International Journal of
Science, Architecture, Technology and Environment

Role of Generative AI in Student Learning and Academic Writing A Review

Dipendra Nath Subedi[1]*, Dr. Rajesh Arora[2]

[1]*Ph.D. Scholar, Manipur International University, Centre for Academic Research, Education Wing, RERF, Mount Abu, Rajasthan, India.*

[2]*Senior Professor, Value Education Department, Manipur International University and CARE, Brahma kumaris, Abu Road, India.*

[*]*Corresponding author, dipendranathsubedi@gmail.com | ORCID:0009-0007-8954-5443*

DOI: https://doi.org/10.63680/ijsate112614.15

Abstract

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) has rapidly emerged as an influential technology in higher education, particularly in the areas of student learning and academic writing. Tools such as ChatGPT can provide students with explanations, feedback, brainstorming support, language assistance, summarization, and personalized learning opportunities. The present review examines the role of generative AI in student learning and academic writing by synthesizing existing literature on its educational benefits, writing support, learning outcomes, academic integrity, ethical concerns, and potential limitations. The reviewed evidence suggests that GenAI can support students in generating ideas, organizing content, improving language and writing quality, receiving immediate feedback, and engaging with learning materials in interactive ways. In academic writing, generative AI may assist with brainstorming, outlining, grammar correction, paraphrasing, revision, and developing initial drafts. However, excessive dependence on AI may reduce students' independent thinking, creativity, critical evaluation, and development of authentic writing skills. The literature also highlights concerns related to plagiarism, inappropriate authorship, inaccurate or fabricated information, bias, privacy, transparency, and unequal access to AI technologies. Therefore, the educational value of GenAI depends substantially on how it is integrated into teaching and learning practices. Rather than replacing students' intellectual work, GenAI should be used as a supportive tool that encourages reflection, verification, critical thinking, and responsible academic practice. The review concludes that universities should develop clear AI-use guidelines, strengthen AI literacy, redesign assessment practices where necessary, and promote responsible and transparent use of generative AI. Future research should examine the long-term effects of GenAI on learning, writing development, critical thinking, and academic integrity across diverse educational and cultural contexts.

Keywords: Generative Artificial Intelligence, ChatGPT, Student Learning, Academic Writing, Higher Education, AI Literacy, Academic Integrity, Critical Thinking

1. Introduction

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) has emerged as one of the most significant technological developments influencing contemporary education. Unlike traditional digital tools that primarily retrieve or organize existing information, generative AI systems can produce new text, explanations, summaries, ideas, questions, and other forms of content in response to user instructions (Kasneci et al., 2023; Dwivedi et al., 2023). The rapid development of tools such as ChatGPT has created new possibilities for teaching, learning, assessment, and academic writing in higher education (Tlili et al., 2023; McGrath et al., 2025).

The increasing availability of generative AI has changed the way students search for information, understand academic concepts, develop ideas, and prepare written assignments (Baidoo-Anu et al., 2024; Ogunleye et al., 2024). Students can interact with AI systems through natural language and receive immediate explanations, examples, suggestions, and feedback. Kasneci et al. (2023) highlighted that large language models may provide important educational opportunities while also presenting significant challenges related to accuracy, ethics, and responsible use.

One important area in which GenAI may influence higher education is student learning. AI tools can provide personalized explanations according to students' questions and perceived learning needs. They may support brainstorming, concept clarification, question generation, summarization, revision, and self-directed learning (Baidoo-Anu & Owusu Ansah, 2023; Ogunleye et al., 2024). Baidoo-Anu and Owusu Ansah (2023) suggested that ChatGPT has potential to support teaching and learning when used appropriately and critically.

Generative AI may also contribute to personalized and interactive learning experiences. Students can ask follow-up questions, request alternative explanations, obtain examples, and receive immediate responses. Such interaction may be particularly useful for students who require additional explanation outside conventional classroom hours (Kasneci et al., 2023; Tlili et al., 2023). However, the quality of learning depends on students' ability to evaluate AI-generated information rather than accepting responses without verification.

Another major area of influence is academic writing. GenAI tools can assist students during different stages of the writing process, including topic exploration, brainstorming, outlining, drafting, language improvement, paraphrasing, summarization, and revision (Zhao et al., 2024; Suryanti & Ramadhanti, 2024). Mahapatra (2024), for example, examined the use of ChatGPT in academic writing and reported potential benefits for students' writing development when the technology was integrated with appropriate instructional guidance.

For students writing in a second or additional language, GenAI may provide particular support through grammar correction, vocabulary suggestions, sentence restructuring, and language feedback. These functions may help students improve the clarity and organization of academic texts (Mahapatra, 2024; Aljuaid, 2024). However, AI-assisted writing should not replace the development of students' own language competence, argumentation skills, and academic voice.

Despite these opportunities, the use of GenAI raises important concerns regarding academic integrity. Students may submit AI-generated content as their own work without appropriate disclosure or modification. This creates challenges for conventional assessment practices and raises questions concerning authorship, plagiarism, originality, and fair evaluation (Cotton et al., 2024; Dwivedi et al., 2023). Cotton et al. (2024)

emphasized the need for institutions to reconsider academic integrity practices in response to the emergence of ChatGPT.

Another concern is the accuracy and reliability of AI-generated information. Generative AI systems can produce plausible but incorrect information, including fabricated references, inaccurate explanations, and unsupported claims. Students who lack sufficient subject knowledge may find it difficult to identify such errors. Therefore, AI literacy and critical evaluation skills are essential components of responsible GenAI use (Kasneci et al., 2023; Tlili et al., 2023).

The literature also highlights concerns related to overdependence and reduced independent learning. Although AI can provide rapid assistance, excessive reliance may discourage students from engaging deeply with academic materials, solving problems independently, developing original arguments, or practicing writing skills (Kasneci et al., 2023; You, 2024). The educational value of GenAI therefore depends on whether it functions as a learning support tool or becomes a substitute for students' intellectual effort.

Ethical issues also require attention. These include privacy, data protection, bias, transparency, unequal access to technology, authorship, and responsible disclosure of AI assistance (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Ogunleye et al., 2024). Universities therefore face the challenge of creating policies that encourage beneficial educational use while protecting academic standards and student rights (Cotton et al., 2024).

The role of teachers is also changing in this environment. Rather than simply prohibiting AI use, educators may need to teach students how to prompt, evaluate, verify, revise, and ethically use AI-generated content. Assessment approaches may also need to place greater emphasis on critical thinking, reflection, process-based writing, oral explanation, and authentic learning tasks (Baidoo-Anu & Owusu Ansah, 2023; McGrath et al., 2025).

Recent reviews indicate that research on GenAI in higher education is expanding rapidly, but the evidence remains relatively new and heterogeneous. Studies differ in educational settings, student populations, AI tools, learning outcomes, and approaches to academic writing (Bhullar et al., 2024; Ogunleye et al., 2024; McGrath et al., 2025). McGrath et al. (2025) noted that generative AI chatbots represent an emerging research area in higher education requiring continued investigation.

Therefore, examining the role of generative AI in student learning and academic writing is important for understanding both its educational potential and its limitations. A review of the existing literature can help identify the major benefits, risks, ethical considerations, and research gaps and can contribute to the development of responsible and pedagogically meaningful approaches to GenAI integration in higher education (You, 2024; McGrath et al., 2025).

2. Need and Justification of the Study

The rapid adoption of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in higher education has created a need to understand its actual educational value and its potential risks. Students are increasingly using AI tools for searching information, understanding concepts, generating ideas, preparing assignments, improving language, and developing academic texts. This changing pattern of academic work makes it important to examine how GenAI is influencing student learning and academic writing.

The present review is needed because GenAI offers both educational opportunities and significant challenges. On the positive side, AI tools can provide immediate explanations, personalized assistance, brainstorming support, language correction, feedback, and opportunities for self-directed learning. These functions may help students overcome difficulties in understanding academic concepts and communicating their ideas effectively.

At the same time, excessive or inappropriate use of GenAI may create concerns regarding academic integrity, originality, critical thinking, independent learning, and writing development. Students may become dependent on AI-generated content or submit such content without adequate evaluation or acknowledgment. AI systems may also generate inaccurate information, fabricated references, biased responses, or misleading explanations. These concerns justify a careful examination of the evidence rather than viewing GenAI as either entirely beneficial or entirely harmful.

The review is further justified by the importance of academic writing as a core higher-education skill. Writing involves more than producing grammatically correct sentences; it requires critical thinking, argument development, evidence evaluation, synthesis, interpretation, and the expression of an individual academic voice. Understanding how GenAI affects these processes is therefore essential for determining appropriate educational use.

Another important justification is the changing role of teachers and universities. Educational institutions need evidence-based approaches for developing AI literacy and responsible AI-use policies. Students require guidance on verifying AI-generated information, acknowledging AI assistance, protecting privacy, avoiding plagiarism, and maintaining responsibility for the final academic work.

The literature on GenAI is rapidly expanding, but findings remain diverse because studies differ in student populations, educational contexts, AI tools, learning tasks, and outcome measures. A focused review can therefore synthesize existing evidence and provide a clearer understanding of common findings, conflicting results, limitations, and emerging research directions.

The review is also important because GenAI access may create new educational inequalities. Differences in digital literacy, technological access, language proficiency, and institutional support may influence how effectively students benefit from AI tools. These factors require greater attention when considering the broader educational impact of GenAI.

Therefore, the present review is justified by the need to critically examine the role of GenAI in student learning and academic writing, identify its educational benefits and potential risks, understand its implications for academic integrity and independent learning, and provide recommendations for responsible and pedagogically appropriate use in higher education.

3. Objectives

The present review aims to:

1. Examine the role of Generative AI in supporting student learning in higher education.
2. Examine the use of Generative AI in academic writing, including brainstorming, outlining, drafting, editing, paraphrasing, and language improvement.

3. Identify the potential benefits of Generative AI for personalized learning, feedback, academic support, and student engagement.
4. Examine the challenges and risks associated with GenAI use, including overdependence, inaccurate information, reduced independent thinking, and writing-skill development.
5. Examine academic integrity and ethical concerns related to AI-assisted learning and academic writing, including plagiarism, authorship, transparency, privacy, and responsible use.
6. Identify research gaps and provide recommendations for the responsible and effective integration of Generative AI into higher education.

4. Methodology

4.1 Review Approach

The present study adopted a narrative literature review approach to examine the role of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in student learning and academic writing. The review focused on educational opportunities, writing support, learning outcomes, academic integrity, ethical concerns, and challenges associated with the use of GenAI in higher education.

4.2 Literature Search

Relevant literature was identified through searches of:

- Google Scholar
- Scopus-indexed literature
- Web of Science-related academic sources
- SpringerLink
- ScienceDirect
- ERIC
- Other credible scholarly and institutional sources

The major search terms included “Generative AI,” “ChatGPT,” “artificial intelligence in education,” “student learning,” “academic writing,” “higher education,” “AI-assisted writing,” “AI literacy,” “academic integrity,” “critical thinking,” and “ethical use of AI.”

4.3 Inclusion Criteria

Studies were considered when they:

- Focused on Generative AI or AI-based conversational tools relevant to education.
- Examined university or higher-education students.
- Addressed student learning, academic writing, or both.
- Discussed educational benefits, challenges, ethical issues, or academic integrity.
- Were published in credible academic journals, scholarly books, or recognized institutional sources.
- Provided information relevant to the objectives of the review.

4.4 Exclusion Criteria

Studies were excluded when they:

- Were unrelated to education or student learning.
- Focused exclusively on technical development of AI without educational relevance.
- Did not address learning, academic writing, or related higher-education outcomes.
- Were duplicate records.
- Were non-scholarly promotional materials, blogs, or unreliable online sources.
- Provided insufficient information for meaningful interpretation.

4.5 Thematic Analysis

The selected literature was organized into the following major themes:

1. GenAI and student learning.
2. Personalized learning and academic support.
3. GenAI and academic writing.
4. AI-generated feedback and language improvement.
5. Critical thinking and independent learning.
6. Academic integrity and authorship.
7. Ethical and privacy concerns.
8. AI literacy and responsible use.
9. Challenges and limitations of GenAI.
10. Future directions for higher education.

4.6 Synthesis of Evidence

The findings were synthesized qualitatively by comparing common patterns, differences, reported benefits, risks, and emerging concerns across the reviewed literature. Particular attention was given to the balance between AI-assisted learning and students' independent intellectual engagement.

4.7 Scope of the Review

The review primarily considered literature published during the recent period of rapid development of generative AI in education, while also incorporating foundational sources where necessary to provide theoretical and educational context. No statistical meta-analysis was conducted because of substantial differences in study designs, populations, AI applications, outcome measures, and research contexts.

5. Review of literature

5.1 Generative AI and Student Learning

Generative AI has introduced new possibilities for student learning by providing immediate, interactive, and personalized academic assistance. Tools such as ChatGPT can explain concepts, answer questions, generate examples, summarize learning materials, and support students in exploring unfamiliar topics. Baidoo-Anu and Owusu Ansah (2023) highlighted the potential of ChatGPT to support teaching and learning when it is used appropriately. Kasneci et al. (2023) similarly noted that large language models may provide educational benefits while requiring careful attention to their limitations.

The interactive nature of GenAI may encourage students to ask follow-up questions and request alternative explanations. This can support self-directed learning and provide additional academic assistance beyond conventional classroom interaction (Tlili et al., 2023; Ogunleye et al., 2024). However, effective learning depends on students' ability to critically evaluate AI-generated responses rather than accepting them automatically (Kasneci et al., 2023).

5.2 Personalized Learning and Academic Support

One of the potential advantages of GenAI is its ability to provide responses adapted to individual questions and learning needs. Students can request simplified explanations, examples, practice questions, summaries, or step-by-step guidance. Such flexibility may be useful for learners with different levels of prior knowledge and learning preferences (Baidoo-Anu et al., 2024; Kasneci et al., 2023).

The literature suggests that AI-based conversational systems may therefore function as supplementary learning assistants (Baidoo-Anu & Owusu Ansah, 2023; Ogunleye et al., 2024). However, personalized responses do not necessarily guarantee accurate or pedagogically appropriate learning. Human guidance and verification remain important, particularly for complex academic topics (Kasneci et al., 2023; Tlili et al., 2023).

5.3 Generative AI and Academic Writing

Academic writing is one of the areas most directly affected by generative AI. Students can use AI tools during brainstorming, topic exploration, outlining, drafting, paraphrasing, grammar correction, editing, and revision (Suryanti & Ramadhanti, 2024; Zhao et al., 2024). Mahapatra (2024) found potential benefits of ChatGPT-supported writing instruction, particularly when AI was incorporated as part of a structured learning process.

GenAI can also help students identify grammatical problems, improve sentence clarity, suggest alternative expressions, and organize ideas. For students writing in an additional language, these functions may provide useful language support (Aljuaid, 2024; Mahapatra, 2024). Nevertheless, academic writing requires argument development, evidence evaluation, synthesis, and an authentic academic voice, which cannot be reduced to language correction alone (Zhao et al., 2024).

5.4 AI-Assisted Feedback and Revision

Traditional writing feedback can be limited by teacher workload and time constraints. GenAI can provide immediate suggestions for grammar, organization, coherence, vocabulary, and style. Students may use this feedback to revise their drafts and identify areas requiring improvement (Mahapatra, 2024; Aljuaid, 2024).

However, AI feedback may sometimes be inaccurate, overly general, or inappropriate for the academic context. Therefore, students need to evaluate suggestions critically and retain responsibility for decisions concerning their final written work (Kasneci et al., 2023; Tlili et al., 2023).

5.5 Critical Thinking and Independent Learning

Although GenAI can support learning, concerns have emerged regarding its possible influence on **critical thinking and independent intellectual effort**. If students use AI to generate complete answers rather than engaging with the underlying learning process, they may have fewer opportunities to practice analysis, problem-solving, argumentation, and independent writing (Kasneci et al., 2023; Dwivedi et al., 2023).

Kasneci et al. (2023) emphasized that the educational value of large language models depends substantially on how they are integrated into learning activities. GenAI is more educationally valuable when it stimulates questioning, reflection, comparison, and verification rather than replacing students' cognitive effort (You, 2024).

5.6 Student Engagement and Learning Interaction

GenAI can create a conversational learning environment in which students interact with an AI system through questions and follow-up prompts. This may increase opportunities for active engagement and exploration. Students can also use AI to generate practice questions, receive explanations, and test their understanding (Tlili et al., 2023; Ogunleye et al., 2024).

However, the novelty and convenience of AI may also encourage passive learning if students simply request ready-made answers. Therefore, instructional design plays an important role in determining whether GenAI promotes active learning or dependency (Kasneci et al., 2023; Baidoo-Anu et al., 2024).

5.7 Academic Integrity and Plagiarism

The use of GenAI has created significant challenges for academic integrity. Students may submit AI-generated text without disclosure, raising concerns about plagiarism, authorship, originality, and fair assessment. Cotton et al. (2024) argued that the emergence of ChatGPT requires educational institutions to reconsider conventional approaches to academic integrity.

At the same time, the distinction between acceptable assistance and inappropriate substitution is becoming increasingly important. Using AI for brainstorming or language improvement may differ substantially from submitting an AI-generated assignment as entirely one's own work (Cotton et al., 2024; Dwivedi et al., 2023).

5.8 Accuracy and Reliability of AI-Generated Information

A major limitation of GenAI is that it can generate information that appears convincing but is factually incorrect. AI systems may produce fabricated references, inaccurate explanations, or unsupported claims. This is particularly problematic in academic writing, where evidence must be reliable and verifiable (Kasneci et al., 2023; Tlili et al., 2023).

Students therefore require strong information-literacy and source-verification skills. AI-generated information should be treated as a starting point for inquiry rather than automatically accepted as authoritative academic evidence (Kasneci et al., 2023; Dwivedi et al., 2023).

5.9 Ethical and Privacy Concerns

The literature identifies several ethical issues surrounding GenAI use in education. These include privacy, data security, bias, transparency, authorship, accountability, and unequal access to technology. Students may also be uncertain about how their personal or academic information is processed when interacting with AI systems (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Tlili et al., 2023).

Universities therefore need clear ethical guidelines addressing appropriate AI use, disclosure of AI assistance, protection of student data, and responsibility for submitted academic work (Cotton et al., 2024; Bhullar et al., 2024).

5.10 AI Literacy and Responsible Use

The increasing use of GenAI makes **AI literacy** an important educational requirement. Students need to understand what AI systems can and cannot do, how to formulate effective prompts, how to verify AI-generated information, and how to recognize possible bias or inaccuracies (Kasneci et al., 2023; Ogunleye et al., 2024).

Educators also require AI literacy to design meaningful learning activities and assessments. Rather than simply prohibiting AI, institutions can emphasize responsible use, transparency, critical evaluation, and academic accountability (Bhullar et al., 2024; McGrath et al., 2025).

5.11 Generative AI and Higher Education Assessment

GenAI has challenged conventional assignment-based assessment because students can use AI to generate essays, summaries, answers, and other academic content. This has encouraged greater interest in process-based and authentic assessment approaches (Cotton et al., 2024; McGrath et al., 2025).

Assessment methods that require students to explain their reasoning, reflect on their learning process, discuss drafts, complete oral presentations, or demonstrate application of knowledge may provide stronger evidence of individual learning than assignments based solely on final written products (Cotton et al., 2024; Bhullar et al., 2024).

5.12 Potential Risk of AI Dependence

The convenience of GenAI may encourage students to rely heavily on automated assistance. Excessive dependence could affect the development of independent writing, problem-solving, creativity, and critical-thinking skills (Kasneci et al., 2023; You, 2024). Therefore, the objective should not be to eliminate AI from education but to establish appropriate boundaries between AI assistance and student intellectual responsibility (Dwivedi et al., 2023).

5.13 Role of Teachers and Universities

The emergence of GenAI is changing the role of educators from information providers toward facilitators of critical and responsible technology use. Teachers can help students compare AI responses with scholarly sources, identify inaccuracies, revise AI-generated material, and reflect on the learning process (Baidoo-Anu & Owusu Ansah, 2023; Ogunleye et al., 2024).

Universities also have an important role in developing institutional policies, AI-literacy programs, assessment guidelines, and academic-integrity frameworks. Bhullar et al. (2024) emphasized the need for continued research and institutional responses to the rapidly developing role of ChatGPT in higher education. Similar institutional and pedagogical considerations are highlighted in the review by McGrath et al. (2025).

5.14 Overall Synthesis

Overall, the reviewed literature indicates that Generative AI has considerable potential to support student learning and academic writing, particularly through personalized explanations, brainstorming, language assistance, feedback, revision, and interactive academic support (Baidoo-Anu & Owusu Ansah, 2023; Mahapatra, 2024; Ogunleye et al., 2024). At the same time, concerns regarding accuracy, overdependence, academic integrity, privacy, bias, and reduced independent learning cannot be ignored (Kasneci et al., 2023; Cotton et al., 2024; Dwivedi et al., 2023).

The literature therefore supports a balanced and responsible approach. GenAI is most educationally valuable when it complements rather than replaces students' intellectual work. Its effective integration requires AI literacy, teacher guidance, source verification, transparent use, appropriate assessment practices, and clear institutional policies (Bhullar et al., 2024; McGrath et al., 2025; You, 2024).

6. Findings and Discussion

The reviewed literature indicates that Generative Artificial Intelligence is becoming an important supplementary tool in higher education, particularly in student learning and academic writing. The evidence shows considerable potential for improving access to academic support, but its educational value depends largely on how students and teachers use and evaluate AI-generated content (Kasneci et al., 2023; Ogunleye et al., 2024; McGrath et al., 2025).

6.1 Findings Related to Student Learning

A major finding is that GenAI can provide students with immediate and interactive academic assistance. Students can use AI tools to obtain explanations, examples, summaries, practice questions, and clarification of difficult concepts. This may support self-directed learning and provide additional assistance outside regular classroom interaction (Baidoo-Anu & Owusu Ansah, 2023; Tlili et al., 2023; Baidoo-Anu et al., 2024).

The personalized nature of AI interaction is another potential advantage. Students can ask the same concept in different ways and request simpler or more detailed explanations according to their needs. However, personalized assistance does not necessarily mean accurate learning. Students still need to verify information and compare AI-generated responses with reliable academic sources (Kasneci et al., 2023; Ogunleye et al., 2024).

6.2 Findings Related to Academic Writing

The literature suggests that GenAI can support multiple stages of academic writing. Students may use it for brainstorming, developing outlines, organizing ideas, improving grammar, paraphrasing, revising sentences, and receiving feedback. Such assistance can be particularly useful for students who experience difficulties with academic language and written expression (Mahapatra, 2024; Suryanti & Ramadhanti, 2024; Zhao et al., 2024).

However, the review also indicates that writing assistance and writing replacement are not equivalent. When students use AI to generate complete assignments without meaningful intellectual engagement, opportunities to develop argumentation, synthesis, critical thinking, and independent writing skills may be reduced (Kasneci et al., 2023; Cotton et al., 2024; You, 2024).

6.3 Findings Related to Feedback and Revision

GenAI can provide rapid feedback on language, organization, clarity, and style. This immediate response may encourage students to revise their work more frequently and experiment with alternative ways of expressing ideas (Mahapatra, 2024; Aljuaid, 2024).

Nevertheless, AI-generated feedback may itself contain errors or inappropriate recommendations. Therefore, students should evaluate AI suggestions rather than accepting them automatically. Teacher feedback remains important for discipline-specific argumentation, conceptual accuracy, and academic standards (Kasneci et al., 2023; Tlili et al., 2023).

6.4 Findings Related to Critical Thinking

The evidence presents a mixed picture regarding the relationship between GenAI and critical thinking. When AI is used to generate questions, compare perspectives, identify weaknesses, or stimulate discussion, it may support higher-order thinking. In contrast, using AI to produce ready-made answers may reduce students' need to analyze information independently (Kasneci et al., 2023; You, 2024).

Therefore, the impact of GenAI on critical thinking appears to depend more on the nature of the task and the pattern of use than on the technology itself (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Ogunleye et al., 2024).

6.5 Findings Related to Academic Integrity

Academic integrity emerged as one of the most significant concerns. GenAI makes it easier for students to produce polished academic text without demonstrating the underlying learning process. This creates challenges related to plagiarism, authorship, originality, unauthorized assistance, and fair assessment (Cotton et al., 2024; Dwivedi et al., 2023).

The literature suggests that simple prohibition may not adequately address these challenges. Instead, universities need clear policies defining acceptable and unacceptable AI use and should encourage transparency regarding AI assistance (Cotton et al., 2024; Bhullar et al., 2024).

6.6 Findings Related to Accuracy and Reliability

Another important finding is that GenAI-generated content cannot automatically be considered reliable academic evidence. AI systems may produce inaccurate information, fabricated citations, incomplete explanations, or misleading statements. This creates particular risks when students use AI-generated content directly in academic assignments (Kasneci et al., 2023; Tlili et al., 2023).

Consequently, verification and source evaluation are essential skills for students using GenAI. Students should independently confirm important claims through scholarly literature and authoritative sources (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Ogunleye et al., 2024).

6.7 Findings Related to AI Dependence

The review identifies excessive dependence on AI as a potential educational risk. Frequent reliance on automated assistance may reduce students' opportunities to practice independent writing, problem-solving, creativity, and information evaluation (Kasneci et al., 2023; You, 2024).

However, moderate and purposeful use may provide useful scaffolding. The key issue is therefore not simply whether students use AI, but how much responsibility they retain for thinking, researching, writing, evaluating, and revising (Dwivedi et al., 2023; McGrath et al., 2025).

6.8 Findings Related to Ethical and Privacy Issues

Ethical concerns include data privacy, transparency, bias, accountability, authorship, and unequal access to AI technologies. Students may also have limited understanding of how their information is processed by AI systems (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Tlili et al., 2023).

These findings highlight the need for universities to provide clear ethical guidance and AI-literacy education rather than expecting students to understand responsible AI use independently (Bhullar et al., 2024; Ogunleye et al., 2024).

6.9 Findings Related to Teaching and Assessment

The emergence of GenAI has implications for teaching and assessment. Traditional take-home assignments may provide less reliable evidence of individual learning when students can obtain extensive AI assistance. Consequently, educators may increasingly use process-based assignments, reflective writing, oral presentations, classroom activities, project-based learning, and tasks requiring explanation of individual reasoning (Cotton et al., 2024; Bhullar et al., 2024; McGrath et al., 2025).

Teachers also have an important role in helping students use GenAI critically. Rather than treating AI solely as a threat, educators can incorporate activities that require students to evaluate, correct, compare, and improve AI-generated responses (Baidoo-Anu & Owusu Ansah, 2023; Kasneci et al., 2023).

6.10 Discussion

The overall findings suggest that GenAI is neither inherently beneficial nor inherently harmful. Its educational impact depends on the purpose, context, frequency, and manner of use. When used as a supplementary learning assistant, GenAI can provide personalized support, writing assistance, immediate feedback, and opportunities for exploration. When used as a substitute for students' intellectual work, it may create risks for independent learning, critical thinking, writing development, and academic integrity (Kasneci et al., 2023; Cotton et al., 2024; You, 2024).

The findings therefore support a human-centered approach to AI integration. Students should remain responsible for the accuracy, originality, reasoning, and final quality of their academic work. GenAI should function as a supportive tool that extends learning opportunities while preserving human judgment and intellectual responsibility (Dwivedi et al., 2023; McGrath et al., 2025).

Overall, the review indicates that effective GenAI integration requires a combination of AI literacy, critical thinking, teacher guidance, transparent use, source verification, ethical awareness, and appropriate assessment practices. This balanced approach can help higher education institutions benefit from the capabilities of GenAI while reducing its potential educational and ethical risks (Bhullar et al., 2024; Ogunleye et al., 2024; McGrath et al., 2025).

7. Research Gaps and Future Recommendations

The reviewed literature indicates that research on Generative AI in higher education is expanding rapidly, but several important gaps remain. These gaps can be broadly classified into methodological, contextual, longitudinal, measurement, pedagogical, ethical, assessment, and digital-equity gaps.

7.1 Methodological Gap

Many existing studies are exploratory, descriptive, or based on self-reported student perceptions. There is a need for more experimental, quasi-experimental, mixed-method, and comparative studies that examine actual changes in learning and writing outcomes.

7.2 Contextual Gap

Current evidence is concentrated in particular countries and higher-education settings. More research is needed across **South Asian and developing-country contexts**, including Nepal, where access to technology, educational practices, language backgrounds, and institutional policies may differ.

7.3 Longitudinal Gap

Most studies examine short-term experiences with GenAI. Limited evidence is available regarding its long-term effects on students' independent learning, academic writing development, critical thinking, creativity, and academic achievement. Longitudinal research is therefore required.

7.4 Measurement Gap

Studies use different measures to assess learning outcomes, writing quality, engagement, critical thinking, and AI literacy. Future research should use validated and transparent assessment criteria to improve comparability across studies.

7.5 Pedagogical Gap

Although GenAI is widely discussed as a learning tool, evidence about which instructional approaches make it educationally effective remains limited. Future studies should examine structured AI-supported activities, guided prompting, AI-assisted feedback, collaborative learning, and reflective use of AI.

7.6 Academic Writing Gap

More research is needed to determine whether repeated use of GenAI improves students' actual writing competence or mainly improves the quality of AI-assisted final products. Future research should distinguish between **writing performance with AI assistance and independent writing ability**.

7.7 Critical Thinking Gap

There is insufficient evidence regarding whether GenAI strengthens or weakens students' critical-thinking skills over time. Future research should directly assess analysis, reasoning, evaluation, argumentation, and problem-solving rather than relying only on students' perceptions.

7.8 Ethical and Academic Integrity Gap

Institutional policies regarding AI use vary considerably. Further research should examine effective approaches to AI disclosure, authorship, plagiarism prevention, responsible use, privacy, and ethical decision-making.

7.9 Assessment Gap

Traditional assessment methods may not adequately distinguish between students' own work and AI-assisted work. Research should evaluate alternative assessment strategies such as oral defense, process-based writing, reflective journals, project-based assessment, and authentic classroom tasks.

7.10 Digital-Equity Gap

Differences in access to AI tools, internet connectivity, digital literacy, paid AI services, and institutional support may create inequalities among students. Future research should examine whether GenAI reduces or increases existing educational disparities.

Future Recommendations

- Conduct more **experimental, longitudinal, and mixed-method research**.
- Examine GenAI use among students from diverse cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds.
- Increase research in **Nepal and other South Asian higher-education contexts**.
- Develop standardized measures for AI literacy, learning outcomes, writing quality, and critical thinking.
- Compare **AI-assisted and independent student performance**.
- Investigate the long-term effects of regular GenAI use on writing competence and intellectual independence.
- Develop evidence-based models for integrating GenAI into classroom teaching.
- Train teachers and students in responsible prompting, verification, citation, and ethical AI use.
- Establish clear institutional policies concerning acceptable AI assistance and disclosure.
- Redesign assessments to emphasize reasoning, reflection, application, and authentic student work.
- Investigate the effects of GenAI on creativity, problem-solving, metacognition, and independent learning.
- Examine privacy, bias, transparency, and data-security concerns.
- Promote equitable access to AI tools and AI-literacy opportunities for students.

8. Practical Implications

1. **For Universities:** Develop clear institutional policies defining responsible, transparent, and academically appropriate use of Generative AI.
2. **For Teachers:** Integrate GenAI into learning activities where it can support explanation, brainstorming, feedback, reflection, and critical evaluation without replacing students' intellectual work.
3. **For Students:** Use GenAI as a learning assistant rather than as a substitute for independent thinking, research, writing, and problem-solving.
4. **For Academic Writing:** Encourage students to use AI for brainstorming, outlining, language improvement, and revision while ensuring that arguments, evidence, interpretation, and final responsibility remain with the student.

5. **For AI Literacy:** Provide training on effective prompting, fact-checking, source verification, bias recognition, privacy, and responsible AI use.
6. **For Critical Thinking:** Design activities in which students evaluate, compare, correct, and critique AI-generated responses rather than simply accepting them.
7. **For Academic Integrity:** Establish clear guidelines regarding plagiarism, authorship, AI disclosure, citation practices, and acceptable levels of AI assistance.
8. **For Assessment:** Increase the use of process-based, reflective, project-based, oral, and authentic assessments that provide stronger evidence of students' individual learning.
9. **For Feedback and Revision:** Use AI-generated feedback as supplementary support while retaining teacher evaluation for conceptual accuracy, discipline-specific writing, and academic quality.
10. **For Teachers' Professional Development:** Provide educators with opportunities to develop AI literacy and learn effective pedagogical approaches for integrating GenAI into teaching and assessment.
11. **For Privacy and Data Protection:** Educate students and staff about protecting personal, confidential, and sensitive information when interacting with AI systems.
12. **For Digital Equity:** Ensure that students have fair access to appropriate AI tools, internet resources, and AI-literacy training so that technology does not increase existing educational inequalities.
13. **For Responsible Innovation:** Encourage universities to adopt a balanced approach that recognizes the educational potential of GenAI while maintaining human judgment, academic standards, and student accountability.
14. **For Institutional Evaluation:** Regularly evaluate the effects of GenAI integration on learning outcomes, writing skills, critical thinking, academic integrity, and student engagement.

9. Limitations

- **Review-Based Evidence:** The study is based on previously published literature and does not involve primary data collected directly from students or teachers.
- **Rapidly Changing Technology:** Generative AI tools are developing very quickly; therefore, some findings may become less applicable as models, features, and educational practices change.
- **Limited Long-Term Evidence:** Most available studies examine relatively short-term experiences, while evidence regarding the long-term effects of GenAI on learning, writing skills, and critical thinking remains limited.
- **Variation in Research Designs:** The reviewed studies differ in research designs, sample sizes, educational settings, AI tools, and outcome measures, making direct comparison difficult.
- **Measurement Differences:** Student learning, academic writing, AI literacy, critical thinking, and engagement are measured using different instruments and assessment approaches.
- **Self-Report Bias:** Several studies rely on students' or teachers' self-reported perceptions, which may not always correspond to actual patterns of AI use or learning outcomes.
- **Limited Causal Evidence:** Many studies are descriptive or cross-sectional, making it difficult to establish whether GenAI directly causes improvements or declines in learning and writing performance.
- **Contextual Differences:** Findings may vary according to country, educational system, language, discipline, technological access, and institutional AI policies.

- **Academic Integrity Concerns:** It can be difficult to determine the extent to which reported academic performance reflects students' independent abilities or AI-assisted work.
- **Generalizability:** The findings should be interpreted cautiously because the available evidence may not represent all student populations, particularly students from under-researched regions and educational contexts.

10. Conclusion

Generative Artificial Intelligence has emerged as an important technological development with considerable potential to influence student learning and academic writing in higher education. The reviewed literature indicates that GenAI tools can provide students with immediate explanations, personalized academic assistance, brainstorming support, language improvement, feedback, revision assistance, and opportunities for self-directed learning.

In academic writing, GenAI can support several stages of the writing process, including idea generation, outlining, drafting, grammar improvement, paraphrasing, and revision. These functions may be particularly useful for students who require additional language or writing support. However, the educational value of such assistance depends on whether students remain actively involved in thinking, researching, evaluating evidence, and developing their own arguments.

The review also identifies important concerns regarding academic integrity, accuracy, overdependence, critical thinking, privacy, bias, authorship, and transparency. AI-generated content may contain factual errors or fabricated references, and excessive reliance on AI may reduce opportunities for students to develop independent writing and problem-solving abilities. Therefore, GenAI should not be considered a replacement for students' intellectual effort or teachers' academic guidance.

Overall, the findings support a balanced, human-centered, and responsible approach to GenAI integration. AI can function effectively as a supplementary learning and writing assistant when students critically evaluate its outputs, verify information through reliable sources, and remain responsible for the final academic work.

Universities and educators should therefore focus on developing AI literacy, ethical guidelines, transparent AI-use practices, critical-thinking skills, and appropriate assessment strategies. Rather than simply prohibiting GenAI, educational institutions should teach students how to use it responsibly and meaningfully.

Future research should examine the long-term effects of GenAI on independent learning, academic writing competence, critical thinking, creativity, academic achievement, and integrity across diverse cultural and educational contexts. In conclusion, the educational value of Generative AI depends not merely on its technological capabilities but on how thoughtfully, critically, ethically, and responsibly it is integrated into the learning process.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and publication of this article.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship and publication of this article.

References

1. Baidoo-Anu, D., & Owusu Ansah, L. (2023). Education in the era of generative artificial intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. Journal of AI, 7(1), 52–62.
2. Baidoo-Anu, D., Asamoah, D., Amoako, I., & Mahama, I. (2024). Exploring student perspectives on generative artificial intelligence in higher education learning. Discover Education, 3, 98. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00173-z
3. 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
4. Chukwuere, J. E. (2024). The use of ChatGPT in higher education: The advantages and disadvantages. Journal of Education and Learning, 13(3), 1–10.
5. Cotton, D. R. E., 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.
6. Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeiffer, F., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., ... Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274
7. Mahapatra, S. (2024). Impact of ChatGPT on ESL students' academic writing skills: A mixed methods intervention study. Smart Learning Environments, 11, 9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00295-9
8. 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. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-024-01288-w
9. Ogunleye, B., Zakariyyah, K. I., Ajao, O., Olayinka, O., & Sharma, H. (2024). A systematic review of generative AI for teaching and learning practice. Education Sciences, 14(6), 636.
10. Suryanti, F., & Ramadhanti, G. (2024). The use of generative AI in higher education students' writing: A systematic literature review. Journal of English as a Foreign Language Education, 5(1). https://doi.org/10.26418/jefle.v5i1.82938
11. Tlili, A., Shehata, B., Adarkwah, M. A., Bozkurt, A., Hickey, D. T., Huang, R., & Agyemang, B. (2023). What if the devil is my guardian angel: ChatGPT as a case study of using chatbots in education. Smart Learning Environments, 10, 15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00237-x
12. You, S. (2024). A systematic review of the impact of ChatGPT on higher education. International Journal of Technology-Enhanced Education, 3(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJTEE.343528
13. Zhao, X., Cox, A., & Cai, L. (2024). ChatGPT and the digitisation of writing. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications,11,482. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-02904-x
14. Aljuaid, H. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence tools on academic writing instruction in higher education: A systematic review. Arab World English Journal, Special Issue on ChatGPT, 26–55. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/
15. Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., Baabdullah, A. M., Koohang, A., Raghavan, V., Ahuja, M., Albanna, H., Albashrawi, M. A., Al-Busaidi, A. S., Balakrishnan, J., Barlette, Y., Basu, S., Bose, I., Brooks, L., Buhalis, D., ... Wright, R. (2023). So what if ChatGPT wrote it? Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. International Journal of Information Management, 71, 102642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642