



REVIEW

The Role of ChatGPT in Academic Writing: Pedagogical and Ethical Dimensions

El papel de ChatGPT en la escritura académica: dimensiones pedagógicas y éticas

Konstantinos T. Kotsis¹  

¹University of Ioannina, Department of Primary Education. Ioannina, Greece.

Cite as: T. Kotsis K. The Role of ChatGPT in Academic Writing: Pedagogical and Ethical Dimensions. EthAlca. 2025; 4:420. <https://doi.org/10.56294/ai2025420>


Submitted: 28-02-2025

Revised: 30-05-2025

Accepted: 29-08-2025

Published: 30-08-2025

Editor: PhD. Rubén González Vallejo 

Corresponding author: Konstantinos T. Kotsis 

ABSTRACT

Introduction: generative AI tools such as ChatGPT are reshaping academic writing in higher education, offering both opportunities for linguistic support and creativity, while raising concerns over authorship, plagiarism, and academic integrity.

Objective: this study examines the pedagogical benefits and ethical challenges of ChatGPT in academic writing, exploring how it can be integrated responsibly into higher education practices.

Method: a qualitative thematic synthesis of 33 peer-reviewed studies, reports, and theoretical essays published between 2022 and 2025 was conducted. The analysis focused on two axes: pedagogical applications in writing instruction and ethical implications for academic integrity and authorship.

Development: findings indicate that ChatGPT can serve as a valuable writing coach, enhancing brainstorming, drafting, and revision processes, particularly for multilingual and novice writers. However, issues of algorithmic dependence, fabricated content, plagiarism risks, and unequal access remain significant. The study concludes that effective use of ChatGPT requires AI literacy, transparent disclosure, and equitable institutional policies. A balanced integration of AI, supported by critical pedagogy, can empower students while safeguarding academic standards.

Keywords: ChatGPT; Academic Writing; Higher Education; Writing Pedagogy; Academic Integrity; Artificial Intelligence Literacy.

RESUMEN

Introducción: la aparición de herramientas de inteligencia artificial generativa como ChatGPT ha planteado tanto oportunidades como desafíos para los procesos de escritura académica en la educación superior. Este trabajo introduce: Las herramientas de inteligencia artificial generativa como ChatGPT están transformando la escritura académica en la educación superior, ofreciendo tanto oportunidades de apoyo lingüístico y creatividad como preocupaciones sobre autoría, plagio e integridad académica.

Objetivo: este estudio examina los beneficios pedagógicos y los desafíos éticos de ChatGPT en la escritura académica, explorando cómo puede integrarse de manera responsable en las prácticas de educación superior.

Método: se realizó una síntesis temática cualitativa de 33 estudios revisados por pares, informes y ensayos teóricos publicados entre 2022 y 2025. El análisis se centró en dos ejes: las aplicaciones pedagógicas en la enseñanza de la escritura y las implicaciones éticas para la integridad académica y la autoría.

Desarrollo: los hallazgos indican que ChatGPT puede funcionar como un valioso tutor de escritura, mejorando la lluvia de ideas, la redacción y los procesos de revisión, especialmente para escritores novatos y multilingües. Sin embargo, persisten riesgos de dependencia algorítmica, generación de contenidos falsos, plagio y desigualdad en el acceso. El estudio concluye que el uso efectivo de ChatGPT requiere alfabetización en IA, transparencia en la divulgación y políticas institucionales equitativas. Una integración

equilibrada, apoyada en la pedagogía crítica, puede empoderar al alumnado y al mismo tiempo salvaguardar los estándares académicos.

Palabras clave: ChatGPT; Escritura Académica; Educación Superior; Didáctica de la Escritura; Integridad Académica; Alfabetización en Inteligencia Artificial.

INTRODUCTION

The incorporation of artificial intelligence (AI) in education has begun a new phase with the extensive utilization of large language models (LLMs), particularly ChatGPT, created by OpenAI. Since its launch in late 2022, ChatGPT has swiftly emerged as a prevalent resource in educational settings, eliciting both excitement and apprehension about its capacity to alter academic writing methodologies.^(1,2) In contrast to earlier systems that focused only on grammar correction or stylistic editing, ChatGPT excels in natural language production, enabling the creation of coherent articles, summaries, literature reviews, and research proposals from minimal user input.⁽³⁾ This transition prompts significant pedagogical and ethical issues regarding the instruction, acquisition, and evaluation of writing in higher education.

Educators have offered diverse viewpoints. ChatGPT is regarded as a democratizing instrument that improves access to academic discourse, especially for students with poor competence in academic English, neurodiverse individuals, or those unacquainted with disciplinary conventions.^(4,5) It functions as an astute writing aid, assisting students in producing preliminary manuscripts, rewording intricate ideas, and obtaining immediate feedback.⁽⁶⁾ Conversely, it has faced criticism for promoting superficial engagement with content and cultivating reliance on algorithmic outputs, thereby hurting critical thinking, originality, and academic integrity.^(7,8) Educators encounter escalating difficulties in creating examinations that generative AI cannot readily complete, while institutional honor codes and plagiarism regulations fail to keep pace with technological advancements.

The educational framework is currently being re-evaluated, with conventional methods of academic writing under scrutiny. Literature indicates that AI literacy—characterized as the capacity to critically utilize and think upon AI tools—may soon be as vital as information literacy in academic environments.^(2,9) Simultaneously, inquiries regarding the definitions of authorship, effort, and learning in relation to AI aid persist as unresolved and contentious. As ChatGPT becomes more integrated into student workflows, higher education institutions must traverse a complicated landscape that combines innovation with accountability.

This page consolidates contemporary academic discussions regarding the pedagogical and ethical aspects of ChatGPT in scholarly writing. This study explores how educators and organizations might facilitate the effective, transparent, and responsible utilization of AI tools, based on a compilation of more than thirty current peer-reviewed studies. The objective is to foster a productive discourse on the evolution of academic writing teaching that maintains integrity while using technology advancements.

METHOD

This study used a qualitative synthesis method to investigate the educational and ethical aspects of integrating ChatGPT into academic writing. Instead of performing a conventional systematic review with rigid inclusion/exclusion criteria and quantitative coding, the study is informed by a deliberate selection of peer-reviewed journal papers, institutional reports, and theoretical commentaries published from 2022 to 2025. This period was chosen to document academic reactions to the public introduction and extensive application of ChatGPT in educational settings.

A total of 33 documents were examined, including empirical investigations, conceptual articles, and editorial essays. These writings were drawn from interdisciplinary sources in education, science communication, higher education policy, and digital ethics. The material was identified through focused searches in Google Scholar, Scopus, and Web of Science, supplemented by hand-searching reference lists. The keywords most frequently used included “ChatGPT and academic writing,” “ChatGPT and higher education,” “generative AI and authorship,” “artificial intelligence and plagiarism,” and “AI literacy in education.” The intention was not to conduct an exhaustive systematic review, but rather to capture a representative set of current debates and emerging perspectives between 2022 and 2025. The final corpus included articles from publications such as *Science*, *Education and Information Technologies*, *Nature*, and a range of education-focused open-access platforms. All sources were examined to discern recurring themes, tensions, and developing trends pertinent to educational practice and ethical considerations.

The synthesis employed a thematic coding methodology centered on two primary axes: (a) pedagogical applications and implications of ChatGPT in academic writing teaching, and (b) ethical challenges and institutional solutions concerning academic integrity, authorship, and evaluation. Themes were derived inductively from literature via an iterative process of reading, memorizing, and cross-referencing. Special emphasis was placed

on areas of agreement and disagreement among the literature, along with regional or disciplinary differences in the characterization of ChatGPT's function.

The methodology utilized here adheres to educational research traditions that emphasize conceptual integration and narrative synthesis rather than meta-analytic quantification. It facilitates a comprehensive, context-aware investigation of a swiftly changing phenomenon in academic practice. This synthesis aims to inform educators, policymakers, and curriculum designers with the implications of generative AI tools in higher education writing contexts.

Pedagogical Applications of ChatGPT

The advent of ChatGPT has instigated a significant transformation in the instruction and facilitation of academic writing within educational settings. There is increasing acknowledgment in the literature that generative AI can serve as an effective educational partner, especially when combined with critical literacy methods and clear instructional design. Instead, than supplanting human effort, ChatGPT is increasingly regarded as a framework that can augment writing fluency, aid in outlining and brainstorming, and facilitate the iterative improvement of student works.^(10,11)

A prominent educational advantage of ChatGPT is its function as a low-stakes, non-judgmental writing coach. Numerous investigations indicate that students, particularly those deficient in confidence or academic discourse skills, utilize ChatGPT to investigate concepts, rephrase source materials, and acquire academic language frameworks.^(4,12,13,14) In multilingual classrooms, ChatGPT is characterized as a potent language equalizer that enables learners from varied backgrounds to generate more clear and structured writing, hence fostering more inclusive learning environments.^(15,16)

From a curriculum design standpoint, ChatGPT's capabilities have encouraged instructors to reconceptualize writing assignments as dialogic and process-oriented instead of product-centric.⁽¹⁰⁾ For instance, several educators advocate for students to utilize ChatGPT during the prewriting stage to create concept maps or thesis statements, subsequently engaging in classroom discussions regarding the relevance, precision, and originality of the produced material. Such techniques correspond with constructivist methodologies that conceptualize learning as an active, metacognitive endeavor rather than a passive acquisition of knowledge. This perspective suggests that the incorporation of AI tools could enhance student engagement with the epistemology of writing, especially if students are instructed to analyze, revise, and question AI-generated writings.

Empirical evidence indicates that ChatGPT can facilitate formative feedback loops when educators' direct students to juxtapose their drafts with those generated by AI. Li et al.⁽¹¹⁾ and Cotton et al.⁽¹⁰⁾ discovered that students charged with finding flaws or biases in ChatGPT's outputs exhibited enhanced awareness of argumentation structures, source evaluation, and genre conventions. This educational application reframes AI as a facilitator of advanced cognitive engagement rather than a replacement for critical thinking.

Nonetheless, the incorporation of ChatGPT in writing pedagogy is inconsistent across many schools and fields of study. In more traditional academic environments, the utilization of AI is perceived as a danger to pedagogical integrity, leading some faculty to refrain from formally recognizing or instructing AI-assisted writing methodologies.^(2,8) Consequently, students frequently utilize ChatGPT casually, lacking direction or ethical context. The lack of clear teaching about AI literacy not only perpetuates disparities in access to writing assistance but also diminishes the potential for ChatGPT to serve as a catalyst for enhanced learning.⁽¹⁰⁾

To fulfill the educational potential of ChatGPT, experts advocate for a comprehensive strategy that incorporates AI literacy into academic writing programs, underpinned by explicit institutional policies and ongoing professional development for educators.^(9,17) In our view, such an approach is essential to ensure that the technology is not reduced to a matter of convenience but becomes part of a reflective learning process that encourages students to critically engage with digital authorship and the epistemic implications of algorithmic knowledge creation.

Ethical Tensions and Academic Integrity

The emergence of ChatGPT in academic settings has heightened discussions over academic integrity, plagiarism, and the limits of permissible aid in writing. The tool provides unparalleled assistance for students and researchers; nonetheless, it presents concerns when utilized naively or without appropriate attribution.⁽¹⁸⁾ The ethical ramifications are especially significant as ChatGPT does not produce knowledge but instead generates text by pattern recognition and statistical prediction, thus blurring the distinction between authentic research and algorithmically constructed content.^(8,7)

Conventional definitions of plagiarism presume a human author who deliberately replicates another's work without attribution. ChatGPT complicates this paradigm as its results, albeit not directly replicated from specific sources, are generated from extensive datasets that include copyright and academic content. Consequently, several scholars contend that employing AI-generated content without alteration or critical analysis amounts to a variant of "algorithmic plagiarism".^(2,19) This issue is exacerbated in student writing, because unrefined

submissions may circumvent the intellectual rigor anticipated in academic assignments.⁽²⁰⁾ Cotton et al.⁽¹⁰⁾ assert that the concept of originality in the age of AI necessitates redefinition to reflect the collaborative creation of material by people and machines, accompanied by appropriate acknowledgment of AI's contribution.

An associated concern is the matter of authorship. Academic integrity frameworks have always emphasized the obligation of authors to guarantee the precision and originality of their work. Nonetheless, when text is either partially or entirely produced by ChatGPT, the location of intellectual accountability becomes ambiguous.^(21,22) Prominent publications and editorial boards, such as *Nature*, *Science*, and the *BMJ*, have determined that AI tools cannot be designated as authors due to their absence of accountability and inability to consent to publication.^(23,24,25) The degree to which AI contributions ought to be recognized—whether it is in footnotes, acknowledgments, or methodology—remains ambiguous, with varying norms among institutions and publications.^(26,27)

Transparency is becoming a fundamental principle for the ethical application of AI in academics. Some educators advocate for students to openly acknowledge their use of AI for brainstorming or editing, while others observe that students frequently conceal this aid due to concerns about being accused of academic dishonesty.⁽⁴⁾ This tension highlights the necessity for explicit institutional regulations and educational norms. A tiered disclosure system is recommended, specifying the nature and extent of AI utilization—ranging from grammatical correction to content generation—in academic papers.⁽⁹⁾

A distinctive ethical concern of ChatGPT is its propensity to generate fictitious references or erroneous information, a process termed “hallucination”.⁽²⁸⁾ Students and inexperienced researchers may unintentionally replicate these blunders, undermining the credibility of scholarly work. The onus of fact-checking and critical assessment lies with the human author, necessitating AI literacy skills that numerous learners are currently cultivating. Educators are therefore tasked with creating coursework and workshops that instruct students on how to assess and rectify AI outputs. From our perspective, this challenge is not a minor technical flaw but a fundamental issue that touches on the epistemic reliability of academic knowledge. If students are not explicitly trained to recognize and interrogate such errors, there is a risk of normalizing inaccurate or fabricated information in scholarly communication. Moreover, hallucinations complicate peer review and editorial practices, as reviewers may be faced with texts that appear polished but contain unverifiable claims. We believe that higher education institutions must not only provide students with practical strategies for cross-checking AI-generated references but also embed critical discussions about the limits of algorithmic knowledge production into curricula. By framing hallucinations as teachable moments rather than merely technical problems, educators can foster a deeper understanding of how knowledge is constructed, validated, and disseminated in the digital age.

Although ChatGPT can equalize opportunities for students facing language obstacles, its inconsistent accessibility prompts ethical concerns regarding equity. Access to advanced AI technologies may be constrained by subscription fees or institutional limitations, thereby intensifying disparities among students from varying socio-economic backgrounds.⁽¹⁷⁾ Consequently, ethical implementation must take into account both academic integrity and the equitable allocation of technology resources.

The literature indicates that the ethical incorporation of ChatGPT into academic writing transcends mere detection or ban. It necessitates a thorough framework encompassing AI literacy, transparency in authorship, and proactive institutional rules. Instead of perceiving ChatGPT merely as a danger to integrity, educators and institutions should leverage its possibilities to foster critical awareness and maintain academic principles in the digital era.

DISCUSSION

The synthesis of contemporary literature indicates that the incorporation of ChatGPT into academic writing lies at the convergence of instructional innovation and ethical disruption. ChatGPT, as a generative AI tool, possesses the capacity to democratize writing assistance, enable novel forms of expression, and stimulate educational reform.⁽⁶⁾ Simultaneously, its capabilities provoke significant inquiries regarding originality, authorship, and the maintenance of academic integrity within digital learning contexts. This contradiction underscores the necessity for a sophisticated comprehension that surpasses binary narratives of celebration or prohibition.⁽³⁾

From an educational standpoint, ChatGPT serves as both a writing framework and a metacognitive collaborator. Its capacity to aid in drafting, paraphrasing, and enhancing arguments might alleviate cognitive burden and enable students, especially bilingual learners or those with less robust academic writing skills, to interact more profoundly with disciplinary subject.^(29,30) When combined with explicit instruction, ChatGPT can enhance the cultivation of critical literacy, reflective judgment, and revision techniques.^(31,32,33) These findings correspond with constructivist pedagogies that prioritize process over output and promote student learning through discourse, especially with nonhuman interlocutors.^(34,35)

Nevertheless, literature continually cautions against the unthinking utilization of ChatGPT without educational

intervention. Dependence on AI-generated content jeopardizes learners' skills, promotes superficial interaction with texts, and diminishes students' ownership of their work.⁽²⁰⁾ Instructors thus confront the problem of creating learning situations in which ChatGPT serves not as a shortcut but as a springboard for profound inquiry. Tasks requiring students to analyze or enhance AI-generated writings can promote evaluative thinking and elucidate disciplinary writing conventions.⁽¹⁵⁾

The ethical implications of ChatGPT's proliferation necessitate a reassessment of established academic standards. The assignment of intellectual accountability, once uncomplicated, is now rendered complex by co-authorship involving algorithmic actors.^(24,25) The literature reveals discrepancies in institutional policy, editorial guidelines, and classroom practices concerning AI disclosure.⁽²⁷⁾ Some universities promote transparency and comprehensive disclosures on AI utilization, while others maintain ambiguity, resulting in uncertainty for both educators and learners.^(10,36) The inconsistencies indicate an immediate necessity for higher education institutions to formulate principled, contextually aware rules that safeguard academic integrity while fostering instructional innovation. In our view, the current inconsistencies across institutional and editorial policies underscore the need for careful reflection rather than hasty regulation. While we acknowledge the risks posed by the uncritical use of AI tools, we also recognize their potential to enrich academic practice when used transparently and with clear guidance. We therefore suggest that higher education should approach ChatGPT neither with outright prohibition nor with unqualified acceptance, but with measured integration that balances innovation with integrity.

An additional layer of ethical concern arises regarding equity. While ChatGPT provides considerable benefits for students with linguistic or cognitive impairments, access to sophisticated AI tools is not ubiquitous. Subscription models, infrastructural gaps, and linguistic biases in AI models may exacerbate current educational inequality. Equity-focused implementation must address not just the existence of technology but also the wider socio-economic and cultural settings in which it is situated.⁽¹⁷⁾

Furthermore, ChatGPT's capacity to produce erroneous or fictitious information highlights the necessity of fostering AI literacy in conjunction with academic literacy. Students must be instructed to utilize these technologies proficiently while also critically examining their limitations, epistemic foundations, and socio-technical origins. This corresponds with growing paradigms advocating for a "critical AI pedagogy" grounded in data ethics, platform literacy, and responsible innovation.⁽³⁷⁾

In conclusion, ChatGPT is not just a technological tool but a pedagogical entity whose function in academic writing requires negotiation through collaborative discourse among educators, students, researchers, and policymakers. Instead of presenting its use as a matter of compliance or restriction, a more effective approach emphasizes educational objectives, ethical judgment, and disciplinary standards. The academic community's task is not in resisting or capitulating AI, but in shaping its integration to preserve the ideals of inquiry, rigor, and equity.

CONCLUSIONS

This synthesis of recent work highlights the intricate and developing function of ChatGPT in academic writing. As generative AI techniques are integrated into higher education, their pedagogical and ethical implications must be rigorously examined rather than being taken for granted. ChatGPT provides substantial educational benefits, such as personalized assistance, enhancement of academic language, and innovative writing engagement, while concurrently posing difficulties to conventional notions of authorship, evaluation, and educational equity.

For educators, the consequence is evident: the incorporation of AI writing aids necessitates not only technological proficiency but also deliberate instructional strategies. Educators must create assignments and learning settings that promote critical engagement with AI tools, rather than passive reliance on them. This entails instructing students on assessing AI outputs, contemplating their application, and recognizing the circumstances in which human judgment is essential. The emergence of ChatGPT necessitates a reconsideration of writing as not solely a result, but as a process, dialogue, and cognitive endeavor.

In conclusion, ChatGPT serves not only as a challenge to academic standards but also as a stimulus for instructional reflection and revitalization. The academic community is urged to interact with generative AI in a principled, inclusive, and pedagogically sound manner, rather than reacting with dread or unthinking enthusiasm. The future of writing in higher education will be collaboratively influenced by both human and machine authors; nevertheless, the trajectory of this future is contingent upon the educational decisions we implement now.

REFERENCES

1. Aljuaid H. The impact of artificial intelligence tools on academic writing instruction in higher education: A systematic review. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on ChatGPT*. 2024:26-55. doi:10.24093/awej/ChatGPT.2.

2. Mollaki V. Death of a reviewer or death of peer review integrity? The challenges of using AI tools in peer reviewing and the need to go beyond publishing policies. *Research Ethics*. 2024;20(2):239-250. doi:10.1177/17470161231224552.
3. Bom H-SH. Exploring the opportunities and challenges of ChatGPT in academic writing: A roundtable discussion. *Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging*. 2023;57:165-7. doi:10.1007/s13139-023-00809-2.
4. Gruda D. Three ways ChatGPT helps me in my academic writing. *Nature*. 2024;8:4-5. doi:10.1038/d41586-024-01042-3.
5. Hirsh-Pasek K, Blinkoff E. ChatGPT in Education: Friend or Foe? Brookings Institution; 2023. Available from: <https://coilink.org/20.500.12592/7rh6t8>
6. Mrabet J, Studholme R. ChatGPT: A friend or a foe? In: 2023 International Conference on Computational Intelligence and Knowledge Economy (ICCIKE). IEEE; 2023. p. 269-274. doi:10.1109/ICCIKE58312.2023.10131713.
7. Thorp HH. ChatGPT is fun, but not an author. *Science*. 2023;379(6630):313. doi:10.1126/science.adg7879.
8. Zambrano R, Gómez-Bayona C, Rosas J. Using ChatGPT in academic writing is not writing. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*. 2023;87:1-20. doi:10.17227/rce.num87-17834.
9. Riepl A. Building a digitalised society: Opportunities and challenges of Austria's three-pillar system of digital education. *Advances in Online Education: A Peer-Reviewed Journal*. 2023;1(3):263-274.
10. Cotton DRE, Cotton PA, Shipway JR. Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*. 2023;61(2):228-239. doi:10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148.
11. Li J, Huang J, Wu W, Whipple PB. Evaluating the role of ChatGPT in enhancing EFL writing assessments in classroom settings: A preliminary investigation. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*. 2024;11(1):1-9. doi:10.1057/s41599-024-03755-2.
12. Lo CK, Yu PLH, Xu S, Ng DTK, Jong MSY. Exploring the application of ChatGPT in ESL/EFL education and related research issues: A systematic review of empirical studies. *Smart Learning Environments*. 2024;11(1):50. doi:10.1186/s40561-024-00342-5.
13. Seelro S, Khan MA. Exploring the benefits and challenges of ChatGPT in enhancing ESL learners writing skills. *Academy of Education and Social Sciences Review*. 2024;4(4):480-493. doi:10.48112/aessr.v4i4.885.
14. Emdad FB, Ravuri B, Ayinde L, Rahman MI. ChatGPT, a friend or foe for education? Analyzing the user's perspectives on the latest AI chatbot via Reddit. In: 2024 IEEE International Conference on Interdisciplinary Approaches in Technology and Management for Social Innovation (IATMSI). IEEE; 2024. p. 1-5. doi:10.1109/IATMSI60426.2024.10502836.
15. Domenech J. ChatGPT in the classroom: friend or foe? In: 9th International Conference on Higher Education Advances (HEAd'23). Editorial Universitat Politècnica de València; 2023. p. 339-347.
16. Harunasari SY. Examining the effectiveness of AI-integrated approach in EFL writing: A case of ChatGPT. *International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies*. 2023;39(2):357. doi:10.52155/ijpsat.v39.2.5516.
17. Shakeel A. The role of ChatGPT in academic writing: An exploratory study [master's thesis]. Oslo: Oslo Metropolitan University; 2024.
18. Kotsis K. Legality of employing artificial intelligence for writing academic papers in education. *Journal of Contemporary Philosophical and Anthropological Studies*. 2024;3(1):10-19. doi:10.59652/jcpas.v3i1.375.
19. Kotsis KT. Artificial intelligence creates plagiarism or academic research? *European Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*. 2024;1(6):169-179. doi:10.59324/ejahss.2024.1(6).18.

20. Mahama I, Baidoo-Anu D, Eshun P, Ayimbire B, Eggley VE. ChatGPT in academic writing: A threat to human creativity and academic integrity? An exploratory study. *Indonesian Journal of Innovation and Applied Sciences (IJIAS)*. 2023;3(3):228-239. doi:10.47540/ijias.v3i3.1005.
21. Aylsworth T, Castro C. Should I use ChatGPT to write my papers? *Philosophy & Technology*. 2024;37(4):117. doi:10.1007/s13347-024-00809-w.
22. Hosseini M, Holcombe AO, Kovacs M, Zwart H, Katz DS, Holmes K. Group authorship, an excellent opportunity laced with ethical, legal and technical challenges. *Accountability in Research*. 2024;32(5):762-784. doi:10.1080/08989621.2024.2322557.
23. Stokel-Walker C. ChatGPT listed as author on research papers: Many scientists disapprove. *Nature*. 2023;613:620-621. doi:10.1038/d41586-023-00107-z.
24. Michaux C. Can chat gpt be considered an author? I met with chat gpt and asked some questions about philosophy of art and philosophy of mind. 2023. doi:10.2139/ssrn.4439607.
25. Van Woudenberg R, Ranalli C, Bracker D. Authorship and ChatGPT: A conservative view. *Philosophy & Technology*. 2024;37(1):34. doi:10.1007/s13347-024-00715-1.
26. Goto A, Katanoda K. Should we acknowledge ChatGPT as an author? *Journal of Epidemiology*. 2023;33(7):333-334. doi:10.2188/jea.JE20230078.
27. Hosseini M, Horbach SPJM. Fighting reviewer fatigue or amplifying bias? Considerations and recommendations for use of ChatGPT and other large language models in scholarly peer review. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*. 2023;8(1):6. doi:10.1186/s41073-023-00133-5.
28. Bender EM, Gebru T, McMillan-Major A, Shmitchell S. On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In: *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 2021. p. 610-623. doi:10.1145/3442188.3445922.
29. Tsai CY, Lin YT, Brown IK. Impacts of ChatGPT-assisted writing for EFL English majors: Feasibility and challenges. *Education and Information Technologies*. 2024;29(17):22427-22445. doi:10.1007/s10639-024-12722-y.
30. Xiao Q. ChatGPT as an artificial intelligence (AI) writing assistant for EFL learners: An exploratory study of its effects on English writing proficiency. In: *Proceedings of the 2024 9th International Conference on Information and Education Innovations*. 2024. p. 51-56. doi:10.1145/3664934.3664946.
31. Li J, Huang J, Wu W, Whipple PB. Evaluating the role of ChatGPT in enhancing EFL writing assessments in classroom settings: A preliminary investigation. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*. 2024;11(1):1-9. doi:10.1057/s41599-024-03755-2.
32. Tate TP, Harnick-Shapiro B, Ritchie DR, Tseng W, Dennin M, Warschauer M. Incorporating generative AI into a writing-intensive undergraduate course without off-loading learning. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*. 2025. doi:10.1002/cae.23113.
33. Gupta A, Shivers-McNair A. "Wayfinding" through the AI wilderness: Mapping rhetorics of ChatGPT prompt writing on X to promote critical AI literacies. *Computers and Composition*. 2024;72:102867. doi:10.1016/j.compcom.2024.102867.
34. Bedington A, Halcomb EF, McKee HA, Sargent T, Smith A. Writing with generative AI and human-machine teaming: Insights and recommendations from faculty and students. *Computers and Composition*. 2024;71:102833. doi:10.1016/j.compcom.2024.102833.
35. Cummings RE, Monroe SM, Watkins M. Generative AI in first-year writing: An early analysis of affordances, limitations, and a framework for the future. *Computers and Composition*. 2024;72:102870. doi:10.1016/j.compcom.2024.102870.

36. Misra DP, Chandwar K. ChatGPT, artificial intelligence and scientific writing: What authors, peer reviewers and editors should know. *Journal of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh*. 2023;53(2):90-93. doi:10.1177/14782715231181023.

37. Velander J, Otero N, Milrad M. What is Critical (about) AI Literacy? Exploring conceptualizations present in AI literacy discourse. In: Buch A, Lindberg Y, Cerratto Pargman T, editors. *Framing Futures in Postdigital Education*. Postdigital Science and Education. Springer; 2024. p. 139-160. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-58622-4_8.

FINANCING

No financing.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTION

Conceptualization: Konstantinos T. Kotsis.

Formal analysis: Konstantinos T. Kotsis.

Research: Konstantinos T. Kotsis.

Methodology: Konstantinos T. Kotsis.

Project management: Konstantinos T. Kotsis.

Supervision: Konstantinos T. Kotsis.

Validation: Konstantinos T. Kotsis.

Display: Konstantinos T. Kotsis.