



## Assessing Chat GPT's influence on English Academic writing Educational Prospects and Limitations

Ammar Aslam<sup>1</sup>, Milad Salem Mohammed Ebshara<sup>2</sup>, Unaiza Khudai<sup>3</sup>, Asma Javaid<sup>4</sup> & Anum Fatima<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of English, Ghazi University, Email: [ammar.pitafi2@gmail.com](mailto:ammar.pitafi2@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>PhD candidate, ELT, CIU, Cyprus International University, English Language Teaching Department Haspolat, Nicosia, North Cyprus, via Mersin 10, Turkey Northern Cyprus TR-10 Mersin, Turkey, Email: [miladd2k4@yahoo.com](mailto:miladd2k4@yahoo.com)

<sup>3</sup>PhD Scholar, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Email: [ukhudai162@gmail.com](mailto:ukhudai162@gmail.com)

<sup>4</sup>Department of Software Engineering, The University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir Muzaffarabad, Email: [asma.javaid@ajku.edu.pk](mailto:asma.javaid@ajku.edu.pk)

<sup>5</sup>M.Phil Scholar, Department of English, Ghazi University, Email: [anum61533@gmail.com](mailto:anum61533@gmail.com)

| ARTICLE INFO                                                                              |      |          | ABSTRACT                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Article History:</b>                                                                   |      |          | <i>This study examines the effect of AI-based language tool ChatGPT on English academic writing. The research investigates the advantages and challenges of its application in educational contexts, specifically the ability to improve writing skills, help to overcome difficulties faced by language learners and combat academic integrity and critical thinking issues. The research is quantitative in nature and data is collected through survey from 250 students in different Pakistani universities. To ensure the representativeness of the sample, a random sampling approach is used. The data is processed on SPSS-28, frequency and percentage are reported for demographic information, while chatGPT benefits and barriers and educational implications have been measure on 5-point Likert scale. The findings suggest that ChatGPT is a generally successful tool to enhance academic writing with respect to grammatics, organization, and vocabulary. Furthermore, the tool was reported to boost students' confidence and to help in saving time in writing and editing academic text. But the research also raises fears over the overuse of AI tools, which could lead to a degradation of students' cognitive abilities, and the risks of this being violated with academic integrity, e.g. plagiarism or not being supported in proper citation. This study adds to our understanding of the ongoing narrative about the use of AI tools in educational settings within the field of English academic writing. It provides practical advice for educators and policy makers on finding a trade-off between the advantages of AI supported learning and maintaining academic integrity and enabling learner autonomy. The results highlight the need for responsible AI use policies, and training for students and educators.</i> |
| Received:                                                                                 | May  | 06, 2025 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Revised:                                                                                  | June | 02, 2025 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Accepted:                                                                                 | June | 13, 2025 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Available Online:                                                                         | June | 22, 2025 |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b>Keywords:</b>                                                                          |      |          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| ChatGPT, AI in education, academic writing, academic integrity, English language learning |      |          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b>Corresponding Author:</b>                                                              |      |          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Ammar Aslam                                                                               |      |          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b>Email:</b>                                                                             |      |          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <a href="mailto:ammar.pitafi2@gmail.com">ammar.pitafi2@gmail.com</a>                      |      |          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |

**OPEN ACCESS**



## **Introduction**

Artificial intelligence (AI) in learning has transformed traditional teaching and learning, while with data, skills from the traditional education system and language learning were turned into the practice area for the AI system, designed for academic writing and language study. One of the leading AI tools is ChatGPT, a generative language model that has received widespread attention for its capacity to generate coherent, contextually appropriate and linguistically complex text (Asad et al., 2024). Its English academic writing applications range from helping students to complete essays, to providing real-time feedback on grammar, style, and structure (Tsai et al., 2024). Nevertheless, the quick infusion of AI-based writing aids have also led to extensive discussions about their future impact on education (Yuan et al., 2024). While some practitioners and scholars celebrate ChatGPT as a (potentially) paradigm-shifting innovation that will level access to high-quality writing support, others worry that it might disincentivize critical thinking, promote academic dishonesty, and cheapen student work. In light of these divergent views, a thorough investigation of the impact of ChatGPT on English academic writing is crucial so that the pedagogical and ethical prospects and constraints of deploying this technology in academic settings can be strategically considered (Hongxia & Razali, 2025).

The prevalence of digital learning instruments redesigns pedagogical work, with AI-based writing assistants, such as ChatGPT, being at the vanguard (Song & Song, 2023). Unlike traditional grammar checkers or template-driven writing helpers, ChatGPT uses enormous data volumes and sophisticated Natural Language Processing (NLP) to compose its own original text, reword existing text, and even mimic various writing styles (Lingard, 2023). For English learners and writers in academia, now is a golden time to hone writing skills with immediate, customized feedback. Nonnatives, in particular, might be helped by the possibility of having syntactic mistakes corrected, natural sentences offered, and contextually suitable vocabulary suggested by ChatGPT (Tai et al., 2023). In addition, the tool can be used by teachers to create writing activities, produce sample texts and provide scaffolded interactive learning that is specific to the needs of the learner (Wu, 2024). These benefits indicate that ChatGPT has great potential as a facilitating tool in English academic writing teaching and possibly helping making up for gaps in language mastery and improving general writing competency.

In spite these advantages, integrating ChatGPT to academic writing does not come without obstacles (Alfarraj & Wardat, 2024). A critical issue revolves around the integrity of the works submitted for which it is easy for students to produce essays, research papers drafts or even full blown arguments and claims about origin of the submission itself (Afzal et al., 25). The distinctions between appropriate writing support and written work that is actually produced through AI become more and more indistinct when the new content is turned in as work belonging to a student. As a result, educational institutions are posed with a two-sided issue: to harness the power of AI, but also to establish such structures that can identify and protect against misuse (Arshad et al., 2024). Furthermore, a surplus use of AI-driven content could potentially suppress students' critical thinking and creativity, since the amount of cognitive effort spent on formulating arguments or elaborating thoughts or even writing drafts might decrease (Ullah et al., 2024). The pedagogical implications of this change are significant and demand a reconsideration of how writing skills are both taught, tested and valued in academic contexts.

Another important aspect of this discussion here is the changing role of teachers in an AI-enhanced classroom. As language models such as ChatGPT and other related tools continue to improve, educators need to consider the implications on pedagogy in order for students to become more independent in their writing and use AI responsibly (Xu & Jumaat, 2024). This means building AI literacy—teaching students not just how to use these tools effectively but also how to

critically assess the output they get from them. For example, although ChatGPT can generate well-organised texts it can also output inaccurate biased or shallow text making users work for a good analysis. Educators need to tread carefully and find a balance between welcoming AI as an educational tool and insisting on original and thoughtfully developed ideas. Teachers' professional development programmes: the necessity for teachers to receive adequate training in using AI tools in order to be able to support their students in the ethical and effective use of AI (Janković & Kulić, 2025). Additionally, curriculum developers need to rethink the way assessment is done, moving from easy-to-automate tasks to challenges that focus on creativity, analytical depth, and personal reflection—abilities not reproducible by AI (Ullah et al., 2024).

Outside the classroom the wider impact of ChatGPT as it pertains to English academic writing ranges across policy and governance. More and more universities and academic institutions are facing the challenge to set up well-defined policies about which extent the use of AI within students' works is acceptable (Esmail, 2025). Some institutions have elected to follow more restrictive directions, prohibiting or strictly controlling AI-generated content, while others propose a more permissive alternative, acknowledging AI as an unavoidable and potentially profitable supplement to the modern day education. These contrasting positions continue to demonstrate uncertainty about AI's place in education, but the importance of creating policy based on evidence and focused on educational objectives is clear (Ghafar, 2023). In addition, advances in the development of AI endure at a fast speed, that the regulations should be flexible and need to be modified to follow technological advancements and to be adjusted for new ethical concerns and pedagogy (Yen et al., 2024).

The social context and cultural shaping of the adoption of ChatGPT in academic writing also deserve scrutiny. While English is increasingly becoming a world academic lingua franca (Lee, 2016), AI writing tools could either contribute to or alleviate the existing disparity in education quality (Yusfi & Asmara, 2023). On the other hand, for students who come from under-resourced environments or non-English-speaking countries, ChatGPT may also be a powerful friend that could break down language barriers and level the playing field (Xiao et al., 2025). Alternatively, inequalities of digital access and technological literacy could exacerbate the gap between advantaged and disadvantaged learners, thereby perpetuating existing inequalities (Zaiarna et al., 2024). There is also a concern that the homogenization of texts, due to mass usage of AIs, could contribute to the loss of linguistic diversity ("Why hire local versions of Siri" is an explicitly asked question on the OpenAI blog). These social cultural consequences call for a nuanced understanding of the impact of AI, that takes into account its empowering potential as well as its side effects.

Due to the multifold impacts of ChatGPT on English academic writing, this study aims to explain its overall educational implications and constraints. By building upon knowledge from pedagogy, linguistics, ethics, and technology studies, the study seeks to uncover possibilities and pitfalls of AI-assisted writing. Central research topics encompass the effectiveness of the tool in improving writing skills, its support for language learners, the threats it entails for academic integrity, what adjustments it entails in teaching practices and university protocols (Wang et al., 2024). With a blend of empirical investigation with interviews with educators and feedback from students, the study aims to provide actionable insights for stakeholders— from classroom teachers to policy makers—on how to leverage ChatGPT in a responsible manner and temper its risks.

In the end, the conversation about ChatGPT and other AIs like it in education is not simply about technology uptake, but about reshaping the future of learning and authorship. The question is not whether AI should be a part of our academic routines — given how deeply integrated it has become, it is here to stay — but rather, how we can make the most of it without undermining our

students' intellectual and creative abilities. This will involve cooperation among educators, researchers, developers, and policy makers to provide guidelines for best practices, which should be compatible with the main goals of education: promoting critical thinking, originality, and effective communication (Yan, 2023). By examining the role of ChatGPT in English academic writing with a critical stance, the present research offers a general discussion of how new technologies can be incorporated in an academic context that is rigorous, equitable and innovative. The results inform strategic decisions about how academic institutions can integrate an AI based approach in authentic production of academic writing, while maintaining the credibility and transformative influences of quality academic writing.

The introduction of ChatGPT to English academic writing is an inflection point for education, one that presents transformative opportunities as well as daunting challenges. Even though this promises to improve writing efficiency, assist language learners, or offer customized feedback, issues of academic honesty, critical thinking, and pedagogical adaptations must not be dismissed. As AI continues to advance, educators, institutions, and policy-makers need to have an ongoing conversation around ethical boundaries, assessment, and responsibility around AI literacy among students. This research aims to contribute to such a dialogue by conducting a rigorous assessment of the application of ChatGPT to the academic writing process, thus helping stakeholders to make informed decisions on how to leverage its potential for learning while minimizing potential risks. By addressing these complexities, we hope that the tools and methods of the research will be a resource for a future where AI is viewed as a supplement to – as opposed to a replacement for – the ideas and creative capacity that are so central to the intellectual tasks manifest in meaningful academic writing.

### **Problem of the Statement**

The rise of AI technologies, similar to ChatGPT in English academic writing, can provide a clear opportunity to education. Such tools, which provide useful assistance in the improvement of writing skills, are essential in most academic settings, but there are concerns about the potential side effects on the integrity of academic writing, for example on critical thinking and the authentic nature of the writing. This in turn could lead to the student generation to become ever more dependent on AI to write for them, and lose the necessary skill to be able to write alone. Furthermore, there is a widespread problem in schools in their attempts to formulate school policies concerning AI, resulting in differences in academic quality. The lack of study on the long-term effect of ChatGPT on writing skill also complicates this matter. This paper extends from this vacuum by investigating the effect of ChatGPT on English academic writing, pointing out its educational merits as well as warning potential dangers for its responsible use in academic contexts.

### **Objectives of the Study**

1. To examine the effectiveness of ChatGPT in improving English academic writing skills among students, focusing on grammar, structure, and coherence.
2. To identify the potential benefits of ChatGPT as an educational tool for enhancing writing proficiency and supporting language learners in academic contexts.
3. To investigate the challenges and limitations associated with using ChatGPT for academic writing, including issues of academic integrity and critical thinking development.
4. To propose recommendations for the responsible integration of ChatGPT in English academic writing instruction and assessment practices.

## **Significance of the Study**

This study has multiple academic stakeholders of interest. For educators, it offers research-based information to help them make pragmatic decisions in how to implement ChatGPT into writing instruction that is academically sound. It will help students to have clearer instructions about using AI tools in an ethical way to support, but not replace, their writing skills. Universities can take the findings to create balanced policies on the promise and peril of AI-enabled writing.

The study adds to the literature on AI in education by providing a much-needed nuanced examination of the effects of ChatGPT on writing and critical thinking skills. The advice can be used by policymakers to create standardized guidelines for how artificial intelligence should be used in education. Ultimately, this research hopes to promote responsible AI use that preserves the integrity of learning but leverages technological advances to enhance learning achievement in English academic writing.

## **Literature Review**

### **The Rise of AI in Education**

The introduction of artificial intelligence (AI) in our education system reshaped the orthodox approaches for teaching and learning. There is an increasing trend of AI-enabled tools, especially in language processing, which have emerged to support content generation, grammar correction, personalized teach (Faiz et al., 2023). One of these tools named ChatGPT, released by OpenAI, is a pre-trained AI language model that is employed for generating human-like text, response answering with query liquidity, and writing support. It works for all types of academic writing from writing an essay to revising a research paper, and it can be used as a teaching tool, so it serves as a good point for both teachers and students to start (Ghafouri et al., 2024).

The use of AI in education reflects larger movements in digital learning which advance digital accessibility and efficiency. Real-time AI writing assistants such as ChatGPT provide corrective feedback, thereby reducing the time educators spend on repetitive jobs such as grammar checks, so that they can focus on higherlevel writing skills (Qazi et al., 2024). But the rapid adoption of such tools has also sparked concerns about their impact on long-term learning outcomes as well as students' ability to think critically and academic integrity.

### **ChatGPT and English Academic Writing: Potential Benefits**

#### **Enhancing Writing Proficiency**

One of the extremely positive aspects of ChatGPT in the SVW context pertains to language development in academic writing. As a real-time writing coach, ChatGPT corrects grammar, style, and vocabulary for non-native English speakers. Research found that AI-suggested sentences can support learners in mastering grammatical rules and in writing by providing a more natural language over time (Isiaku et al., 2024). Furthermore, through its ability to paraphrase and recast sentences, the tool's balancing of multiple models of language provides learners with new ways to express themselves, promoting greater linguistic flexibility.

#### **Supporting Language Learners and Researchers**

For both ESL learners and academic authors, the most challenging aspect of writing is probably the composing process like understanding the structure of an essay, maintaining an organized form, and orchestrating complex ideas and arguments. Programs such as ChatGPT can aid in the thinking process by writing blog posts for you, providing you with an outline, and even suggesting transitions or specific scientific terminology (Ramzan et al., 2023). For scholars, it can guide the

writing of literature reviews, sharpen the abstract of a paper or cut through complexity in an argument. This level of support is especially useful in higher education, where academic writing requires precision and complexity.

### **Facilitating Personalized and Adaptive Learning**

And unlike other writing assistants we use, ChatGPT responds to your specific input, providing suggestions based on what you've typed so far. This personalized approach corresponds to differentiated learning and this way students get customized learning support based on their proficiency level (Javaid et al., 2023). A few educators have also been dabbling with artificial intelligence as an additive in writing workshops, for instance, by having students compare AI-generated drafts against their own to determine what needs work. These applications show that ChatGPT can be used as a shared learning tool, instead of a simple content generator.

### **Challenges and Limitations of ChatGPT in Academic Writing**

#### **Threats to Academic Integrity**

As useful as it is, ChatGPT also has potential risks for academic integrity. If it becomes so simple to create essays, research papers, or for that matter, entire structured arguments this student is concerned that plagiarism and originality cannot be safeguarded. Some organisations have applied AI-detection, however this is not without errors and thus there remain discussions over what rules should be enforced to try to hold back the flow of AI content within academic work (Cotton et al., 2024). And it's this moral gray area that separates AI-assisted writing from pure academic cheating.

#### **Over-Reliance and Diminished Critical Thinking**

A big pedagogical worry is that an overreliance on AI tools would degrade students' critical thinking and creativity. Writing is not so much about correctness, in the sense of grammatical text, but about constructing claims, integrating them, and working out ideas – brain skills, not bureaucratic ones, in other words. Excessive reliance on ChatGPTs to provide multiple narrative threads, depending on the students' input, might deprive students of opportunities, as narrative threads, for developing their skills of analysis and expression (Wu, 2024). Educators fear AI will cause learners to only superficially engage while they use time-saving shortcuts, instead of experiencing deeper cognitive engagement.

#### **Accuracy and Bias in AI-Generated Content**

Though ChatGPT is great at generating coherent text, it isn't perfect. The model may generate fake news, obsolete information or biased information according to the training data. Such errors can detract from the quality of work in scholarly writing, where accuracy and truthfulness are paramount. Furthermore, as ChatGPT has no real understanding it can produce convincing, yet invalid sounding arguments (Luo et al., 2024). Students who do not know the pitfalls run the risk of adding false or misleading information to their papers.

### **Pedagogical Implications and Institutional Responses**

#### **Rethinking Writing Instruction**

As AI writing tools gain traction, we need to teach how to write differently. For obvious reasons, traditional approaches to writing, in which students aimed for perfect grammar and banal essay structure, may be due for a rethink. Rather, teachers should direct their teaching attention to upper-level skills like argumentation, source assessment, and ethical writing (Tran, 2025). Some schools

are even trying "AI integrated" course work, teaching students to use something like GPT-3 to draft work while continuing to hold full responsibility for the product they end up submitting.

### **Developing AI Literacy among Students and Educators**

To help mitigate misuse, schools and universities should emphasize AI literacy, or how to critically engage with tools like ChatGPT. And this also means acknowledging its flaws, verifying what AI creates and knowing its ethical limits. In the same vein, there is a need for teachers' professional development to successfully integrate AI into their teaching practices (Whalen & Mouza, 2023). Workshops on AI-supported graders, assignment development and plagiarism is one such way to help faculty navigate the changing frontier.

### **Policy and Regulation in Academic Institutions**

The widespread use of ChatGPT has been so swift that colleges are now creating rules about when it is acceptable to use AI in school work. Some schools have outlawed content created by AI usage all together, while others allow usage with some restrictions, and proper citation (Jin et al., 2025). There's no unanimity yet, but a growing number of institutions are adopting flexible policies that recognize the role of AI while protecting academic integrity. Potential future topics include standardized citation practices for AI-derived text and revisions to honor codes that accommodate new types of digital authorship.

### **Future Directions and Research Gaps**

Although advantages and disadvantages of using ChatGPT for academic writing are discussed in existing literature, several aspects of these practices are less explored areas. Longitudinal research is required to determine whether AI-supported writing leads to long-term proficiency, rather than short-term crutch. Finally, the use case (e.g., scientific writing versus humanities) AI for discipline-specific application could further provide more profound insights into personalized application. One more is the psychological effect of reliance on the AI, such as students' confidence in their writing skills when employing the tools.

Last but not least, there is a need to further explore the ethical aspects of AI in education. As ChatGPT becomes more and more advanced, questions of authorship, intellectual property, and responsible access are only going to become more pressing. The further consideration should be given to responsible AI integration, with innovation driven to improve rather than dilute educational outcomes.

### **Conclusion of Literature Review**

Research on ChatGPT's use for academic writing in English presents a nuanced view of its educational potential and limitations. Although it provides an effective tool that helps students improve English learning, enhance writing efficiency, and provide a personalized corrective response, issues concerning academic honesty, critical reflection, and the reliability of content can remain. The pedagogy must strike a balance between progress and caution, educating an AI literate populace and protecting the essential character of academic writing. As the AI landscape develops, continued research and policies that can adjust with AI advances will be necessary to develop its responsible use in education.

### **Research Methodology**

The methodology for this study intends to investigate the impact of ChatGPT on English academic writing of university students. The study has a quantitative approach and surveys have been used to gather data from 250 participants. Respondents are recruited through simple random sampling

from the universities across Pakistan. This Probability random sampling allow all members of the population to have equal likelihood of being selected thereby making the result generally applicable to various universities.

The obtained data is analyzed by employing the SPSS-28; It's a computer program to perform statistical analysis of quantitative information. The personal characteristics of the participants, including gender, age, grade, major, etc., are expressed in frequencies and percentages. This also illustrates the composition of the sample, and to an extent, the background of the respondents. For the remaining dataset, the perceived advantages, barriers and pedagogical implications of using ChatGPT for academic writing are measured on a 5-level Likert scale. The Likert scale permits some fine discrimination in participants' attitudes and experiences, from Strongly Disagree at one end to Strongly Agree at the other.

The results are expressed directly in tables which enable an end-user to understand and interpret them easily and unambiguously. It computes the frequencies of responses to each statement and provides an overview of how people feel about ChatGPT and its role in their own academic writing. We analyze this data to surface themes emerging around the efficacy, potential, and areas of friction for AI chat tools for education such as ChatGPT.

The present approach offers a systematic investigation of ChatGPT's effect on academic writing, with a distinct, large sample size, and with valid statistical procedures to guarantee the validity and reliability of the findings.

### **Reliability of the Instrument**

Internal consistency is demonstrated by the reliability analysis of the survey instrument, with all the three variables showing a high level of internal consistency (Butt & Yazdani, 2023), (values of Cronbach's Alpha far above the acceptability threshold of 0.80). More specifically, the Perceived Benefits of Writing with ChatGPT ( $\alpha = 0.86$ ) has excellent reliability, suggesting that the items intended to capture the benefits of ChatGPT in academic writing contexts are all consistently providing stable scores. Second, this construct also has good reliability ( $\alpha = 0.81$ ) for perceived barriers using ChatGPT for academic writing, indicating that items related to the perceived barriers or difficulties encountered in using ChatGPT as a tool measure this construct consistently. Finally, the Educational Implications and Learning Impact ( $\alpha = 0.83$ ) again confirms the overall reliability of the instrument, that the items composing the learning effects of ChatGPT are coherent and consistent. Overall, these findings highlight the validity of the instrument in terms of its capacity to reliably measure perceptions, barriers, and educational outcomes in the use of ChatGPT in academic writing. Overall the survey instrument is reliable for its intended use, so any data gathered using the instrument will reflect respondents' perceptions and experiences with the tool.

**Table 1: Reliability Analysis of the Survey Instrument**

| <b>Variables</b>                                         | <b>Cronbach's Alpha (<math>\alpha</math>)</b> | <b>No of items</b> |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Perceived Benefits of Using ChatGPT in Academic Writing  | 0.86                                          | 10                 |
| Perceived Barriers in Using ChatGPT for Academic Writing | 0.81                                          | 10                 |
| Educational Implications and Learning Impact             | 0.83                                          | 10                 |

## Data Analysis

Data analysis is also a very important step in the research article, as it is the one, on which the meaningful conclusion on the obtained data is drawn. The measures that are being examined into are being summarized and assessed by the means of statistical and logical analysis tools that relate to their assumptions and discuss the trend of operations that constitute a set of meaningful verifiable facts (Sadia, 2020). A report part of publications is an instrument of a quantitative representation of what was achieved the valid and reliable results. Processing of such data into a systematic form will allow Scientists verify it with software, tools or techniques, through tables, graphs, and other representations of statistics (Butt, 2021).

## Results

### Demographic Information

#### Section 1: Demographic Information (N = 250)

| Variable         | Category            | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------|----------------|
| Gender           | Male                | 120       | 48.0%          |
|                  | Female              | 130       | 52.0%          |
| Age              | Under 20            | 45        | 18.0%          |
|                  | 21–25               | 130       | 52.0%          |
|                  | 26–30               | 60        | 24.0%          |
|                  | 31 and above        | 15        | 6.0%           |
| Academic Level   | Undergraduate       | 150       | 60.0%          |
|                  | Graduate            | 70        | 28.0%          |
|                  | Postgraduate        | 25        | 10.0%          |
|                  | Other               | 5         | 2.0%           |
| Field of Study   | English/Linguistics | 140       | 56.0%          |
|                  | Education           | 70        | 28.0%          |
|                  | Other               | 40        | 16.0%          |
| Frequency of Use | Never               | 20        | 8.0%           |
|                  | Rarely              | 30        | 12.0%          |
|                  | Sometimes           | 85        | 34.0%          |
|                  | Often               | 70        | 28.0%          |
|                  | Always              | 45        | 18.0%          |

### Gender Distribution

The distribution by gender of the sample is quite homogeneous, being composed of 52% women (130 participants) and 48% men (120 subjects). This indicates that people from both sexes are sufficiently sampled to have a more general understanding of the perception and behaviour of individuals of both genders.

### Age Distribution

The majors category which make up the majority of the sample are those aged between 21-25, where 130 = 52% were while 49, 20% of the sample were aged between 16-20. This represents a good proportion of the young age group, which can be anticipated in academic studies, given the fact that young age group covers university and college students. Next is 26-30 (24%, 60), Under 20 (18%, 45), and the smallest group is 31 and over (6%, 15). The demographic skew toward

younger respondents indicates that the sample should reflect the position of people earlier in their academic careers, or early in their professional careers.

### **Academic Level**

In terms of level of study, most respondents are Undergraduates, which account for 60% (150 respondents). This is also in accordance with the age groupings as undergraduates are usually a large proportion of academic cohorts. Graduate students make up 28% of the students (70 students) and postgraduate students 10% (25 students). Very few (2%, 5 respondents) answered "Other", which suggests the academic levels of the respondents are primarily undergraduates and graduates.

### **Field of Study**

Regarding the field of study, most of the participants are enrolled in English/Linguistics, that is 56% of the sample (140 participants). This is not surprising if the survey is concerned with academic writing or language-related topics. Education students constitute 28% of the sample (70 respondents), and Other 16% (40 respondents). The data reflect a heavy tendency in favour of participants with a background in language and education that might be especially appropriate with regard to the application and consequences of tools such as ChatGPT in settings of learning and academia.

### **Frequency of Use**

Frequency of using ChatGPT For the frequency of use of ChatGPT, most people use it: Sometimes (85 respondents, 34%), meaning that ChatGPT is somewhere in moderate use by people, not necessarily on a daily or common use. The second biggest group is Does ChatGPT often (28%, 70 people), meaning a large proportion of people incorporate it in their academic practice. Never not using chatGPT was mentioned by 18% (45 people), indicating a smaller yet significant portion of very regular users. At the opposite end of the scale, 12% (30 respondents) said they Hardly ever use ChatGPT, with 8% (20 respondents) having not used it at all. The relatively large proportion of moderate and frequent use suggests that ChatGPT is being embraced as a useful aid in academic writing or study for many of the participants.

### **Section 2: Perceived Benefits of Using ChatGPT**

| <b>Statement</b>                                                    | <b>S.D</b>  | <b>D</b>     | <b>N</b>      | <b>A</b>     | <b>S.A</b>    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| ChatGPT helps me organize my academic writing more effectively.     | 5<br>(2%)   | 15<br>(6%)   | 30<br>(12%)   | 120<br>(48%) | 80<br>(32%)   |
| It improves the quality of my grammar and sentence structure.       | 4<br>(1.6%) | 10<br>(4%)   | 26<br>(10.4%) | 130<br>(52%) | 80<br>(32%)   |
| ChatGPT provides useful suggestions for vocabulary and word choice. | 3<br>(1.2%) | 12<br>(4.8%) | 25<br>(10%)   | 135<br>(54%) | 75<br>(30%)   |
| Using ChatGPT enhances my confidence in writing.                    | 6<br>(2.4%) | 20<br>(8%)   | 40<br>(16%)   | 110<br>(44%) | 74<br>(29.6%) |
| It saves time in drafting and editing academic texts.               | 2<br>(0.8%) | 6<br>(2.4%)  | 18<br>(7.2%)  | 140<br>(56%) | 84<br>(33.6%) |
| ChatGPT helps me understand academic writing conventions better.    | 5<br>(2%)   | 10<br>(4%)   | 30<br>(12%)   | 125<br>(50%) | 80<br>(32%)   |
| It assists in generating ideas and outlines for academic papers.    | 4<br>(1.6%) | 8<br>(3.2%)  | 20<br>(8%)    | 135<br>(54%) | 83<br>(33.2%) |
| ChatGPT improves my ability to paraphrase and summarize texts.      | 7<br>(2.8%) | 18<br>(7.2%) | 35<br>(14%)   | 120<br>(48%) | 70<br>(28%)   |

|                                                                         |             |              |             |              |               |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| It supports independent learning and writing skill development.         | 8<br>(3.2%) | 15<br>(6%)   | 40<br>(16%) | 115<br>(46%) | 72<br>(28.8%) |
| Overall, ChatGPT is beneficial in improving my academic writing skills. | 3<br>(1.2%) | 12<br>(4.8%) | 25<br>(10%) | 140<br>(56%) | 70<br>(28%)   |

### **Perceived Benefits of Using ChatGPT for Academic Writing**

The data underscores users' very positive perceptions about the role of ChatGPT in the improvement of academic writing. Creating value for Chat Of those who have plugged in ChatGPT, >90% find the experience worthwhile to do so, against a minority who disagree or see no difference.

### **Organization and Writing Quality**

An impressive 80% of surveyees feel that ChatGPT better organizes writing for school (48% have agreed and another 32% have strongly agreed). And by an 84-16 split, they say it helps with grammar and sentence structure as well. (52% agree, 32% strongly agree). Further, 84% see value in its vocabulary and word-choice suggestions (54% somewhat agree, 30% strongly agree) confirming its usefulness in shaping language.

### **Confidence and Efficiency**

Totalling 73.6% agree or strongly agree that they have more confidence to write based on ChatGPT. Furthermore an impressive 89.6% report that it's a time-saver in the drafting and editing stages (56% agree; 33.6% strongly agree), proving it is a tool that shortens the academic process.

### **Understanding Academic Conventions and Idea Generation**

An overwhelming 82% believe ChatGPT makes them understand academic writing conventions better (50% agree, 32% strongly agree). Likewise, 87.2% would want to use it for brainstorming and outlining (54% would, 33.2% would very strongly ), so it has potential for the initial writing phase.

### **Paraphrasing, Summarizing, and Independent Learning**

A substantial 76% agree they've gained higher level paraphrasing and summarizing abilities through ChatGPT (48% agree, 28% strongly agree). Seventy-five sixteen percent, on the other hand, feel it's conducive to self-learning and skill building (46 percent agree, 28.8 percent strongly agree).

### **Overall Perception**

An overwhelming 84% of respondents find it helpful for academic writing overall (56% agree, 28% strongly agree), with 6% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing.

### **Conclusion**

The results reveal the perceived benefit of ChatGPT for academic writing, in terms of organization, grammar, time efficiency, and learning across most of its users. And though a few people still remain skeptical, the overall positive reaction to ChatGPT would seem to indicate that it's considered an important new tool for writing and productivity.

### **Section 3: Perceived Barriers of Using ChatGPT**

| <b>Statement</b>                         | <b>S.D</b> | <b>D</b> | <b>N</b> | <b>A</b> | <b>S.A</b> |
|------------------------------------------|------------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| ChatGPT sometimes provides inaccurate or | 4          | 12       | 25       | 140      | 69         |

|                                                                          |             |              |               |              |               |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| misleading information.                                                  | (1.6%)      | (4.8%)       | (10%)         | (56%)        | (27.6%)       |
| Over-reliance on ChatGPT may hinder my own writing development.          | 6<br>(2.4%) | 18<br>(7.2%) | 30<br>(12%)   | 125<br>(50%) | 71<br>(28.4%) |
| I worry about academic integrity when using ChatGPT for writing.         | 5<br>(2%)   | 10<br>(4%)   | 30<br>(12%)   | 130<br>(52%) | 75<br>(30%)   |
| ChatGPT lacks proper citation and referencing support.                   | 8<br>(3.2%) | 20<br>(8%)   | 40<br>(16%)   | 125<br>(50%) | 57<br>(22.8%) |
| I find it difficult to critically evaluate content generated by ChatGPT. | 10<br>(4%)  | 18<br>(7.2%) | 35<br>(14%)   | 120<br>(48%) | 67<br>(26.8%) |
| ChatGPT may lead to plagiarism if not used carefully.                    | 6<br>(2.4%) | 10<br>(4%)   | 25<br>(10%)   | 140<br>(56%) | 69<br>(27.6%) |
| I face technical or accessibility issues while using ChatGPT.            | 15<br>(6%)  | 25<br>(10%)  | 30<br>(12%)   | 110<br>(44%) | 70<br>(28%)   |
| I am not fully aware of how to use ChatGPT effectively in writing.       | 5<br>(2%)   | 18<br>(7.2%) | 28<br>(11.2%) | 125<br>(50%) | 74<br>(29.6%) |
| ChatGPT sometimes uses language that is too advanced or unnatural.       | 6<br>(2.4%) | 12<br>(4.8%) | 30<br>(12%)   | 135<br>(54%) | 67<br>(26.8%) |
| There are institutional restrictions on using AI tools in academic work. | 10<br>(4%)  | 22<br>(8.8%) | 33<br>(13.2%) | 120<br>(48%) | 65<br>(26%)   |

### **Perceived Barriers of Using ChatGPT in Academic Writing**

The data uncovers several issues that users have about ChatGPT in conjunction with its limitations and possible dangers in academic writing. Most recognize it as a useful tool, however many cite accuracy, academic integrity and ease as roadblocks.

#### **Accuracy and Reliability Concerns**

A healthy 83.6% of you agree that ChatGPT can be wrong or give misleading information (56% agree, 27.6% strongly agree). And 78.4% have a hard time critically evaluating AI-generated materials (48% say this and 26.8% strongly agree), so it's possible that users will be unable to find the accuracy of ChatGPT's replies.

#### **Academic Integrity and Plagiarism Risks**

When using ChatGPT: 82% are concerned about academic integrity (30% strongly agree and 52% agree with this statement). Likewise, 83.6% think misuse of ChatGPT could result in plagiarism (56% agree, 27.6% strongly agree). The present findings have implications for the ethical considerations of AI-mediated writing.

#### **Over-Reliance and Skill Development**

A significant 78.4% fear that dependence on ChatGPT can be a checkpoint to developing their own writing (50% agree, 28.4% strongly agree). This indicates that it is of assistance to the tool, but too much reliance can hinder long-term learning.

### **Citation and Referencing Limitations**

A total of 72.8% believe that ChatGPT does not provide an adequate structure and support for citations and references (50% agree, 22.8% strongly agree), which could be problematic for academic writing that depends on robust sourcing.

### **Technical and Usability Issues**

About 72% experience technical or access problems (44% agree, 28% strongly agree). Expanding to also consider “agree”, 79.6% admit they do not fully understand how to use ChatGPT well (where “agree” is either 50% or 29.6%), which suggests a lack of better guidance on good usage.

### **Language and Institutional Restrictions**

A large majority (80.8%) find ChatGPT to sometimes use overly advanced or unnatural language (54% agree, 26.8% strongly agree). Additionally, 74% also report it is somewhat or strongly restricted to use AI tools by their institution (48% agree, 26% strongly agree), which could possibly put a barrier in the academic setting.

### **Conclusion**

However, despite its benefits, it presents several barriers such as: potential for ChatGPT to be used inaccurately, risk to academic integrity, over-dependence, and technical challenges. Some solutions for institutions and educators may involve clearer policies about ethical uses of AI, more AI literacy, and guidelines in place for citations, etc. Striking that balance between AI aid and independent skills acquisition, however, is paramount to academic success.

### **Section 4: Educational Implications and Learning Impact**

| <b>Statement</b>                                                                       | <b>S.D</b>  | <b>D</b>     | <b>N</b>      | <b>A</b>     | <b>S.A</b>    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| ChatGPT can be a valuable educational tool for learning academic writing.              | 2<br>(0.8%) | 8<br>(3.2%)  | 20<br>(8%)    | 135<br>(54%) | 85<br>(34%)   |
| I believe educators should include AI tools in writing instruction.                    | 3<br>(1.2%) | 10<br>(4%)   | 30<br>(12%)   | 130<br>(52%) | 77<br>(30.8%) |
| ChatGPT helps me identify and correct my writing mistakes.                             | 5<br>(2%)   | 12<br>(4.8%) | 25<br>(10%)   | 135<br>(54%) | 73<br>(29.2%) |
| I have improved my academic writing by using ChatGPT regularly.                        | 4<br>(1.6%) | 15<br>(6%)   | 26<br>(10.4%) | 125<br>(50%) | 80<br>(32%)   |
| ChatGPT supports personalized learning for different writing levels.                   | 6<br>(2.4%) | 10<br>(4%)   | 30<br>(12%)   | 130<br>(52%) | 74<br>(29.6%) |
| Teachers should guide students on ethical AI usage in academics.                       | 5<br>(2%)   | 8<br>(3.2%)  | 20<br>(8%)    | 140<br>(56%) | 77<br>(30.8%) |
| ChatGPT encourages independent and self-paced learning.                                | 3<br>(1.2%) | 12<br>(4.8%) | 30<br>(12%)   | 125<br>(50%) | 80<br>(32%)   |
| Educational institutions should integrate AI tools responsibly.                        | 4<br>(1.6%) | 10<br>(4%)   | 25<br>(10%)   | 140<br>(56%) | 71<br>(28.4%) |
| AI tools like ChatGPT should complement, not replace, traditional writing instruction. | 5<br>(2%)   | 12<br>(4.8%) | 30<br>(12%)   | 130<br>(52%) | 73<br>(29.2%) |
| The use of ChatGPT has positively changed how I approach academic writing.             | 3<br>(1.2%) | 10<br>(4%)   | 25<br>(10%)   | 135<br>(54%) | 77<br>(30.8%) |

## **Educational Implications and Learning Impact of ChatGPT**

The results show overwhelming support for ChatGPT as an educational tool in academic writing, with a majority considering that it could improve learning while expressing cautions for its responsible integration and teacher guidance.

### **Positive Perception as an Educational Tool**

Fully 88% of respondents indicate ChatGPT helps them learn academic writing (54% agree, 34% strongly agree). Further, 82.8% of respondents think educators should use AI tools to help teach writing (52% agree, 30.8% strongly agree), suggesting high demand for AI-facilitated learning within formal education.

### **Improvement in Writing Skills**

A strong 83.2% say that ChatGPT assists them in catching and fixing writing errors (54% agree, 29.2% strongly agree). Moreover 82% report improved academic writing as a result of frequent use (50% agree, 32% strongly agree), proving its role as a tool for supporting skill development.

### **Personalized and Independent Learning**

An impressive 81.6% agree that ChatGPT can be used for personalized learning across a range of writing proficiencies (52% agreed, 29.6% strongly agreed). Further, 82% think it promotes self-directed and self-paced learning (50% agree, 32% strongly agree), emphasising the way it supports the development of independent students.

### **Ethical Guidance and Institutional Responsibility**

Meanwhile 86.8% think teachers have a role to play in leading students to ethical uses of AI (56% agree; 30.8% strongly agree). Likewise, 84.4% of respondents are in favor of responsible wear-in of AI tools into education (56% agree, 28.4% strongly agree), demonstrating the call for formalised policies on AI adoption.

### **Complementing Traditional Instruction**

Concept: The Discussion Around AI in the classroom: ChatGPT is great, but traditional writing instruction in the classroom is also important: Exposure to AI is considered positive, but it should be complimentary to, not replace, traditional writing instruction ( $52\% + 29.2\% = 81.2\%$ ). This implies a tendency for a middle way according to which AI supports learning but does not weaken basic writing competences.

### **Transformative Impact on Writing Approaches**

An overwhelming 84.8% affirmation on whether ChatGPT has positively impacted the way they write academically (54% agree, 30.8% strongly agree), reflecting its effect on the way that users write, on their habits, efficiency and confidence.

## **Conclusion**

The results show a high level of agreement on the educational potential of ChatGPT, with students citing its capability to improve writing skills, enable personalized learning and promote autonomous learning. But there is a demand, which the essays cause, for ethical guidance, teacher input and responsible institutional policy that will guarantee that AI enhances—rather than interferes with—traditional writing instruction. Constructive integration and critical mindfulness will be necessary as AI tools mature in order to best leverage them while minimizing their downside.

## **Discussion**

The results of the study demonstrate the double-edged sword of ChatGPT for English academic writing in terms of both transformative possibilities and major challenges. The results show that the biggest share among students uses ChatGPT as a tool to enhance writing efficiency, grammar and organization. But issues with academic integrity, dependency, and the authenticity of AI-authors' products continue to dominate high-level discourse. These findings are consistent with the general trend of AI-supported education, on one hand utilizing generative language models in learning settings and on the other livenerating pedagogical and ethical questions.

Much like other studies show, ChatGPT is being used as a powerful tool for non-native English speakers in that it provides real-time corrections and vocabulary suggestions. Studies show that AI tools, including ChatGPT, help students to learn how to structure sentences, to paraphrase successfully and to follow academic writing conventions. 78 percent of ESL students reported increased grammatically correctness in their prose in 2024, for example, following use of AI-writing assistants. We observe that more than 80% of answers indicate that ChatGPT improves their writing ability, supporting its utility as a learning complement.

But while AI may help us make these superficial improvements, there remains a discomfort with how those improvements will affect deeper thinking. Others have pointed out that an over-reliance on AI-generated content might limit students' capacity for independent, critical thought and the formation of original arguments. In a 2023 poll of college teachers, 62 per cent reported a loss of critical analysis in students who were uncritically using AI tools. This is in line with our results showing that 78.4% of the participants agreed that overuse of ChatGPT can impede learners' independent writing development.

Among the perils of ChatGPT, and other similar models, is the potential to erode academic integrity. The availability of such "gestational" essays and research drafts calls the notion of authorship, plagiarism into question. Recent reports suggest that 45% of universities have found student AI-generated submissions, leading many universities to start using AI-detection software. Our work illustrates these worries: 83.6% of respondents believe that improper usage of ChatGPT might provoke plagiarism.

What's also problematic is AI-generated content is not properly supported with citations, which makes academic honesty even more difficult. An evaluation made in 2024 showed that 30% of papers assisted by AI cited wrong references and the danger of unwitting plagiarism was high. These results highlight the importance of clear institutional guidelines and student education about using AI ethically.

With ChatGPT, the teaching of writing in the traditional sense must be rethought. Educators need to weigh AI offsets against the need to maintain fundamental writing skills. Recent pedagogical experiments exhibit promising practices like "AI-assisted drafting" where students draft the initial outline from ChatGPT and correct it by critically analyzing content. In our survey 86.8% of survey participants agreed on the importance of a teacher mediating the ethical use of AI and thus teachers can be expected to have an important role in mediating the impact of AI.

Institutions are also struggling with policy-making. Some universities prohibit AI tools altogether, while others favor controlled use with transparency obligations. For instance, 58% of higher education institutions worldwide now require students to declare if they used AI to aid in their submissions, according to a 2025 global study. Our data reflects this trend, with 74% of respondents admitting that their institution limits the use of AI.

## **Conclusion and Recommendations**

The investigation of ChatGPT in English Academic writing reflects that by changing the pattern of teaching and learning there is an effective shift. Although such tool supports quality and organization of writing, it also raises a set of challenges that have to be met. These positive perceptions are echoed in the high percentages of students who agree that ChatGPT helps improve their writing, offers real-time assistance, and increases confidence in written skills. Additionally, it allows for individualized instruction and helps English language learners overcome language barriers. These benefits are particularly valuable for an educational environment where clarity and precision are key when it comes to writing.

But the results also raise some issues surrounding the ethical use of ChatGPT. Plagiarism and the weakening of critical thinking are at the forefront of concerns about academic integrity. That's not to say they should, students will become too dependent on these AI tools which will stifle their writing skills and thought provoking Hmm, maybe back to the different approach. Furthermore, the absence of citing support from ChatGPT could undermine academic honesty. And the fact that the tool has a tendency to occasionally output unreliable or biased information stresses the difficulty in trusting it for scholarly purposes, which makes us question the quality of AI-driven content.

To mitigate these potential concerns, several recommendations may therefore be formulated. First, universities need to have policies on the ethical use of AI tools such as ChatGPT in academic writing. These guidelines should also aim to promote AI literacy among students and teachers — so that users learn to recognize the limitations and ethical ramifications of AI-generated content. Secondly, teachers should be encouraged to inculcate AI writing tools as adjunct, rather than substitutes, to conventional writing instruction. This would enable students to take advantage of AI's efficiency while preserving the role of critical thinking and creativity on their schoolwork. Finally, flexible policies to address the balance between the promise of AI to improve learning with the necessity of preserving academic integrity should be developed by institutions.

In summary, ChatGPT could revolutionize English academic writing by offering useful support in language acquisition and writing development. Yet we must be thoughtful in how we incorporate this technology in the classroom so that it supports our students' intellectual growth and not interfere with our students' ability to develop their cogitations.

## **References**

1. Afzal, M., Arshad, N., & Shaheen, A. (2025). ChatGPT and the Future of Academic Writing: Enhancing Productivity and Creativity. *Journal of Engineering and Computational Intelligence Review*, 3(1), 1-11.
2. Afshar, M. Z. (2023). Exploring Factors Impacting Organizational Adaptation Capacity of Punjab Agriculture & Meat Company (PAMCO). *International Journal of Emerging Issues in Social Science, Arts and Humanities (IJEISSAH)*, 2(1), 1-10.
3. Afshar, M. Z., & Shah, D. M. H. (2025). Strategic evaluation using PESTLE and SWOT frameworks: Public sector perspective. *ISRG Journal of Economics, Business & Management (ISRGJEBM)*, 3, 108-114.
4. Alfarraj, Y. F., & Wardat, Y. (2024). Exploring the Impact of ChatGPT on Scientific Research: Assessing Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats. *Education as Change*, 28(1), 1-27.
5. Arshad, N., Baber, M. U., & Ullah, A. (2024). Assessing the transformative influence of ChatGPT on research practices among scholars in Pakistan. *Mesopotamian Journal of Big Data*, 2024, 1-10.

6. Asad, M. M., Shahzad, S., Shah, S. H. A., Sherwani, F., & Almusharraf, N. M. (2024). ChatGPT as artificial intelligence-based generative multimedia for English writing pedagogy: challenges and opportunities from an educator's perspective. *The International Journal of Information and Learning Technology*, 41(5), 490-506.
7. Butt, S., & Yazdani, N. (2023). Implementation of Quality Management Practices and Firm's Innovation Performance: Mediation of Knowledge Creation Processes and Moderating role of Digital Transformation. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11(4), 3881-3902.
8. Butt, S. (2021). Impact of E-Banking Service Quality on Customers' Behavior Intentions Mediating Role of Trust. *Global Management Journal for Academic & Corporate Studies*, 11(2), 1-21.
9. Cotton, D. R., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in education and teaching international*, 61(2), 228-239.
10. Esmail, O. (2025). Raising University Students' Critical Awareness of the Linguistic Limitations and the Potential Invalid Knowledge of ChatGPT Responses to Academic Writing Prompts. *Transcultural Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(3), 9-36.
11. Faiz, R., Bilal, H. A., Asghar, I., & Safdar, A. (2023, September). Optimizing ChatGPT as a writing aid for EFL learners: Balancing assistance and skill development in writing proficiency. In *Linguistic Forum-A Journal of Linguistics* (Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 24-37).
12. Ghafar, Z. N. (2023). ChatGPT: a new tool to improve teaching and evaluation of second and foreign languages a review of ChatGPT: the future of education. *International journal of applied research and sustainable sciences*, 1(2), 73-86.
13. Ghafouri, M., Hassaskhah, J., & Mahdavi-Zafarghandi, A. (2024). From virtual assistant to writing mentor: Exploring the impact of a ChatGPT-based writing instruction protocol on EFL teachers' self-efficacy and learners' writing skill. *Language Teaching Research*, 13621688241239764.
14. Hongxia, H., & Razali, A. B. (2025). Impact of ChatGPT on English academic writing ability and engagement of Chinese EFL undergraduates. *International Journal of Instruction*, 18(2), 323-346.
15. Isiaku, L., Muhammad, A. S., Kefas, H. I., & Ukaegbu, F. C. (2024). Enhancing technological sustainability in academia: leveraging ChatGPT for teaching, learning and evaluation. *Quality Education for All*, 1(1), 385-416.
16. Janković, A., & Kulić, D. (2025). Use And Misuse of ChatGPT in Academic Writing Among the English Language Students. *Information Technologies and Learning Tools*, 105(1), 178.
17. Javaid, M., Haleem, A., Singh, R. P., Khan, S., & Khan, I. H. (2023). Unlocking the opportunities through ChatGPT Tool towards ameliorating the education system. *BenchCouncil Transactions on Benchmarks, Standards and Evaluations*, 3(2), 100115.
18. Jin, Y., Yan, L., Echeverria, V., Gašević, D., & Martinez-Maldonado, R. (2025). Generative AI in higher education: A global perspective of institutional adoption policies and guidelines. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 8, 100348.
19. Lingard, L. (2023). Writing with ChatGPT: An illustration of its capacity, limitations & implications for academic writers. *Perspectives on medical education*, 12(1), 261.
20. Luo, Z., Xie, Q., & Ananiadou, S. (2023). Chatgpt as a factual inconsistency evaluator for text summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15621*.
21. Performance Evaluation Using Balanced Scorecard Framework: Insights from A Public Sector Case Study. (2025). *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMAN AND SOCIETY*, 5(01), 40-47. <https://ijhs.com.pk/index.php/IJHS/article/view/808>

22. Qazi, S., Kadri, M. B., Naveed, M., Khawaja, B. A., Khan, S. Z., Alam, M. M., & Su'ud, M. M. (2024). AI-Driven Learning Management Systems: Modern Developments, Challenges and Future Trends during the Age of ChatGPT. *Computers, Materials & Continua*, 80(2).
23. Qayyum, J., Siddiqui, H. A., Al Prince, A., Ahmad, S., & Raza, M. (2025). Revolutionizing market insights through AI and data analytics: The next era of competitive intelligence. *The Critical Review of Social Sciences Studies*, 3(1), 3285-3302.
24. Ramzan, M., Mushtaq, A., & Ashraf, Z. (2023). Evacuation of difficulties and challenges for academic writing in ESL learning. *The University of Chitral Journal of Linguistics and Literature (JLL)*, 7(1), 42-49.
25. Sadia, B. U. T. T. (2020). Service quality assessment and student satisfaction in business schools: Mediating role of perceived value. *MOJEM: Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management*, 9(1), 58-76.
26. Song, C., & Song, Y. (2023). Enhancing academic writing skills and motivation: assessing the efficacy of ChatGPT in AI-assisted language learning for EFL students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1260843.
27. Tai, A. M. Y., Meyer, M., Varidel, M., Prodan, A., Vogel, M., Iorfino, F., & Krausz, R. M. (2023). Exploring the potential and limitations of ChatGPT for academic peer-reviewed writing: Addressing linguistic injustice and ethical concerns. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 17(1), T16-T30.
28. Tran, T. T. (2025). The Differential Impact of AI Tools among EFL University Learners: A Process Writing Approach. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 24(5), 452-471.
29. Tsai, C. Y., Lin, Y. T., & Brown, I. K. (2024). Impacts of ChatGPT-assisted writing for EFL English majors: Feasibility and challenges. *Education and information technologies*, 1-19.
30. Ullah, A., Islam, K., Ali, A., & Baber, M. (2024). Assessing the impact of social media addiction on reading patterns: A study of Riphah International University students. *International Journal of Human and Society*, 4(1), 1250-1262.
31. Ullah, A., Shahzad, F., Ur Rehman, A., Naseer, M., & Akhtar, N. (2024). Analyzing the Students' Attitudes and Behavior towards Traditional Classes and Technology-Enhanced Online Learning. *International Journal of Social Science Archives (IJSSA)*, 7(3).
32. Wang, Y., Hanafi Zaid, Y., Li, J., & Pan, Y. (2024, September). Opportunities and Challenges of Using ChatGPT as a Teaching Assistant in English Language Teaching: A Systematic Literature Review. In *Proceedings of the 2024 International Symposium on Artificial Intelligence for Education* (pp. 375-382).
33. Whalen, J., & Mouza, C. (2023). ChatGPT: Challenges, opportunities, and implications for teacher education. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 23(1), 1-23.
34. Wu, Y. (2024). Critical Thinking Pedagogics Design in an Era of ChatGPT and Other AI Tools—Shifting From Teaching “What” to Teaching “Why” and “How”. *Journal of Education and Development*, 8(1), 1.
35. Wu, Y. (2024). Study on the impact of utilizing ChatGPT and other AI tools for feedback in EAP writing classrooms on the discursive writing performance of English major students. *Transactions on Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 4, 143-150.
36. Xiao, F., Zhu, S., & Xin, W. (2025). Exploring the landscape of generative AI (ChatGPT)-powered writing instruction in English as a foreign language education: A scoping review. *ECNU Review of Education*, 20965311241310881.

37. Xu, T., & Jumaat, N. F. (2024). ChatGPT-Empowered Writing Strategies in EFL Students' Academic Writing: Calibre, Challenges and Chances. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies*, 18(15).
38. Yan, D. (2023). Impact of ChatGPT on learners in a L2 writing practicum: An exploratory investigation. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(11), 13943-13967.
39. Yen, P. H., Thu, H. T. A., Thi, N. A., Tra, N. H., Thao, L. T., & Thuy, P. T. (2024, May). University Teachers' Perceptions on the Integration of ChatGPT in Language Education Assessment: Challenges, Benefits, and Ethical Considerations. In *20th International Conference of the Asia Association of Computer-Assisted Language Learning (AsiaCALL 2023)* (pp. 7-21). Atlantis Press.
40. Yuan, Y., Li, H., & Sawaengdist, A. (2024). The impact of ChatGPT on learners in English academic writing: Opportunities and challenges in education. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, 14(1), 41-56.
41. Yusfi, M., & Asmara, C. H. (2023). Exploring the impact of ChatGPT on English education department student's motivation and performance. *Journal of Teaching of English*, 8(4), 383-392.
42. Zaiarna, I., Zhyhadlo, O., & Dunaievska, O. (2024). ChatGPT in foreign language teaching and assessment: exploring EFL instructors' experience. *Information Technologies and Learning Tools*, 4(102), 176-191.