

Generative Artificial Intelligence And Its Dual Impact On Scholarly Writing: Fostering Or Hindering Intellectual Autonomy

الذكاء الاصطناعي التوليدي وتأثيره المزدوج على الكتابة الأكاديمية:
تعزيز للاستقلالية الفكرية أم تقويض لها

Soufyane KHELLOUL

MCB, Teachers Training College of Bouzareah (ENSB), Algiers, Algeria

sofiyane.khelloul@ensb.dz

Date Of Receipt: 10/12/2025

Date Of Acceptance: 06/03/2026

Date Of Publication: 31/03/2026

ملخص:

يُمثل ظهور الأدوات المدعّمة بالذكاء الاصطناعي وولوجها السريع للمشهد الأكاديمي، وخاصةً نماذج اللغات الكبيرة، تحولاً مُعقّداً ومتعدد الجوانب، يُعيد صياغة الممارسات، الأخلاقيات والنظريات المعرفية في الأوساط الأكاديمية بشكل جذري، ويُشكّل نقطة تحوّل حاسمة في تطوّر الكتابة الأكاديمية. وهذا يُثير تساؤلاتٍ عميقة حول التزاوة وأصول التدريس وطبيعة التأليف. تُناقش هذه المقالة بشكلٍ نقديّ نمط التأثير المزدوج للذكاء الاصطناعي، مُجادلةً بأنّ هذه الأدوات، على الرغم من امتلاكها إمكانياتٍ هائلة لتعزيز الإنتاجية، وتحسين إمكانية الوصول، ودعم المهام المعرفية المُعقّدة، تُهدّد في الوقت نفسه بإعاقة تطوير المهارات الفكرية الأساسية، التفكير النقدي، والتزاوة الأكاديمية. وتُخلص هذه الورقة إلى أنّ الإدراج المسؤول للذكاء الاصطناعي في المشهد الأكاديمي يتطلّب إعطاء الأولوية لإنشاء "ذكاء هجين" يجمع بين الإنسان والذكاء الاصطناعي، ووضع إجراءات إفصاح أخلاقية لمواكبة العصر الجديد من التعاون بين الإنسان والذكاء الاصطناعي في الأوساط الأكاديمية.

الكلمات المفتاحية:

الذكاء الاصطناعي، الكتابة الأكاديمية، أنماط التأثير المزدوج للذكاء الاصطناعي، الإفصاح عن الذكاء الاصطناعي، الذكاء الهجين.

Abstract

The emergence of AI-powered tools and its rapid integration into the academic landscape, particularly Large Language Models (LLMs), represents a complex multifaceted transition which is fundamentally reshaping the practices, ethics, and epistemology of academia, and triggering a crucial inflection point in the evolution of academic writing. This raises profound questions regarding integrity, pedagogy, and the very nature of authorship. This article critically examines the dual-impact pattern of AI, arguing that while these tools possess immense potential to foster productivity, enhance accessibility, and scaffold complex cognitive tasks, they simultaneously threaten to hinder the development of core intellectual skills, critical thinking, and academic integrity. This paper concludes that the responsible integration of AI in academia demands prioritizing the creation of human-AI "Hybrid" Intelligence and establishing ethical disclosure procedures to navigate this new era of human-AI collaboration in academia.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Academic Writing, Dual-Impact Patterns of (AI), AI Disclosure, Hybrid Intelligence.

1. INTRODUCTION:

While previous technological advancements primarily affected the tools used in research (e.g., statistical software, online databases), Generative AI actively mediates the processes of scholarly inquiry, challenging established norms of writing, thinking, and knowing. Generally, it produces human-quality texts, codes, and synthesized data. It presents a challenge of an entirely different scale. Unlike previous tools that merely optimized manual processes such as grammar checkers or citation managers, contemporary Large Language Models (LLMs)- such as GPT-4, Gemini, Claude, and ChatGPT- demonstrate fundamentally different capabilities. They can produce plausible manuscripts complete with abstracts, methods, and references (Roberts, 2024), participate meaningfully in conceptualization, outlining, drafting, and rhetorical structuring (Lin, 2023), and produce work that blind reviewers cannot reliably distinguish from human-authored texts (Molinari & Molinari, 2024). These systems provide not merely computational assistance but what Lin (2023) terms "cognitive offloading" and "imaginative stimulation," reshaping core academic practices across research, teaching, and dissemination rather than simply streamlining administrative workflows (Machado et al., 2025). They offer unprecedented assistance at nearly every stage, from brainstorming to final proofreading. Thus, the rapid -mostly unregulated- adoption of these tools by students and researchers worldwide necessitates a rigorous, balanced, and evidence-based assessment of their influence. Multiple studies document that Generative AI adoption in higher education is outpacing the development of institutional safeguards and governance frameworks (Machado et al., 2025; Vieira & Mesquita, 2025), with practical student-LLM substitution occurring in real assignments before policies are fully established (Molinari & Molinari, 2024). This institutional gap creates significant risks: human reviewers frequently fail to detect AI authorship, instances of hallucinated data and fabricated citations proliferate, and the boundaries of academic integrity become increasingly contested (Hysaj et al., 2024).

This paper is structured around the central thesis that Generative AI exerts a dual impact on academic writing: it fosters academic writing by restructuring technical aspects and enhancing productivity. Simultaneously, it hinders the intellectual rigour, scholarly ethics, and the integrity upon which academia is built. Eventually, this paper puts forward a critical study to the necessary policy and pedagogical alterations in academia supported by concrete examples and referenced arguments to ensure the ethical and productive integration of AI into the academic arena. It demonstrates the augmentative potentials of Generative AI and investigates its subtractive risks. Then, it sums up in a discussion of the required policy and pedagogical reformation necessary to govern its responsible integration within higher education and scholarly publishing.

2. The Augmented Intelligence Perspective: Fostering Efficiency and Cognitive Scaffolding

The main request of integrating Generative AI into academic workflows lies in its capacity to enhance efficiency, particularly for tasks situated at the lower and middle tiers of Bloom's revised taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). This integration aligns with the concept of Augmented Intelligence (AuI), which positions the machine as a collaborative partner rather than a replacement (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). That is to say, Generative AI tools integration should not replace the student or the teacher, but to work alongside them. The human handles intellectual control, evaluation, and the final critical output, while the AI handles the time-consuming aspects of the work.

2.1. Fostering Efficiency: The Lower and Middle Tiers of Bloom's Taxonomy

According to Anderson & Krathwohl (2001), Bloom's Revised Taxonomy defines six hierarchical levels of cognitive processes, ranging from simple recall to complex creation. Generative AI offers immediate and significant value at the lower and middle levels of this hierarchy, as it is highlighted in the table below:

Table 1: The Role of Generative AI in Bloom's Revised Taxonomy

Tier	Level (Verb)	Description	Typical Academic Tasks
Lower	Remember	Recalling or recognizing information, facts, and concepts.	Defining terms, listing steps, recalling dates.
	Understand	Explaining ideas or concepts.	Summarizing texts, paraphrasing, classifying information, explaining principles.
Middle	Apply	Using information in a new situation.	Solving routine problems, demonstrating procedures, carrying out a task.
	Analyze	Breaking down information into parts to understand structure or relationships.	Comparing and contrasting, distinguishing elements, outlining causes/effects.
Higher	Evaluate	Making judgments based on criteria and standards.	Critiquing, assessing, judging, justifying.
	Create	Putting elements together to form a new whole; generating new ideas or products.	Designing, inventing, composing, planning, hypothesizing.

2.2. Rapid Outlining and Conceptualization:

Smith et al (2024) assures that Generative AI significantly accelerates time-consuming, repetitive, and cognitively draining aspects of the writing process, leading to measurable gains in scholarly output. That is to say, Generative AI excels at rapid idea generation and the creation of detailed, hierarchical outlines. By providing a comprehensive prompt, a scholar can receive a structural draft of a chapter or article, complete with suggested section headings, logical flow, and provisional topic sentences, which then serves as a framework for human refinement and content insertion. This transforms the initial drafting process from a creation task into a refinement task, significantly reducing the cognitive strain associated with starting a large project.

2.3. Linguistic Refinement and Cognitive Scaffolding

Hapsari & Wu (2022) put it forward that AI-powered tools provide refined editorial support that surpasses traditional grammar checking. For non-native English speakers or those writing in a foreign language, Generative AI offers an invaluable bridge. It can promptly rephrase awkward constructions, adjust the technical register to match disciplinary conventions such as turning a statement from informal to formal academic style, and ensure adherence to style guides such as APA and MLA. They adds, studies have shown that for EFL students, Generative AI can improve language fluency and confidence, enabling them to focus their limited cognitive resources on complex content and critical analysis, rather than linguistic mechanics.

Alongside fostering efficiency, Generative AI may function as a powerful cognitive scaffold, particularly in educational settings. Johnson & Smith (2019) announce that AI-powered tutoring systems built upon Large Language Models (LLMs) can offer adaptive learning pathways that respond immediately to a student’s demonstrated knowledge gaps. By generating adapted examples, complex analogies, or simplifying high-density source material, Generative AI helps in comprehension, making traditionally inaccessible or highly abstract concepts more tangible. This personalization competency improves student engagement and performance in tasks requiring information analysis.

Actually, Generative AI can examine vast quantities of published literature to identify thematic clusters, controversial arguments, emerging research gaps, and tasks that traditionally require hundreds of human hours. In fact, even though the Large Language Models cannot replace the human insight required to synthesize this information critically, its ability to map instantly a complex domain permits scholars to reach the phase of original contribution much faster. The dual-impact Generative AI-Critical Thinking framework suggests that, when properly mediated, AI's affordances can facilitate deep analysis by freeing up cognitive capacity (de la Puente Pacheco et al., 2025).

3. The Subtracted Intelligence Perspective: Hindering Criticality and Originality

The advantages of Generative AI are intimately associated with a series of substantial risks that threaten to destroy the intellectual foundations of academic training and scholarly output. These risks manifest primarily as the automation bias and the potential for a systemic deterioration in critical thinking:

3.1. Destruction of Intellectual Autonomy and Critical Thinking

The main objective of higher education writing is the development of metacognitive skills. That is to say, developing the ability to analyse, interpret, assess, and infer arguments independently (Facione, 1990). Therefore, Generative AI introduces a significant threat of passive learning by automating the complex processes of information synthesis and textual generation. Empirical studies prove that excessive reliance on AI could weaken the ability to think independently (European Research Studies Journal, 2024). When a student assigns the entire task of structuring an argument or synthesizing a source to Generative AI, they miss out the necessary cognitive effort required to truly understand the material, decide what evidence is best, and find their own unique way of thinking. In other words, Outsourcing the hard thinking means sacrificing deep learning and original thought. This, presumably, results to what is referred to by Burbules & Callister (2018) as Surface Knowledge Acquisition, where the student understands the output but fails to grasp the underlying critical process that generates it. Yet, The automation-augmentation contradiction is realized when the convenience of the tool leads to the absolute replacement of human effort, rather than its enhancement.

3.2. Homogenization of Discourse and the Crisis of Reliability

AI-generated texts often reveals a systematic tone, potentially leading to a homogenization of academic discourse and hindering the stylistic development and originality of a writer's voice (Siddiqui, Pea, & Subramonyam, 2025). Thus, As more academic papers are generated by a shared set of Large Language Models (LLMs), the unique voice, stylistic flair, and nuanced density that distinguish high-level scholarship risk being replaced by a universally fluent, yet eventually sterile, Large Language Models voice. This algorithmic smoothing reduces intellectual variation and makes it difficult for human reviewers to identify genuinely original arguments, which often reside in unconventional phrasing or rhetorical risks. Furthermore, Large Language Models (LLMs) tend to be conservative in their ideation, potentially reinforcing existing academic conventions and hindering creative thought and paradigm shifts (Fitzpatrick, 2018).

Beside to the problem of homogenising academic discourse, Generative AI raises another formidable challenge to academia. It is its propensity for hallucination; generating factually nonsensical, inappropriate, or fabricated content introduced with high confidence. In the context of academic writing, this poses a significant threat to research reliability, particularly in terms of citations and evidence. Generative AI can frequently invent sources, misattribute quotes, or generate highly probable, yet fabricated, research findings. If students or researchers fail to verify thoroughly every piece of AI-generated information, they risk submitting work underpinned by a manufactured evidentiary base. This places the burden of fact-authentication entirely on the human user, paradoxically increasing the time and cognitive load for the most critical task of scholarly work: establishing truthful claims. Prohibiting the use of unverified references generated by AI is a critical policy response to this threat (WAME, 2023).

4. Ethical Challenges in Scholarly Publishing

The integration of Generative AI in academia has launched a reactive policy shift in the academic publishing landscape. The main concerns revolve around ensuring responsibility, defining authorship, and protecting the confidentiality of the peer-review process. International bodies managing publication ethics have been clear and unequivocal: AI-powered tools cannot be listed as authors. The International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE, 2024) and the World Association of Medical Editors (WAME, 2023) both assert that authorship is grounded upon four criteria, which require human capacity for intellectual

conception, drafting, accountability, and final approval. Therefore, since Large Language Models (LLMs) cannot hold the intellectual responsibility, manage conflicts of interest, or ethically assent to the final version, it could not be considered as an author (ICMJE, 2024; WAME, 2023). Unlike the human authors, they hold the full ethical responsibility for every component of the manuscript, including sections generated by AI. This shift of responsibility places a heavy compulsion on the human researcher to function as a severe quality controller who ensures the accuracy and credibility of the AI-generated content.

4.1. Required Disclosure, Transparency, and Confidentiality

To uphold academic integrity, acknowledging the use of Generative AI is now an essential requirement. Transparency policies require authors to report clearly the use of AI-powered tools in the Acknowledgments section or the Methods section, depending on the amount of the contribution. The required disclosure, according to the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE, 2023), must specify the following items:

- *The name and version of the AI tool:* e.g., ChatGPT-4, Gemini 2.5.
- *The purpose of its use:* e.g., used for preliminary outline generation, or used for language polishing in Section 2.1 ...etc.
- *The extent of AI involvement:* e.g., grammar suggestions only, or complete revision of the introduction draft ...etc.

The inappropriate use of AI can be considered as research misconduct, potentially leading to rejection or denial, in accordance with the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE, 2023) guidelines. This level of transparency is essential for readers to gauge the human intellectual contribution versus the computational assistance.

Moreover, the peer review process raises a critical ethical issue of data confidentiality that often goes neglected or unaddressed. Generally, reviewers and editors are explicitly prohibited from uploading confidential, unpublished manuscript content into public Generative AI platforms (ICMJE, 2024). Large Language Models (LLMs) are often used in commercial applications, where they continue to rely on prompts and input data that can be leveraged to train future models or unintentionally disclose non-public research findings. This represents a serious breach of trust and the integrity of the peer-review system, particularly in sensitive fields such as medicine and national security. Moreover, faculty and institutions must be attentive about the use of AI-powered tools that may violate privacy

procedures, such as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), when handling student data (Cornell University CTI, 2023).

5. Pedagogical Transformation

Generative AI is currently creating a crisis that demands a comprehensive, practical transformation of pedagogical practices, moving away from detection towards integration and critical thinking skills. The emphasis must shift from *what* students write to *how* they think and collaborate with technology to create an advanced intellectual work. This encompasses:

5.1. Reconsidering Assessment: A move towards AI-Resistant Design

According to the UNESCO (2025) report, the advent of Large Language Models (LLMs) and AI-powered tools has made the traditional assessment procedures, which depend on memorisation, summarisation, and automated problems, obsolete. Maintaining effective pedagogy in the era of AI requires "AI-resistant" assignments that highly demand human cognitive skills. These include:

Table 2: Shifting Assessment Paradigms in the AI Era

Assignment Type (Old Paradigm)	AI-Resistant Type (New Paradigm)	Core Skill Targeted
Summarize a historical event.	Critique two AI-generated summaries of the event, identifying biases and missing context.	Metacognitive Critique, Bias Recognition
Define a complex scientific theory.	Apply the theory to a novel, ill-defined real-world problem with conflicting variables, justifying the ethical implications of the solution.	Application, Ethical Reasoning, Problem-Solving
Write an essay based on primary sources.	Develop the initial 200-word essay using Generative AI, then submit the AI's prompt and output alongside a 1000-word critique and revision log explaining all human changes and justifications.	Transparency, Iterative Revision, Ownership

5.2. The Metacognitive Mandate and Critical AI Literacy

Metacognition is defined as a higher-order thinking skill that involves one’s awareness and control over his own cognitive processes. In other words, it is thinking about thinking as Paris and Winograd (1990) eloquently summarise it in self-appraisal (reflections on knowledge/abilities) and self-management of cognition (mental processes that help "orchestrate aspects of problem solving"). Nowadays, in the Generative AI era, the most vital skill for instructors and learners is not “using” AI, but “critically evaluating” its output. This demands fostering a metacognitive command – thinking about one’s own thinking - in partnership with the machine.

Critical AI literacy is intimately related to the quality of the human prompt. Teachers and students should learn what is known as “Prompt Engineering”: the art of creating precise, contextualized, and iterative instructions. This allows instructors and learners to understand the subject matter deeply enough to give critical prompts that allow shifting the Generative AI use from passive delegation into an active, high-level interaction.

Thesify (2025) puts forward a reflective practice to encourage transparency and make the ethical use of AI a visible component of authorship and academia. He asserts that assignments should mandate a reflective element, often called an AI-Use Addendum. In this addendum, the academic staff should detail:

- Which AI tools were used?
- The specific function the AI fulfilled.
- The steps taken to verify the AI's output, especially concerning sources and factual claims.
- A brief critique of the AI’s performance, including any errors or biases noted.

5.3. Developing Institutional Frameworks and Ethical Education

Institutional response requires coordinated effort across faculty, libraries, and administration. Clear, unified, and continuously updated syllabus policies are essential to eliminate confusion and establish boundaries.

Furthermore, ethical education must be integrated into the core curriculum. This includes raising student awareness of:

- **Algorithmic Bias:** How the LLM's training data can perpetuate and amplify human biases, potentially leading to inequitable or skewed academic outcomes. Many scholars such as Baker & Hawn (2022), Smith (2020) assume that algorithmic systems built on historical, flawed data can create a feedback loop that reinforces existing biases and leads to inequitable outcomes in areas like education, hiring, and criminal justice.
- **Environmental and Labor Costs:** The significant computational power, data storage, and low-wage human labor required to train and maintain these models, which constitutes the often-invisible, yet substantial, ethical footprint of Generative AI.

Crawford, K. (2021)et. al. This book comprehensively details the "hidden costs" of AI, including the material and environmental costs (energy and water consumption for data centers/training, rare earth mineral mining for hardware) and the labor required for data labeling and content moderation, which is often low-paid and emotionally taxing.

- **Data Privacy:** The risks associated with inputting confidential or proprietary information into public AI systems.Using public LLMs often means any input is used for future model training unless explicitly stated otherwise, leading to potential data leakage and privacy breaches. In its report on LLM privacy risks, IBM (2025) refers to the general risk of data exfiltration/leakage where users input sensitive work or academic data into a public model that then retains and potentially uses that data.

The adoption of an institutional-level Critical AI Literacy framework, which examines the tools through a lens of power and justice, is necessary to ensure responsible and equitable integration (Cornell University CTI, 2023).

6. CONCLUSION

The integration of Generative AI into academic writing presents a complex, irreversible duality. The technology is neither a universal saviour nor an inherent destroyer, but a powerful, morally neutral tool whose impact is determined entirely by human intent, policy, and pedagogical framework. This article asserts that the era of academic writing has transitioned into the era of “*Hybrid Intelligence*”, where the most successful scholars will be those capable of leveraging the computational strengths of AI (speed, data processing, generation) while maintaining the distinct human capacity for critical judgment, ethical reasoning, and original conceptualization

To mitigate the pervasive risks of intellectual destruction and academic misconduct, and to harness the true augmentative potential of Generative AI, the academic community must prioritize four non-negotiable mandates:

Mandate Augmentation over Automation: Assignment design must shift to tasks requiring higher-order thinking such as critique, analysis, and application to ill-defined problems that force the human-in-the-loop. (Chesterman, 2025)

Mandate Disclosure for Transparency: Universities, institutions and publishing bodies should enforce the mandatory disclosure of AI usage across all stages of the writing and review process to ensure transparency and accountability. This goes in line with APA updated policy (APA, 2023, 2025), and COPE principles (COPE, 2023). Mandating disclosure for transparency, according to COPE (2023), prohibits authorship for Generative AI and place the full accountability on human authors.

Mandate Critical AI Literacy: Critical AI literacy is defined as the ability to understand, apply, and critically evaluate the purpose of AI technologies, focusing on ethical and social implications. (Limongi & Marcolin, 2024; Valenzuela, 2021). Therefore, curricular changes are emphasizing AI literacy, critical evaluation of outputs, and the specific skill of prompt engineering. Notably, Critical thinking is a 'human domain' skill (Kadwa, 2020) vital for assessing the quality, reliability, and accuracy of Generative AI outputs (Bearman et al., 2024). Thus, academics should view AI as a "sparring partner," not an entirely trusted source (Walter, 2024; Essien et al., 2024) as they should be equipped with skills in prompt engineering for the effective use AI-powered tools.

Review EL'BAHITH - ENS - Bouzareah - Algiers					
ISSN : 9577-1112	EISSN : 2602-5388	Volume: (18)	Number : (01)	year: 2026	Pages: 80-95

Mandate Accountability: Authors must remain legally and intellectually accountable for all submitted content, regardless of the level of AI assistance received, as it is eloquently issued in ICMJE, WAME guidelines. The two international publishing organizations (ICMJE, WAME) assume that AI tools cannot be authors and that human authors remain fully responsible for accuracy, originality, and ethical compliance, even with AI use. Furthermore, Editors' Statement on the Responsible Use of Generative AI Technologies in Scholarly Journal Publishing – PMC confirms that Large Language Models should not be listed as authors because they lack the moral responsibility and accountability required for authorship, which is essential to the mission of scholarly publishing (Hosseini et al., 2023; Teixeira & Tsigaris, 2023).

Ultimately, future research must emphasise on longitudinal empirical studies to measure accurately the long-term effects of Generative AI use on the critical thinking development of cohorts who have been much exposed to these tools. The challenge is not to prohibit the tool, but to redefine what it means to be a competent, ethical, and original academic author in the era of Generative AI.

7. Bibliography

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Longman.

APA Journals policy on generative AI (August 2025) Policy on Generative AI Use and Disclosure. Available at:

<https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/resources/publishing-tips/policy-generative-ai>

Baker, R. S., & Hawn, M. A. (2022). Algorithmic bias in education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 32(4), 1052–1092. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-021-00285-9>

Bearman et al., (2024) 'Developing evaluative judgement for a time of generative artificial intelligence', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 49(6), pp. 893 – 905. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2335321>

Burbules, N. C., & Callister, T. A. (2018). *Teaching and learning in a digital world: New roles for teachers and technology*. Routledge.

Chesterman, S (2024). *Good Models Borrow, Great Models Steal: Intellectual Property Rights and Generative AI*. NUS Law Working Paper No. 2023/025; Policy

Review EL'BAHITH - ENS - Bouzareah - Algiers					
ISSN : 9577-1112	EISSN : 2602-5388	Volume: (18)	Number : (01)	year: 2026	Pages: 80-95

& Society (2024), puae006, <https://doi.org/10.1093/polsoc/puae006>, Available at SSRN:<https://ssrn.com/abstract=4590006> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4590006>

Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (2023) Authorship and AI tools. Available at: <https://publicationethics.org/guidance/cope-position/authorship-and-ai-tools> (accessed 21 January 2025).

Cornell University Centre for Teaching Innovation (CTI). (2023). CU Committee Report: Generative Artificial Intelligence for Education and Pedagogy. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University. <https://teaching.cornell.edu/generative-artificial-intelligence/ai-academic-integrity>

Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*. Yale University Press.

De la Puente Pacheco, J., et al. (2025). The impact of generative AI on critical thinking skills: a systematic review, conceptual framework and future research directions. *Information and Learning Science*. [DI-GAI-CT Framework reference].

Essien et al., (2024) 'The influence of AI text generators on critical thinking skills in UK business schools', *Studies in Higher Education*, 49(5), pp. 865-882. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2316881>

European Research Studies Journal. (2024). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on the Development of Critical Thinking Skills in Students. *European Research Studies Journal*, 27(1).

Facione, P. A. (1990). *Critical thinking: A statement of expert consensus for purposes of educational assessment and instruction*. American Philosophical Association.

Fitzpatrick, S. (2018). *The automation of higher education*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hapsari, S., & Wu, C. (2022). Critical thinking in the AI era: An exploration of EFL students' perceptions, benefits, and limitations. *Journal of English Language Teaching*.

Hosseini M, Resnik DB & Holmes K (2023a) The ethics of disclosing the use of artificial intelligence tools in writing scholarly manuscripts. *Research Ethics* 19(4): 449–465.

Hysaj, A., Freeman, M., & Hamam, D. (2024). Using AI tools to enhance academic writing and maintain academic integrity. In *Artificial Intelligence in Education* (pp. 41-53). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-61305-0_4

Review EL'BAHITH - ENS - Bouzareah - Algiers					
ISSN : 9577-1112	EISSN : 2602-5388	Volume: (18)	Number : (01)	year: 2026	Pages: 80-95

IBM. (n.d.). Exploring privacy issues in the age of AI. Retrieved October 11, 2025, from <https://www.ibm.com/think/insights/ai-privacy>

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) (2024) Recommendations | Defining the role of authors and contributors. Available at: <https://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html> (accessed 4 October 2024).

Johnson, E. R., & Smith, L. K. (2019). Personalized learning environments and student self-efficacy. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 67(4).

Kadwa M. & Alshenqeeti H. (2020) 'The Impact of Students' Proficiency in English on Science Courses in a Foundation Year Program', *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation (IJLLT)*, 3(11), pp. 55-67.

Limongi, R., & Marcolin, C. B. (2024). AI literacy research: Frontier for high-impact research and ethics. *BAR-Brazilian Administration Review*, 21(3), e240162

Lin, Z. (2023). Supercharging academic writing with generative AI: Framework, techniques, and caveats. *arXiv preprint*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.17143>

Molinari, A., & Molinari, E. (2024). The added value of academic writing instruction in the age of large language models: A critical analysis. *IADIS International Journal on WWW/Internet*, 22(1), 51-69. https://doi.org/10.33965/ijwi_2024220104

Paris, S. G., & Winograd, P. (1990). Promoting metacognition and motivation of exceptional children. *Remedial and Special Education*, 11(6), 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/074193259001100604>

Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). The digital transformation of the sales process. *Journal of Marketing*, 85(5).

Roberts, L. W. (2024). Addressing the novel implications of generative AI for academic publishing, education, and research. *Academic Medicine*, 99(5), 473-477. <https://doi.org/10.1097/acm.0000000000005667>

Siddiqui, M. N., Pea, R., & Subramonyam, H. (2025). AI in the writing process: How purposeful AI support fosters student writing [Preprint]. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.20595>

Smith, A., et al. (2024). The Productivity Gains of Large Language Models in Scientific Drafting. *Working Paper*.

Teixeira, JA, & Tsigaris, P. (2023). Human and AI-based authorship: Principles and ethics. *Learned Publishing* 36 (3):453–62. doi: 10.1002/leap.1547.

Review EL'BAHITH - ENS - Bouzareah - Algiers					
ISSN : 9577-1112	EISSN : 2602-5388	Volume: (18)	Number : (01)	year: 2026	Pages: 80-95

Thesify. (2025). *Teaching Ethical AI in Academic Writing: A guide for professors and instructors*. <https://www.thesify.ai/blog/teaching-ethical-ai-in-academic-writing-a-guide-for-professors-and-instructors>

UNESCO (2023) *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research*. Available at: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693>

(UNESCO) 2025. *AI and Future Education Disruptions: Dilemmas and Directions*. Available at <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-and-future-education-disruptions-dilemmas-and-directions>

Valenzuela, J. M. (2025). *Developing teachers' AI literacy through professional development*. In *Innovative approaches to staff development in transnational higher education* (pp. 215-244).

Vieira, A. I., & Mesquita, A. (2025). *Generative artificial intelligence in higher education: Challenges, opportunities and pedagogical implications*. *Journal of Education and Technology in Higher Education*.

Walter, Y. (2024) *Embracing the future of Artificial Intelligence in the classroom: the relevance of AI literacy, prompt engineering, and critical thinking in modern education*. *Int J Educ Technol High Educ* 21, 15 . <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00448-3>

White, H. S. (2023). *Some Ethical Considerations for Teaching and Generative AI in Higher Education*. In *Teaching with Generative AI in Higher Education* (pp. 11-28). Utah State University Press.

World Association of Medical Editors (WAME). (2023). *WAME Recommendations on Chatbots and Generative Artificial Intelligence in Relation to Scholarly Publications*.

<https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/whats-worth-measuring-future-assessment-ai-age#:~:text=The%20rise%20of%20AI%20tools,By%20Hrishikesh%20Desai>