

For release: Wednesday 21 October 2026

AI-written posts get a quarter fewer reactions as LinkedIn targets “AI slop”, study finds

LinkedIn says using AI and posting slop aren't the same thing. A detector check of 2,016 posts found the same person's AI-written posts still earn about 24% fewer reactions than their own writing, and AI use hasn't fallen since LinkedIn's slop button arrived.

21 October 2026: As LinkedIn ramps up new classifiers to catch “AI slop”, a study of 2,016 recent posts has found that the same person's AI-written posts earn about a quarter fewer reactions than the ones they wrote themselves.

The study, by LinkedIn content studio Flypost, ran one post a month from April to September 2026 for each of 336 B2B creators through Pangram, a dedicated AI-text detector, then compared each person's AI-written posts with the ones they wrote themselves. Flypost sells AI-assisted LinkedIn writing software.

Key findings

1. **AI posts get fewer reactions.** Mostly AI-written posts earned about 24% fewer reactions than the same person's human-written posts, in the same format, month and length, across 236 creators who post both ways.
2. **The more AI, the bigger the drop.** Posts with no human writing detected at all earned about 32% fewer reactions.
3. **No sign of a retreat.** After LinkedIn added its “Seems like AI slop” button in late July, mostly AI-written posts made up 52% of the sample in August and 55% in September, in line with 51% to 58% from April to July.
4. **Feed or readers? The data can't say.** The study measures reactions and comments, not views, so it cannot tell whether the gap comes from LinkedIn showing these posts to fewer people or from readers scrolling past. People may also save AI for rushed posts that would have done worse anyway.
5. **Smaller accounts use it most.** 63% of posts from creators with 1,000 to 10,000 followers were mostly AI-written, against 55% for 10,000 to 50,000 and 38% for 50,000 to 500,000.

"LinkedIn says AI isn't the problem, slop is. Whoever is doing the judging, the feed or the reader, the post you wrote yourself does better than the one you didn't."

Sam Cassman, founder, Flypost

About the study

Flypost ran 2,016 original LinkedIn posts through Pangram (model pangram-4), a dedicated AI-text detector: one randomly chosen post a month, April to September 2026, from each of 336 English-speaking B2B creators (1,000 to 500,000 followers), picked at random from the 948 in its LinkedIn study who posted every month. Posts are public and were collected through a third-party data provider. A post counts as mostly AI-written when Pangram judged more than half of its text AI-generated or AI-assisted, and completely AI-written when it found no human writing at all. The engagement figures compare each creator's AI-written posts with their own human-written posts, holding format, month and length steady, with 95% intervals from resampling creators. They measure reactions and comments, not views, and cannot rule out that people use AI for posts that would have done worse anyway. No detector is perfect; an August 2025 University of Chicago working paper found Pangram the most accurate of four it tested. Flypost paid about \$250 in detector fees, and the study was not independently reviewed. Full method, limits and charts: <https://www.flypost.io/learn/ai-generated-linkedin-posts-study>

ENDS

Notes to editors

- 1. **Full methodology** is on the study page above, including how posts were sampled and what the detector can and can't tell.
- 2. **Engagement table** (each creator's AI-written posts compared with their own human-written posts, in the same format, month and length; 95% interval; creators who post both ways):

Comparison	Effect	Interval	Creators
Reactions: mostly AI-written	-24%	-33% to -15%	236
Reactions: completely AI-written	-32%	-42% to -21%	181
Comments: mostly AI-written	-12%	-21% to -2%	236
Reactions: image posts only	-28%	-38% to -17%	156
Reactions: text-only posts (too few to call)	-15%	-38% to +13%	29
Reactions: 1,000-10,000 followers	-30%	-43% to -13%	86
Reactions: 10,000-50,000 followers	-15%	-27% to +1%	103
Reactions: 50,000-500,000 followers	-35%	-53% to -13%	47

3. **How common** (share of posts judged mostly AI-written; 95% interval; posts checked):

Posts	Mostly AI-written	Interval	Posts checked
All posts	54%	52% to 56%	2,016
Posts over 250 words	61%	57% to 65%	547
1,000–10,000 followers	63%	60% to 67%	702
10,000–50,000 followers	55%	51% to 58%	882
50,000–500,000 followers	38%	34% to 43%	432

4. **What LinkedIn has said:** The Next Web, 30 July 2026, <https://thenextweb.com/news/linkedin-seems-like-ai-slop-button> ; Engadget, 21 August 2026, <https://engadget.com/2241857/linkedin-says-its-ai-slop-button-is-working>
5. **Other published estimates:** Pangram's own scan, reported by The Decoder, 12 July 2026 (a different sample, so not a trend comparison): <https://the-decoder.com/linkedin-is-the-undisputed-king-of-long-form-ai-slop-according-to-a-study-spanning-five-platforms/>
6. **On the detector:** Jabarian and Imas, Artificial Writing and Automated Detection, University of Chicago Booth working paper 2025-116, August 2025: https://bfi.uchicago.edu/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/BFI_WP_2025-116.pdf
7. **Related research:** Flypost's October 2026 study of 116,000+ LinkedIn posts on what works: <https://www.flypost.io/press/linkedin-study-2026>
8. **Assets** (charts, data tables, headshot, logo): <https://www.flypost.io/press/ai-written-linkedin-posts-2026>
9. **Interviews:** Sam Cassman, founder of Flypost, is available for interview.
10. **About Flypost:** Flypost is a LinkedIn content studio that turns a company's own material (posts, transcripts, case studies) into LinkedIn posts, carousels and articles. <https://www.flypost.io>
11. **Media contact:** Sam Cassman, sam@flypost.io. Phone available on request.