prompting as a creative method, copyright, and bias in machine-written news. Read together, the studies indicate that a gain for one writer does not automatically become a gain for everyone: stories written with AI help may score higher while growing more alike. The remaining works point to the need for human fact-checking, the risk of skewed representation, the difficulty of turning unspoken creative know-how into written prompts, and unsettled questions about ownership and openness. We compare how the studies were carried out and what each contributes, draw out the shared challenges, and suggest where future work could head. Because only five hand-picked papers were examined and no exhaustive database search was run, this work is a focused narrative review rather than a systematic one.

Keywords— Generative artificial intelligence, content creation, creativity, content diversity, algorithmic bias, copyright, human–AI collaboration, responsible AI.

I. INTRODUCTION

Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) describes software that creates new material from prompts, sample inputs or other starting points. In content work, these systems can draft or assist with text, stories, news, images and other digital media. Because they are easy to access, they give creators fresh ways to brainstorm, write, revise and publish. Still, producing smooth, readable output says nothing about whether that output is correct, original, fair, legally safe to use, or true to what the creator had in mind.

The weaknesses of GenAI are therefore more than technical. They touch the social setting in which people create, the quality and variety of what gets produced, the way human skills develop, and the rules that decide how generated material may be used. Creators may have to check facts, look out for biased wording, keep private details safe, and decide whether to say that AI was involved. Work on AI-assisted storytelling also hints that a better individual output can sit alongside less variety across a whole set of outputs (Doshi & Hauser, 2024).

The five studies chosen here come at these concerns from different directions. Kim et al. (2026) look at how social-media creators try to use generative AI responsibly. Doshi and Hauser (2024) run an experiment on creativity and variety across stories. Casacuberta and Guersenzvaig (2025) question what

prompting can and cannot do in creative practice. Al-Busaidi et al. (2024) discuss copyright and intellectual-property problems, and Fang et al. (2024) measure gender and racial bias in news written by language models.

This review has four aims: (i) to summarize the chosen studies and what they found; (ii) to compare their methods, contributions and reach; (iii) to identify the shared challenges and possible gaps that this group of papers points to; and (iv) to suggest research directions for more responsible and useful content creation. Throughout, GenAI is treated as a helper that still depends on human judgement and human accountability.

II. REVIEW METHODOLOGY AND SELECTION CRITERIA

This work is a focused narrative review of five selected papers. They were picked because each speaks directly to a limitation of generative AI in content creation: creator responsibility, creativity and diversity, prompting in creative practice, copyright and intellectual property, and bias in generated news. For every paper we noted the research focus, the method, the main findings and the limits that the authors state or that can be reasonably inferred.

Each paper was read and sorted by focus, method, findings and fit with the review aims. Empirical studies were judged by their

participants, tasks and evaluation approach, while conceptual papers were judged by their arguments and proposed implications. The copyright paper was treated as a broad analysis of legal and knowledge-domain questions and not as a controlled experiment.

Four criteria guided the selection: (1) a direct link to generative AI and content creation; (2) a clear research question, argument or analytical goal; (3) publication in a scholarly journal or conference venue; and (4) a contribution to at least one of the review's themes. No papers beyond these five were added. As no multi-database search, search strings or formal screening steps were recorded, the work must not be called a systematic review, and no claim of exhaustive coverage or PRISMA compliance is made.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Responsible use by content creators

Kim et al. (2026) explore how creators on platforms such as YouTube, Instagram and TikTok use generative AI responsibly. Their qualitative study is based on semi-structured interviews with 16 creators. The paper covers risks around misinformation, social bias, authenticity and privacy, and the habits creators adopt in response, including fact-checking, moderating content, disclosing AI use and protecting information. It also describes the pull between careful work and platform pressure to publish often and win engagement. The study is valuable because it shows how AI weaknesses are handled in everyday creator workflows rather than treating generated content as a stand-alone product. With a small interview sample, it gives rich accounts of experience but cannot tell us how common each experience is among creators overall.

2. Individual creativity and collective diversity

Doshi and Hauser (2024) test how generative AI changes creative writing. In their experiment, 293 writers wrote short stories in one of three conditions: with no AI help, with a single AI-generated idea, or with access to several ideas from GPT-4. A separate panel of 600 evaluators then rated the stories. According to the authors, AI help raised scores for creativity, writing quality and enjoyment, with the biggest lift for writers who were less creative to begin with. However, the AI-assisted stories were more similar to each other, which points to a drop in collective novelty. The study thus reveals a real trade-off: AI may help the individual while narrowing the range of what the wider group produces. These results come from one storytelling task and should not be assumed to hold for every medium or professional setting.

3. Prompting and creative practice

Casacuberta and Guersenzvaig (2025) offer a conceptual analysis of prompting in design and the arts. Their argument is that creative expertise rests on tacit knowledge, bodily experience, practical skill and ongoing feedback, much of which is hard to put fully into written instructions. A workflow built around prompts could therefore limit creative control or tempt users to lean on generated results instead of building deeper skills. The paper moves the discussion past output quality and asks which parts of creative practice get flattened when interaction shrinks to instructions given to a model. Being conceptual, it clarifies assumptions and arguments but does not measure how large these effects actually are.

4. Copyright and intellectual property

Al-Busaidi et al. (2024) provide an expert-based, multi-perspective analysis of what generative AI means for innovation, knowledge domains, copyright and intellectual-property rights. They discuss unclear ownership, limited transparency from platforms, gaps in the law, and the call for ethical and legal frameworks. These issues matter to any creator who uses generated material and must decide how to credit, reuse or sell it. Since legal rules differ between countries and can change, the paper's broad discussion should not be read as one universal legal verdict. It does show that technical ability can move faster than shared legal and professional norms.

5. Bias in AI-generated news

Fang et al. (2024) study bias in news content produced by seven large language models. They feed in headlines from The New York Times and Reuters and assess gender and racial bias at the word, sentence and document levels, including tests that use gender-biased prompts. The authors report notable gender and racial bias in the generated text, including discriminatory portrayals of women and Black people. They also find differences between models: ChatGPT showed the least bias in most experiments and was the only model that refused to generate text when given biased prompts. The findings show that smooth writing should never be taken as neutral writing. The results remain tied to the chosen models, prompts, source articles and evaluation methods.

IV. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE STUDIES

The five studies deal with linked problems but differ in method and unit of analysis, so their findings complement one another instead of being interchangeable. Table 1 sets out the scope, main contribution and boundary of each.

Table 1. Comparative summary of the five selected studies

Study	Method / scope	Main finding and boundary
Kim et al. (2026)	Semi-structured interviews with 16 social-media creators	Creators do fact-checking, moderation, disclosure and privacy work; the small qualitative sample cannot estimate how widespread this is.
Doshi & Hauser (2024)	Experiment: 293 writers; 600 evaluators	AI ideas raised ratings of single stories but made stories more alike; results come from a short-story task.
Casacuberta & Guersenzvaig (2025)	Conceptual analysis of prompting and creative practice	Argues that tacit knowledge and embodied skill are not fully captured by prompts; the claims still need empirical testing.
Al-Busaidi et al. (2024)	Multi-perspective analysis of copyright and intellectual property	Points to legal, ownership and transparency concerns; outcomes depend on jurisdiction and changing law.
Fang et al. (2024)	Evaluation of news generated by seven LLMs	Finds gender and racial bias in tested outputs; results depend on the models, prompts, source articles and metrics used.

Four themes run across the studies. The first is the gap between fluent output and dependable content: Fang et al. (2024) show that generated news can carry biased portrayals, and Kim et al. (2026) describe the checking and moderating that creators do to compensate. The second is the gap between individual and collective results, since AI may improve one story while making a group of stories more alike (Doshi & Hauser, 2024). The third is human agency; Casacuberta and Guersenzvaig (2025) suggest that prompts may fail to capture the full range of practical knowledge in creative work. The fourth, from Al-Busaidi et al. (2024), is that generated content raises questions that go beyond immediate quality, such as who owns it and how openly it is produced.

The methods also decide what each study is able to prove. Experiments test outcomes under set conditions, interviews reveal how creators live with and manage risk, conceptual analysis sharpens assumptions about creativity, and legal or multi-perspective analysis maps institutional questions. No single approach covers the whole problem, so a fuller picture needs several methods and close attention to the setting in which a model is used.

V. RESEARCH CHALLENGES AND IDENTIFIED GAPS

The points below are gaps that these five papers suggest. They are not evidence that no other research has touched these topics.

1. Balancing quality and diversity

The storytelling experiment shows that better individual quality can go hand in hand with less variety across outputs. Future studies could check whether the same pattern appears in other genres, other languages, image and video generation, and professional settings, and whether different prompting styles or interface designs can keep variety while preserving the benefits of AI help.

2. Consistent evaluation of factuality and bias

Fluency alone cannot reveal bias or misinformation. Evaluation methods are needed that combine human review, automated checks and source verification. Studies should record their prompts, model versions, source material and evaluation criteria so that results can be compared and repeated.

3. Human expertise and long-term learning

The conceptual work asks whether regular dependence on prompts and generated suggestions changes how creative skill grows. Long-term studies could follow novice and experienced creators in AI-assisted and non-AI workflows, looking at independent skill, revision habits, confidence and creative judgement over time.

4. Copyright, provenance and disclosure

Ownership, credit and transparency stay open questions for creators and platforms. More work could ask what provenance information users need, how AI involvement should be disclosed in different settings, and how practice varies across countries. Any legal conclusion should rest on the applicable law and its present status.

5. Creator responsibility and platform incentives

Creators can be caught between careful checking and the pressure to post quickly and attract engagement. Comparative

studies could test whether platform policies, institutional guidance and practical tools make responsible habits easier to keep up.

VI. PROPOSED RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Drawing on the comparison, the following directions may help address the gaps above:

- **Cross-format evaluation:** compare text, image, video and social-media generation to separate limitations shared across media from those tied to one format.
- **Diversity-aware generation:** test ways of encouraging variety across outputs without losing usefulness or quality.
- **Human-in-the-loop verification:** evaluate workflows for checking facts, bias, privacy and attribution, including their effect on error rates and time cost.
- **Longitudinal research on creative skills:** follow learners and professionals to see how different levels of AI help affect independent ability and creative judgement.
- **Transparent provenance and disclosure:** explore understandable ways to show AI involvement and record where content came from.
- **Context-sensitive governance:** compare platform rules, institutional guidance and national legal frameworks without assuming one policy suits every kind of content.

Future studies should keep measured findings separate from conceptual claims and avoid assuming that results from one model or task apply everywhere. They should also report trade-offs: a safeguard may cut risk but add time, and a diversity measure may raise variety but reduce consistency.

VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE SCOPE

This review examined five studies on the limitations of generative AI in content creation. Together they show that GenAI can speed up production but does not remove important risks and trade-offs. The selected literature points to the checking and responsibility work that falls on creators, a possible loss of collective diversity despite better individual stories, the limits of prompt-centred creative practice, uncertainty over copyright and intellectual property, and bias in generated news. These challenges depend not only on model capability but also on human judgement, evaluation methods, creator education, platform incentives and legal or institutional frameworks.

The review is limited by its small, hand-picked set of five papers and does not cover the whole field. The studies differ in

method and content setting, so their results should not be treated as a single uniform experimental finding. A wider future review should search several scholarly databases, record search terms and screening decisions, and add work on factual reliability, image and video generation, cultural and language differences, and real creator workflows.

In short, generative AI is best seen as a supporting tool and not a substitute for human responsibility. Future research should aim to preserve diversity, assess bias and reliability, support the growth of human skill, and improve transparency and legal clarity.

REFERENCES

1. Al-Busaidi, A. S., Raman, R., Hughes, L., Albashrawi, M. A., Malik, T., Dwivedi, Y. K., Al-Alawi, T., AlRizeiqi, M., Davies, G., Fenwick, M., Gupta, P., Gurbur, S., Hooda, A., Jurcys, P., Lim, D., Lucchi, N., Misra, T., Raman, R., Shirish, A., & Walton, P. (2024). Redefining boundaries in innovation and knowledge domains: Investigating the impact of generative artificial intelligence on copyright and intellectual property rights. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 9, Article 100630. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2024.100630>
2. Casacuberta, D., & Guersenzvaig, A. (2025). Disembodied creativity in generative AI: Prima facie challenges and limitations of prompting in creative practice. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 8, Article 1651354. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2025.1651354>
3. Doshi, A. R., & Hauser, O. P. (2024). Generative AI enhances individual creativity but reduces the collective diversity of novel content. *Science Advances*, 10, Article eadn5290. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adn5290>
4. Fang, X., Che, S., Mao, M., Zhang, H., Zhao, M., & Zhao, X. (2024). Bias of AI-generated content: An examination of news produced by large language models. *Scientific Reports*, 14, Article 5224. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-55686-2>
5. Kim, J., Yu, M., Zhi, J., Milani, S., Cheng, J., Fan, X., Shen, H., & Forlizzi, J. (2026). Content creation with generative AI: How do content creators responsibly use generative AI tools? *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 10(2), Article CSCW009. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3788080>