



IMPACT OF CHATGPT ON ACADEMIC WRITING: OPPORTUNITIES, CHALLENGES AND ETHICAL CONCERNS

Dr. K. Laxmi Senapati

Assistant Professor, UG CTE, Baripada.

Paper Received On: 20 MAY 2026

Peer Reviewed On: 24 JUNE 2026

Published On: 01 JULY 2026

Abstract

The rapid development of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), particularly ChatGPT, has introduced substantial changes in the ways students, researchers, teachers and academic professionals approach writing and scholarly communication. ChatGPT can support academic writing through idea generation, language improvement, outlining, summarisation, translation, brainstorming, feedback and assistance with literature-oriented tasks. At the same time, its integration into academic writing has generated concerns relating to factual inaccuracy, fabricated references, plagiarism, authorship, academic integrity, privacy, bias, intellectual property, unequal access and excessive dependence on automated systems. This paper critically examines the opportunities, challenges and ethical concerns associated with ChatGPT in academic writing. Drawing on recent scholarly literature, policy guidance and publishing standards, the paper argues that ChatGPT should be understood neither as a replacement for academic writers nor simply as a threat to academic integrity. Rather, its educational and scholarly value depends on the purposes for which it is used, the degree of human oversight, the transparency of its use, and the institutional and disciplinary norms governing academic work. The paper proposes a responsible-use framework based on human authorship, verification, transparency, privacy protection, academic integrity, AI literacy and equitable access. It concludes that universities and scholarly publishers should move beyond blanket prohibition toward context-sensitive policies that distinguish legitimate AI-assisted support from the outsourcing of intellectual work. Responsible integration of ChatGPT can enhance the efficiency and accessibility of academic writing while preserving the principles of originality, accountability, critical thinking and scholarly trust.

Keywords: ChatGPT, generative artificial intelligence, academic writing, higher education, academic integrity research ethics, AI literacy, scholarly communication

1. Introduction

The emergence of generative artificial intelligence has become one of the most significant technological developments affecting contemporary education and scholarly communication. Among the most visible tools in this transformation is ChatGPT, a conversational artificial intelligence system capable of generating and transforming natural-language text. Since its

public release in 2022, ChatGPT has rapidly entered educational and research environments, generating considerable interest among students, teachers, researchers, publishers and policymakers.

The growing use of ChatGPT has particular significance for academic writing. Academic writing traditionally requires researchers and students to formulate arguments, engage with existing scholarship, synthesise evidence, organise ideas, communicate findings and demonstrate independent intellectual judgment. ChatGPT can assist with several of these activities. Recent reviews have identified applications of ChatGPT across higher education, including writing support, learning assistance, research activities, content generation, translation, feedback and administrative work. A systematic review of 57 studies published between 2023 and 2024 found that ChatGPT applications in higher education were expanding across different user groups and academic functions.

However, the integration of ChatGPT into academic writing has also challenged established assumptions about authorship, originality, plagiarism, assessment and scholarly responsibility. AI-generated text can be grammatically sophisticated and persuasive while nevertheless containing factual errors, unsupported claims, biased representations or fabricated references. A recent review of AI use in academic writing identifies both productivity benefits and continuing problems involving academic integrity and the appropriate balance between human and AI contributions.

The central issue, therefore, is not simply whether ChatGPT should be used in academic writing. Rather, the more important questions concern **how, when, for what purposes and under what ethical conditions**, it should be used. UNESCO's guidance on generative AI in education and research similarly emphasises a human-centred approach involving ethical validation, data protection, equity, institutional preparedness and appropriate human oversight. This paper critically examines the impact of ChatGPT on academic writing by addressing three interconnected dimensions: opportunities, challenges and ethical concerns. It also proposes practical principles for responsible use by students, researchers, teachers, universities and academic publishers.

2. Objectives of the Paper

The paper has four principal objectives:

1. To examine the major opportunities created by ChatGPT for academic writing and scholarly communication.
2. To analyse the pedagogical, methodological and practical challenges associated with AI-assisted academic writing.
3. To explore ethical issues relating to academic integrity, authorship, plagiarism, privacy, bias, intellectual property and accountability.
4. To propose a framework for responsible and transparent use of ChatGPT in academic writing.

3. Methodological Approach

This paper adopts a **critical narrative review** approach. Relevant peer-reviewed literature, systematic reviews, institutional guidance and scholarly publishing policies concerning ChatGPT, generative AI, higher education, academic writing and research ethics were examined.

Recent systematic reviews provide evidence that research on ChatGPT in higher education has expanded rapidly. For example, Albadarin et al. reviewed empirical research on ChatGPT in education, while Baig and Yadegaridehkordi examined 57 studies addressing ChatGPT applications and adoption in higher education. Springer+1 Bhullar, Joshi, and Chugh's synthesis similarly identified academic integrity, student learning, engagement, assessment and scholarly research as major areas of concern and investigation. Springer.

The review also considers policy and ethical guidance from organisations and publishers, including UNESCO and Elsevier. These sources are particularly relevant because AI policies are evolving rapidly and because responsible academic use requires alignment with institutional and journal-specific requirements.

The analysis is organised thematically around opportunities, challenges, ethical concerns and recommendations for responsible practice.

4. ChatGPT and the Transformation of Academic Writing

Academic writing is not merely a process of producing grammatically correct sentences. It involves intellectual activities such as problem identification, critical reading, conceptualisation, argument construction, evidence evaluation, interpretation and scholarly judgment. Consequently, the introduction of generative AI raises a fundamental question: **Which parts of academic writing can appropriately be delegated to AI and which require human intellectual responsibility?**

ChatGPT can perform or assist with many language-based tasks. These include generating preliminary outlines, suggesting research questions, explaining concepts, improving grammar, translating text, summarising material, proposing alternative formulations and providing feedback on drafts. Research examining AI-assisted academic writing has identified applications in idea generation, content organisation, literature synthesis, editing and related research-support activities.

Nevertheless, the ability of ChatGPT to produce fluent prose does not mean that the resulting text is necessarily accurate, original, theoretically appropriate, or adequately supported by evidence. The linguistic quality of an AI-generated paragraph may therefore conceal significant epistemic weaknesses.

This distinction is crucial. **Language production and scholarly knowledge production are not equivalent activities.** ChatGPT can facilitate the former, but responsibility for the latter remains with the human researcher.

5. Opportunities Presented by ChatGPT in Academic Writing

5.1 Assistance with Idea Generation

One of the most accessible applications of ChatGPT is brainstorming. Students and researchers can use the system to generate possible research questions, identify conceptual dimensions of a topic, propose outlines or explore alternative perspectives.

For novice researchers, this can reduce the initial difficulty associated with beginning a paper. Instead of facing an empty document, the writer can use AI-generated suggestions as preliminary material for subsequent evaluation and refinement.

The important distinction is that generated ideas should be treated as **starting points rather than authoritative conclusions**. The researcher must independently determine their relevance, novelty, feasibility and scholarly value.

5.2 Improving Language and Readability

ChatGPT can assist writers whose first language is not English. It can help improve sentence structure, grammar, coherence, vocabulary and readability.

This function has particular potential for international researchers and multilingual academic communities. Rather than replacing intellectual work, language assistance can allow researchers to communicate their existing ideas more effectively.

However, language improvement should not result in the unintended removal of disciplinary voice, culturally significant expressions or conceptual nuances. Human review remains necessary.

5.3 Support for Academic Organisation

Long academic projects frequently involve complex structures consisting of literature reviews, theoretical frameworks, research questions, methodology, findings, discussion, and conclusions. ChatGPT can help writers identify possible organisational structures and relationships among sections.

Such assistance may improve productivity by reducing the time required for routine organisational tasks. Recent research reviews have identified content organisation and writing support among the important applications of generative AI in academic work.

5.4 Summarisation and Explanation

ChatGPT can provide preliminary explanations of complex concepts and summarise information supplied by the user. This may be useful during early stages of reading and note-taking.

Nevertheless, AI-generated summaries should not replace direct engagement with primary sources. A summary can omit qualifications, misunderstand an argument or distort the emphasis of the original author. Therefore, academic writers should return to the original source before citing or representing its claims.

5.5 Translation and Multilingual Academic Communication

Generative AI can support translation between languages and thereby potentially reduce linguistic barriers to scholarly communication. For researchers working in multilingual environments, this can facilitate drafting and preliminary comprehension.

The opportunity is especially relevant to global higher education because language proficiency can otherwise influence who is able to participate effectively in international scholarly communication.

5.6 Feedback on Drafts

ChatGPT can provide feedback concerning clarity, organisation, transitions, grammar and the apparent coherence of an argument. Used appropriately, this may provide an additional layer of formative feedback.

The writer, however, should determine which suggestions to accept. AI feedback is not equivalent to peer review or expert disciplinary evaluation.

5.7 Accessibility and Educational Support

AI-based writing assistance may provide support for students with different linguistic and educational needs. UNESCO has emphasised the potential of generative AI for creative applications in teaching, learning, curriculum design and research while simultaneously stressing the importance of human-centred and equitable implementation.

Thus, ChatGPT has the potential to contribute to more accessible academic environments when implemented alongside appropriate pedagogical support.

6. Challenges Associated with ChatGPT in Academic Writing

6.1 Hallucination and Factual Inaccuracy

One of the most important challenges is that ChatGPT can produce plausible-sounding statements that are inaccurate. Generative AI systems generate language probabilistically; they do not function as infallible databases of verified knowledge.

This becomes particularly problematic when researchers use AI to produce references, quotations, statistics or claims. Academic publishers explicitly warn that AI-generated citations may be incorrect, incomplete or fabricated.

Consequently, every substantive factual claim generated by AI requires appropriate verification.

6.2 Fabricated References

Fabricated or inaccurate references represent a serious threat to academic writing. An AI system may produce a citation that appears to correspond to a genuine journal article but contains an incorrect title, author, publication year, journal, volume, pages or DOI.

This problem undermines the traceability of scholarship. Researchers should therefore verify references against authoritative databases, publisher websites, library catalogues, or the original publications before including them in a manuscript.

6.3 Overdependence and Declining Critical Engagement

Another challenge concerns excessive dependence on AI. Academic writing is itself a learning process through which students develop reasoning, synthesis, argumentation and disciplinary knowledge.

If students routinely outsource these activities to ChatGPT, they may have fewer opportunities to practise them independently. Recent literature identifies concerns that inappropriate use of ChatGPT may weaken independent learning and contribute to overreliance.

The objective should therefore be to use AI to **support cognitive work rather than eliminate it**.

6.4 Academic Assessment

Generative AI has challenged conventional forms of written assessment. A conventional take-home essay may no longer reliably demonstrate whether a student independently developed the submitted text.

This creates a need to rethink assessment practices. Universities may increasingly emphasise drafts, oral presentations, reflective commentary, process portfolios, classroom writing, source evaluation and assignments requiring personal or research-specific engagement.

6.5 Digital Inequality

Although AI tools may increase access to writing assistance, access is not necessarily equal. Differences in internet connectivity, subscription plans, digital literacy, institutional resources, language support, and familiarity with AI can create new forms of inequality.

The issue is therefore not simply whether ChatGPT is available but whether students and researchers have **equitable access to effective and responsible AI literacy**.

6.6 Bias and Representation

Generative AI systems can reproduce or amplify biases present in training data and broader social structures. Bias may occur in representations of gender, culture, geography, language, ethnicity, discipline or other social categories.

UNESCO identifies bias, privacy, accessibility, gender and diversity among the ethical issues requiring attention in the educational use of ChatGPT and related technologies. Human critical judgment is therefore essential when evaluating AI-generated content.

7. Ethical Concerns in AI-Assisted Academic Writing

7.1 Academic Integrity

Academic integrity involves honesty, responsibility, originality and accountability in scholarly work. The use of ChatGPT becomes ethically problematic when students or researchers present AI-generated intellectual work as entirely their own without appropriate disclosure or when AI is used to circumvent assessment requirements.

The ethical issue is not simply the presence of AI-generated language. Rather, it concerns **misrepresentation of intellectual contribution**.

A student who uses AI to identify grammatical errors in an independently written essay is engaging in a substantially different practice from a student who submits an AI-generated essay as their own original work.

Institutions should therefore distinguish among different levels and purposes of AI use rather than treating all AI assistance as ethically identical.

7.2 Authorship and Accountability

AI systems should not be treated as authors. Authorship involves responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, originality and final approval of scholarly work—responsibilities that cannot be transferred to a generative AI system.

Current Elsevier journal policy explicitly states that AI tools should not be listed as authors or co-authors because authorship entails accountability that can only be assigned to humans.

Human authors therefore remain responsible for every substantive claim in a manuscript, regardless of whether AI contributed to its preparation.

7.3 Transparency and Disclosure

Transparency is a central ethical principle. Readers should know when generative AI has played a substantive role in the preparation of academic work.

Current Elsevier guidance requires authors to disclose relevant generative AI use in manuscript preparation, including the tool used, its purpose, and the authors' human review and responsibility. A suitable disclosure statement can be included near the end of a manuscript when required by the target journal:

During the preparation of this work, the author(s) used [name of tool] for [specific purpose]. After using this tool, the author(s) reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the published article.

The precise wording should always be adapted to the requirements of the target journal.

7.4 Privacy and Confidentiality

Researchers frequently work with unpublished manuscripts, interview transcripts, research participants' information, examination materials, institutional documents and other confidential data.

Uploading such material to an external AI system may create privacy and confidentiality risks depending on the tool's terms, data retention practices and security arrangements.

UNESCO recommends strong attention to data privacy and human-centred regulation of generative AI in education and research.

Researchers should therefore avoid entering confidential, personally identifiable, proprietary or sensitive research information into AI systems unless appropriate safeguards and permissions are established.

7.5 Intellectual Property and Copyright

Generative AI raises complex questions about ownership, attribution and the use of copyrighted material. Researchers must distinguish between material they have permission to upload and material belonging to third parties.

Academic publishers increasingly emphasise that researchers should review AI-tool terms and avoid uploading confidential or copyrighted material when doing so could compromise intellectual property rights.

7.6 Plagiarism and Undisclosed AI Use

ChatGPT has intensified debates about plagiarism. Traditional plagiarism involves presenting another person's words or ideas as one's own. AI-generated text introduces a related but distinct problem: **undisclosed machine-assisted production of intellectual work**.

Consequently, institutions may need to expand academic-integrity policies beyond traditional definitions of copying. Policies should clarify what forms of AI assistance are permitted, restricted or prohibited.

7.7 The Problem of AI Detection

AI-detection systems are often proposed as a solution to undisclosed AI use. However, AI detection should not be treated as an infallible method for establishing misconduct.

False positives and false negatives can occur, particularly across different languages, writing styles and levels of AI assistance. A responsible academic-integrity process should therefore rely on multiple forms of evidence rather than treating an automated detector's output as conclusive proof.

8. ChatGPT, Academic Writing and the Changing Role of the Teacher

The emergence of ChatGPT does not eliminate the role of teachers; instead, it changes some aspects of that role.

Teachers increasingly need to help students understand:

- how generative AI systems work;
- how to formulate effective prompts;
- how to evaluate AI-generated claims;
- how to verify references;
- how to recognise bias;
- when AI use is inappropriate;
- how to disclose AI assistance;
- and how to preserve independent intellectual judgment.

AI literacy should therefore become part of broader academic literacy.

Rather than simply asking students to avoid AI, educators can teach students to critically interrogate AI-generated material. For example, an instructor might provide an AI-generated paragraph containing factual errors and ask students to identify, verify, and correct them. Such activities transform AI from a potential shortcut into an object of critical inquiry.

9. Towards Responsible AI-Assisted Academic Writing

A responsible model of AI-assisted academic writing should be based on six principles.

9.1 Human Intellectual Ownership

The central argument, interpretation, research design, evidence evaluation and scholarly contribution should remain under human intellectual control.

9.2 Verification

All substantive AI-generated claims, references, quotations, statistics and interpretations should be independently checked.

9.3 Transparency

Where AI use is substantive and relevant under institutional or journal policies, authors should disclose the tool, purpose and extent of use.

9.4 Privacy

Confidential, personal, unpublished, proprietary or sensitive information should not be entered into AI systems without appropriate safeguards and authorisation.

9.5 Accountability

The human author—not the AI system—must remain responsible for the final manuscript.

10. Implications for Universities and Academic Institutions

Universities should develop clear, flexible and regularly updated policies concerning generative AI.

First, institutional policies should distinguish between **assistive use** and **substitutive use**. Grammar correction, brainstorming, translation and feedback are qualitatively different from submitting an AI-generated assignment as one's own work.

Second, universities should provide AI-literacy programmes for students and staff. Recent systematic reviews emphasise the need for institutional guidelines, AI literacy, professional development, and human oversight in response to the growing use of ChatGPT.

Third, assessment practices should evolve. Assignments that require personal reflection, research documentation, oral defence, process-based writing, source evaluation and iterative drafts can provide stronger evidence of student learning than a single unmonitored written product.

Fourth, institutions should address equity. Students should not be penalised simply because they lack access to technological resources available to others. Responsible AI policy must therefore consider accessibility and digital inequality.

11. Implications for Academic Publishers and Journals

Academic journals also have an important role in establishing responsible AI practices.

Journal policies should clearly explain:

- whether AI-assisted writing is permitted;
- which forms of AI use require disclosure;
- whether AI may be used for research methods or data analysis;
- whether AI-generated figures or images are permitted;
- whether reviewers may use AI tools;
- how confidentiality should be protected; and
- who retains responsibility for the submitted work.

Elsevier's current journal policy, for example, permits certain forms of AI-assisted manuscript preparation while requiring human oversight, verification, transparency and disclosure. It also

states that AI systems should not be listed as authors. Such policies demonstrate a broader shift from simple prohibition toward principles of transparency, human accountability and responsible use.

12. Discussion

The impact of ChatGPT on academic writing is multidimensional. It can increase efficiency, reduce linguistic barriers, support brainstorming, assist with organisation and provide accessible feedback. Recent reviews of the literature indicate substantial interest in these possibilities across higher education.

At the same time, these benefits cannot be separated from substantial risks. The most important challenge is the possibility that convenience will displace intellectual engagement. Academic writing is valuable not simply because it produces a finished document but because the process of writing requires students and researchers to formulate and test ideas.

This leads to an important conceptual distinction between **AI-assisted writing** and **AI-substituted writing**.

AI-assisted writing occurs when a human author retains intellectual control and uses AI to support selected tasks. AI-substituted writing occurs when the system effectively performs the central intellectual and compositional work while the human merely submits or minimally edits the output.

The first can potentially strengthen productivity and accessibility; the second risks undermining the educational and scholarly purposes of writing.

The distinction also explains why blanket prohibition may be insufficient. Students will encounter generative AI beyond educational institutions, and researchers increasingly encounter it within scholarly workflows. The more sustainable response is therefore to develop the capacity to use AI critically and ethically.

A systematic review of empirical research on ChatGPT in education demonstrates that the research field is still developing, while more recent reviews continue to identify unresolved questions concerning educational outcomes, integrity, bias, equity and institutional governance.

The appropriate future direction is consequently neither unrestricted adoption nor universal rejection. It is **responsible integration based on human oversight, transparency, verification and accountability**.

13. Conclusion

ChatGPT is changing academic writing by introducing new possibilities for brainstorming, language improvement, organisation, summarisation, translation, feedback, and research support. Its potential benefits are particularly significant for multilingual writers, novice researchers, and academic communities seeking more efficient approaches to communication. However, the technology also creates serious challenges. Inaccurate information, fabricated references, overdependence, bias, privacy risks, intellectual-property concerns, academic misconduct, and uncertainty about authorship require careful consideration. The central ethical question is not whether ChatGPT can produce academic prose, but whether its use preserves the intellectual values on which academic writing is based.

The future of academic writing is therefore likely to involve increasing interaction between human authors and AI systems. This development should be governed by a clear principle: **AI**

may assist scholarly work, but human researchers must retain intellectual control and accountability.

Responsible use requires verification, transparency, privacy protection, academic integrity, equitable access, and AI literacy. Universities and journals should consequently develop policies that distinguish legitimate assistance from the outsourcing of intellectual responsibility. UNESCO's human-centred approach and emerging publisher policies provide useful foundations for this transition.

Ultimately, the value of ChatGPT in academic writing will depend less on the sophistication of the technology itself than on the quality of human judgment surrounding its use. Academic institutions should therefore aim not merely to regulate AI but to educate researchers and students to use it critically, ethically, transparently and responsibly.

References

- Albadarin, Y., Saqr, M., Pope, N., & Tukiainen, M. (2024). *A systematic literature review of empirical research on ChatGPT in education*. *Discover Education*, 3, 60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00138-2>
- Baig, M. I., & Yadegaridehkordi, E. (2024). *ChatGPT in higher education: A systematic literature review and research challenges*. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 127, 102411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2024.102411>.
- Bhullar, P. S., Joshi, M., & Chugh, R. (2024). *ChatGPT in higher education—A synthesis of the literature and a future research agenda*. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29, 21501–21522. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12723-x>.
- Bond, M., Khosravi, H., De Laat, M., Bergdahl, N., et al. (2024). *A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour*. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, Elsevier. (2026). *Generative AI policies for journals*.
- Islam, I., & Islam, M. N. (2024). *Exploring the opportunities and challenges of ChatGPT in academia*. *Discover Education*, 3, 31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00114-w>.
- McGrath, C., Farazouli, A., & Cerratto-Pargman, T. (2025). *Generative AI chatbots in higher education: A review of an emerging research area*. *Higher Education*, 89, 1533–1549.
- Mohebi, L. (2024). *Empowering learners with ChatGPT: Insights from a systematic literature exploration*. *Discover Education*, 3, 36.
- UNESCO. (2023, updated 2026). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (2023). *ChatGPT and artificial intelligence in higher education: Quick start guide*. UNESCO International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean. UNESCO Documents