International Journal of
Humanities, Education, and Social Sciences

e-ISSN : 3026-0892
p-ISSN : 3026-1422

Index: Harvard, Boston, Sydney, Dimensions, Lens, Scilit, Semantic, Google, etc

https://doi.org/10.58578/IJHESS.v4i3.12699

Training on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Academic Writing for Midwifery Students

Muhammad Saleh Nst & Leo Kusuma
UIN Syekh Ali Hasan Ahmad Addary Padangsidimpuan, Indonesia
salehnasution983@gmail.com; leokusuma@uinsyahada.ac.id

Submitted:	Revised:	Accepted:	Published:
Oct 5, 2026	Nov 3, 2026	Nov 14, 2026	Nov 19, 2026

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) can support students throughout the academic writing process, and its responsible use requires skills in formulating prompts, verifying information, and checking references. This community engagement activity aimed to describe the implementation and outcomes of a three-hour AI training session for 45 Diploma III midwifery students at STIKES Namira Madina on November 12, 2026. Master's students from UIN Syekh Ali Hasan Ahmad Addary Padangsidimpuan delivered the training through presentations, discussions, demonstrations, and hands-on exercises using ChatGPT, Gemini, and NotebookLM. The exercises covered selecting research titles, formulating research questions, developing research matrices, outlining proposals, preparing presentation slides, refining academic language, and finding and verifying references. The evaluation drew on interviews with all participants, observations during the exercises, and activity records. All participants reported that the training helped them prepare for their final assignments. Facilitators observed that approximately 75% of participants could independently use AI to support the preparation of the initial sections of a research proposal and could practice verifying journal references. Challenges included difficulties in formulating prompts and verifying information and references, limited access to laptops, and internet connectivity problems. The evaluation suggests that academic writing training should combine hands-on AI use with facilitator guidance and explicit instruction in verification to promote critical and responsible use.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; Academic Writing; Midwifery Education; AI Literacy; Reference Verification

IJHESS Journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

INTRODUCTION

Academic writing is an essential component of higher education. Through academic writing activities, students are trained to identify problems, formulate research questions, develop arguments, use scholarly sources, and communicate ideas systematically. For students enrolled in Diploma III Midwifery programs, the ability to produce academic writing is an important part of preparing for their final assignments. This process requires critical thinking, knowledge of research methodology, academic writing skills, and the ability to utilize reliable information sources.

In practice, preparing a final assignment is not always straightforward. Students may encounter difficulties from the initial stages, including selecting research topics and titles, formulating research questions, organizing ideas into a proposal framework, and finding relevant references. Academic writing ability is also related to students' confidence in their capacity to complete writing tasks. Mitchell et al., (2023) explain that writing self-efficacy among higher education students is associated with writing experiences, learning contexts, and instructional support. Therefore, training activities that help students understand the stages of academic writing and practice them directly can serve as a form of academic support (Naznin et al., 2025 ; (Wang et al., 2024).

The use of AI in academic writing also presents several challenges. One important skill is the ability to formulate clear and appropriate prompts or instructions. Lee & Palmer, (2025) explain that prompt design is an important part of user interaction with GenAI because the quality of instructions influences the relevance of the generated output. Park & Choo, (2025) also emphasize the importance of developing, refining, and evaluating prompts in educational applications of AI. Therefore, students need more than basic familiarity with AI applications, they also need to understand how to provide appropriate instructions (O'Dea et al., 2026 ; Hersh, 2025).

Another challenge concerns the accuracy of information and the validity of references. AI-generated outputs may contain inaccurate information, explanations that do not fit the context, or references that cannot be located in their original sources (Walters & Wilder, 2023 ; Franzoni Velázquez et al., 2024). Kim et al., (2025) indicate that students using GenAI in academic writing perceive certain benefits but also encounter challenges related to AI limitations and user literacy. Miao & Holmes, (2023) emphasizes that the use of AI in education should consider information validation, data protection, a human-centered

approach, and ethical responsibility. Consequently, the ability to verify information and trace original references is an essential component of AI literacy.

In health education, the use of AI also needs to be adapted to the characteristics of the academic discipline. Hale et al., (2024) explain that generative AI has the potential to support medical education, including writing activities, although quantitative evidence of improved learning outcomes remains limited. Wang et al., (2024) also examine the use of ChatGPT in academic writing among medical undergraduates, demonstrating the relevance of this technology in health education. These studies highlight the need for training activities that not only introduce AI technology but also guide students in using it appropriately (Hosseini et al., 2023 ; Adarkwah et al., 2025).

Based on these needs, this community service activity was conducted at STIKES Namira Madina with students from the Diploma III Midwifery Program. The training focused on using ChatGPT, Gemini, and NotebookLM to support several stages of academic writing, from research title selection to proposal presentation preparation. Participants also practiced prompt formulation and information and reference verification. This activity aimed to describe the implementation of the training, participants' responses, practical abilities observed during the sessions, and challenges encountered throughout the activity. Its contribution lies in documenting an AI training program that integrates academic writing practice with information literacy and scholarly source verification for midwifery students.

METHODS

This activity was a community service program employing training, hands-on practice, and descriptive evaluation. It was conducted on Thursday, November 12, 2026, at STIKES Namira Madina. The activity lasted three hours and involved 45 students from the Diploma III Midwifery Program. It was organized by master's students from UIN Syekh Ali Hasan Ahmad Addary Padangsidimpuan, with Muhammad Saleh Nst and Leo Kusuma serving as facilitators.

The training was delivered through material presentations, application demonstrations, discussions and question-and-answer sessions, and hands-on practice. The applications used were ChatGPT, Gemini, and NotebookLM. Participants were guided to

use these applications as supporting tools in academic writing rather than as substitutes for independent thinking, academic judgment, and authorship responsibility.

The training materials covered several activities. First, participants practiced using AI to explore alternative research titles. Second, they used AI to assist in formulating research questions. Third, they practiced developing research matrices to organize the components of a research design. Fourth, they prepared research proposal outlines. Fifth, they practiced creating PowerPoint presentations for proposal seminars and thesis defenses. Sixth, they used AI to assist in improving academic language. Seventh, they received explanations and practical guidance on searching for and verifying scholarly references.

Activity evaluation data were obtained through interviews with all participants, facilitator observations during practical sessions, and activity documentation. Examples of students' practical outputs were available only from some participants, therefore, these documents were treated as examples of practical outcomes rather than as representative evidence from all participants. Records or evidence of individual AI prompts were not available. Accordingly, the analysis did not examine each student's interaction history with AI but focused on participant responses and observations of the practical activities.

The data were analyzed descriptively by grouping information into several aspects such as perceived benefits of the training, practical abilities, challenges in using AI, information and reference verification skills, and technical obstacles during implementation. Interview information was used to describe participants' responses, while observations were used to identify their abilities during practical sessions. The approximately 75% figures represent estimates based on facilitator observations, not results from formal tests or standardized assessment instruments. No pre-test or post-test was administered; therefore, the activity was not intended to measure statistically significant improvements in competency.

RESULTS

1. Implementation of the Training Activity

The training on the use of Artificial Intelligence in academic writing was conducted on November 12, 2026, at STIKES Namira Madina. The activity lasted three hours and was attended by 45 students from the Diploma III Midwifery Program. The implementation

combined material presentations, application demonstrations, discussions, question-and-answer sessions, and hands-on practice.

The three applications used in the activity were ChatGPT, Gemini, and NotebookLM. Their use was directed toward helping participants understand the stages of academic writing and practice preparing several components of a research proposal. The training was not limited to introducing the applications, it also provided participants with opportunities to directly explore how AI could be used to support their academic tasks.



Figure 1. Practice on the Use of AI



Figure 2. Introducing AI to Students



Figure 3. Output: 75% of Students Understand the Material

Table 1. Training Materials and Practical Activities

No	Training Material	Practical activity
1	Use of ChatGPT, Gemini, and NotebookLM	Introduction to and practice using AI applications
2	Research title selection	Exploring and developing alternative research titles with AI assistance using the KPVP structure (Material Object + Formal Object + Context + Method) and the SPAM structure (Subject Solved [SS] + Problem [P] + Area of Study [AS] + Method [M])
3	Research question formulation	Practicing the formulation of research questions
4	Research matrix development	Organizing the components of a research design using the structure of Research Questions + Indicators + Research Type + Research Subjects + Data Collection Techniques.
5	Research proposal outline	Preparing a proposal outline using the STIKES Namira Madina guidebook
6	PowerPoint presentation development	Preparing presentation materials for proposal seminars and thesis defenses
7	Academic language improvement	Using AI as a supporting tool for language editing
8	Reference searching and verification	Learning and practicing the verification of scholarly sources

During the activity, all of these materials were introduced and practiced by the participants. However, directly inspectable documents of practical outputs were available only from some students. Therefore, the implementation of practical activities across all materials should not be equated with the availability of complete documentary evidence from every participant.

2. Students' Responses to the Training

Based on interviews conducted with all participants, students reported that the training was beneficial in preparing for their final assignments. Their responses covered several aspects, including assistance in selecting research titles, greater ease in formulating research questions, support in developing proposal outlines, and the perceived usefulness of the training for final assignment preparation.

All participants stated that they had benefited from the training. These responses indicate positive acceptance of the activity, particularly because the materials were directly related to students' academic needs when beginning to prepare their research assignments.

Table 2. Summary of Students' Responses to the Training

No	Response aspect	Summary of interview findings
1	Research title selection	Students felt assisted in selecting research titles.
2	Research question formulation	Students found it easier to formulate research questions.
3	Proposal outline development	Students felt assisted in preparing proposal outlines.
4	Perceived benefits	Students considered the training useful for preparing their final assignments.
5	Overall assessment	All participants stated that the activity had been helpful.

These findings summarize participants' responses based on the interview information. Direct quotations are not included because verbatim transcripts or individual interview notes were not available.

3. Participants' Practical Abilities Based on Observations

During the activity, the facilitators observed participants' engagement and ability to practice using AI. The observations indicated that approximately 75% of participants were able to use AI independently during the practical sessions to assist with research title selection, research question formulation, and proposal outline development.

In addition, during the reference verification session, the facilitators explained how to search for and verify the validity of journal references. After receiving explanations and demonstrations, participants carried out direct practice. Based on the facilitators' observations, approximately 75% of participants demonstrated an understanding of and ability to practice journal reference verification.

Table 3. Observed Results of Participants' Practical Activities

No	Observation Indicator	Observation Results
1	Using AI to assist in selecting research titles	Approximately 75% of participants were able to practice independently.
2	Using AI to assist in formulating research questions	Approximately 75% of participants were able to practice independently.
3	Using AI to assist in developing proposal outlines	Approximately 75% of participants were able to practice independently.
4	Verifying the validity of journal references	Approximately 75% of participants were able to practice independently.

These percentages are estimates based on facilitator observations during the activity, rather than results from formal tests or standardized assessment rubrics. Accordingly, the figures are used to describe the implementation of practical activities and should not be interpreted as standardized measures of competency improvement.

4. Challenges in Using AI and Verifying Information

Although participants responded positively, several challenges were identified during the activity. The first was difficulty formulating appropriate prompts or instructions. Some students were not yet accustomed to providing structured instructions and therefore needed to adjust how they interacted with AI applications.

The second challenge was difficulty verifying the accuracy of AI-generated information. Students still needed guidance in comparing AI-generated responses with reliable information sources. The third challenge was difficulty finding and confirming the validity of journal references or scholarly sources provided by AI.

To address these challenges, the facilitators taught participants how to verify references by searching for the original journal sources and checking whether the sources could be located. Following the explanation, participants practiced the process directly. Observations indicated that approximately 75% of participants understood and were able to practice reference verification.

Table 4. Mapping of Challenges and Instructional Responses

No	Identified Challenge	Instructional Response
1	Difficulty formulating prompts	Participants received explanations and practical guidance on writing instructions for AI.
2	Difficulty verifying the accuracy of information	The facilitators explained the importance of checking information.
3	Difficulty confirming the validity of journal references	The facilitators taught participants how to search for and verify journal sources through hands-on practice.

These findings indicate that using AI in academic writing requires more than the ability to operate an application. Students also need to develop the skills to formulate instructions, evaluate generated responses, and ensure that the sources they use are available and relevant.

5. Technical Obstacles and Responses

Two main technical obstacles were encountered during the activity: internet connectivity and limited laptop availability. The limited availability of laptops was addressed by asking participants to use their own mobile phones to access AI applications. This allowed participants to continue practicing even though not all of them used laptops.

Internet connectivity problems were addressed by waiting until the connection on each participant's device became available again. When connection disruptions occurred, the facilitators and other participants waited so that the practical session could continue. These conditions required adjustments to the time allocated for practice.

Table 5. Technical Obstacles and Implementation Responses

No	Technical Obstacle	Response
1	Limited laptop availability	Participants used their own mobile phones to access and use AI applications.
2	Internet connectivity problems	Participants waited until their internet connections became available again; the facilitators and other participants also waited before continuing the practical session.

These responses enabled the activity to continue, and all practical materials were still introduced to the participants. Nevertheless, limited connectivity and device availability remain important considerations for planning future training activities.

6. Mapping of Main Themes and Subthemes

Based on the grouping of information from interviews, observations, and activity documentation, the findings can be organized into several main themes. This mapping reflects the available data and is not presented as the result of an analysis of verbatim interview transcripts.

Table 6. Mapping of Main Themes and Subthemes of the Activity Findings

No	Main theme	Subtheme	Findings
1	Benefits of the training	Support for final assignment preparation	Participants felt assisted in selecting research titles, formulating research questions, and developing proposal outlines.
2	Practical use of AI	Use of AI applications	Participants practiced using ChatGPT, Gemini, and NotebookLM in several stages of academic writing.

No	Main theme	Subtheme	Findings
3	Prompt literacy	Formulating instructions	Students still experienced difficulties in creating appropriate prompts.
4	Information literacy	Verifying information accuracy	Students experienced difficulties in checking information generated by AI.
5	Reference literacy	Verification of journal sources	Students had difficulty confirming reference validity but received guidance through demonstrations and practice.
6	Practical outcomes	Ability to use AI and verify references	Approximately 75% of participants demonstrated these abilities based on facilitator observations.
7	Technical barriers	Devices and internet connectivity	Limited laptop availability and internet connectivity disrupted the practical sessions.
8	Adaptive strategies	Use of mobile phones and time adjustments	Participants used their own mobile phones and waited for internet connections to become available again.

DISCUSSION

1. AI Training as Support for Academic Writing Preparation

The results indicate that AI can serve as a form of support for students preparing academic writing. All participants stated that the training had been helpful, particularly in selecting research titles, formulating research questions, and developing proposal outlines. These responses suggest that the training materials were relevant to the participants' academic needs.

The use of AI in the writing process can help students explore ideas and organize preliminary information. Bhullar et al., (2024) explain that ChatGPT has been used in higher education for various learning and academic activities. Baig & Yadegaridehkordi, (2024) also show that ChatGPT has a range of applications in higher education while presenting challenges that need to be addressed.

In this activity, ChatGPT, Gemini, and NotebookLM were used as supporting tools across several stages of academic writing. Students practiced using the applications to select research titles, formulate research questions, develop research matrices, prepare proposal outlines, and create PowerPoint presentations. These activities demonstrate that AI can be integrated into practical academic support and training (Naznin et al., 2025 ; Li et al., 2024).

Nevertheless, the findings cannot be interpreted as evidence that AI directly improved the quality of academic writing among all participants. The activity did not use pre-tests or post-tests, and practical documents were available from only some students.

Therefore, the findings are more appropriately understood as a description of participants' acceptance and the practical abilities observed during the training.

2. Difficulties in Prompt Formulation and the Importance of AI Literacy

One of the challenges identified in this activity was students' difficulty in formulating prompts. A prompt is an instruction or command given by a user to an AI system to generate a response that meets a particular need. Instructions that are too general may produce responses that do not adequately match the user's academic objectives.

Lee & Palmer, (2025) explain that prompt engineering skills should be taught in higher education because the quality of instructions influences how users interact with GenAI. Park & Choo, (2025) also emphasize that users need to learn how to formulate and refine prompts and evaluate the outputs generated by AI. Thus, students' difficulties in formulating prompts represent an important aspect that should be addressed in future training. AI literacy involves not only the ability to operate AI applications but also the capacity to understand, evaluate, and interact critically with AI-generated outputs (O'Dea et al., 2026 ; Hersh, 2025).

These findings indicate that introducing AI applications should be accompanied by exercises in formulating instructions that include the purpose, context, information requirements, and expected output format. In academic writing, students need to understand that AI generates responses based on the instructions and context provided. Students must still determine whether the responses are relevant to their research focus and academic requirements.

3. Information Accuracy and Reference Validity Verification

Another challenge identified was the difficulty of checking the accuracy of information and confirming the validity of journal references generated by AI. This is an important concern because AI-generated outputs are not always accurate and may present convincing information that is not supported by valid sources.

Kim et al., (2025) identify that GenAI can support the academic writing process but also creates challenges related to technological limitations and users' abilities. Tlili et al., (2023) similarly warn that the use of chatbots in education requires critical evaluation because generated responses may contain misleading or inaccurate information. Research has shown that bibliographic references generated by ChatGPT may contain fabricated or incomplete

information, which reinforces the need for users to verify the original publication details before citing them (Walters & Wilder, 2023 ; Franzoni Velázquez et al., 2024).

In this activity, the facilitators provided explanations and practical guidance on journal reference verification. Participants were instructed not to accept AI-generated references without checking them, but instead to trace the original sources and confirm their existence. Based on facilitator observations, approximately 75% of participants understood and were able to practice this verification process.

These findings demonstrate the importance of including information verification as an integral component of AI training. Miao & Holmes, (2023) emphasizes that the use of AI in education and research should consider output validation, human responsibility, and data protection. For midwifery students, these principles are particularly important because academic writing may involve health-related information that requires accuracy and reliable sources.

Therefore, students need to develop the habit of checking article titles, author names, journal names, publication years, DOIs or source addresses, and the relevance of article content to the statements being cited. References that cannot be located or verified should not be included directly in the bibliography.

4. Practical Abilities and the Role of Direct Guidance

Based on facilitator observations, approximately 75% of participants were able to use AI independently during the practical sessions to assist in selecting research titles, formulating research questions, and developing proposal outlines. The same approximate percentage was observed among participants who understood and were able to practice journal reference verification.

These findings illustrate that hands-on practice provides students with opportunities to explore AI applications according to their academic needs. This is consistent with Lee & Palmer, (2025), who emphasize the importance of practical learning in developing skills for interacting with GenAI. In health education, Hale et al., (2024) also indicate that AI has the potential to support learning and writing activities, although evidence of quantitative learning outcomes still needs further development.

The activity also demonstrates that guidance should not stop at facilitator demonstrations. Participants need opportunities to practice independently, ask questions, and examine the results they obtain. Thus, training activities can be designed as an active

learning process involving interaction among facilitators, participants, and technology. Practical integration of ChatGPT into health-related education has been explored as a way to support student learning, although its implementation requires appropriate guidance and critical evaluation (Han et al., 2024 ; Thomae et al., 2024).

However, the approximately 75% figure in this activity represents an observational estimate rather than a formal competency test. Therefore, it cannot be used to claim that participants' abilities increased by 75%. The figure is used only to describe the proportion of participants who, according to facilitator observations, demonstrated practical abilities during the activity.

5. Infrastructure Challenges and Adaptive Strategies

Limited laptop availability and internet connectivity were technical obstacles during the activity. The limited availability of laptops was addressed by asking participants to use their own mobile phones. Meanwhile, internet disruptions were handled by waiting until connections became available again.

These conditions demonstrate that the implementation of AI-based training is strongly influenced by infrastructure readiness. The use of AI applications requires suitable devices and stable internet connectivity. When technical support is limited, practical activities may proceed more slowly, making the training schedule less efficient.

Yusuf et al., (2024) explain that the use of GenAI in higher education offers opportunities as well as challenges that need to be managed through appropriate policies and institutional support. In the context of this activity, such support could include more stable internet access, backup devices, and the organization of practice groups so that participants can follow the training more effectively.

The use of participants' own mobile phones was an adaptive response to limited device availability. However, the use of personal devices also requires consideration of device capacity, battery availability, and internet access. Future training activities should therefore prepare alternative arrangements in case of internet disruptions, such as providing sample materials and exercises that can be studied offline.

6. Implications of the Training for Midwifery Education

This training activity has several implications for the development of learning in midwifery education. First, introducing AI can form part of efforts to strengthen students' academic skills, particularly in preparing their final assignments. Second, training should

emphasize prompt formulation skills so that students can interact with AI in a more structured manner. Third, the ability to verify information and references should be treated as a central component of AI literacy rather than merely an additional topic.

In midwifery education, students must also maintain information accuracy and academic responsibility. AI should not be treated as the sole source for establishing scientific facts, particularly when supporting health-related decisions. All information used in academic writing must be checked against relevant and reliable scholarly sources.

Furthermore, the use of AI must maintain academic integrity. Cotton et al., (2024) explain that the emergence of ChatGPT presents challenges to academic integrity, requiring educational institutions to develop appropriate teaching and assessment approaches. Bouteraa et al., (2024) also identify student integrity as an important aspect of understanding ChatGPT use in higher education. Students must therefore understand that AI is a supporting tool, while responsibility for the content of academic work remains with the author. Responsible use of AI in scholarly writing also requires transparency regarding the role of AI tools and the maintenance of human accountability for the submitted work (Hosseini et al., 2023).

7. Limitations of the Activity

This activity had several limitations. First, the training was conducted for only three hours at one institution and involved 45 students. Second, the evaluation did not use pre-tests or post-tests; therefore, no data were available to measure changes in competency quantitatively. Third, the approximately 75% figures were based on facilitator observations rather than formal tests or standardized assessment rubrics.

Fourth, practical documents were available from only some students, meaning that a comprehensive analysis of the quality of all participants' outputs could not be conducted. Fifth, evidence of AI prompts was unavailable, so individual participants' interaction processes with AI applications could not be examined in detail. Sixth, verbatim interview transcripts or quotations were not available; consequently, participants' responses are presented as summaries.

These limitations should be considered when planning future activities. Subsequent training could use observation sheets or assessment rubrics to evaluate prompt formulation, the accuracy of research questions, the quality of proposal outlines, and the validity of

references. In addition, practical outputs and evaluation records should be collected systematically to enable more comprehensive analysis of the activity.

CONCLUSION

Training on the use of Artificial Intelligence in academic writing for 45 Diploma III Midwifery students at STIKES Namira Madina was conducted on November 12, 2026, over a three-hour period through material presentations, demonstrations, discussions, and hands-on practice. The applications used were ChatGPT, Gemini, and NotebookLM. The training materials covered research title selection, research question formulation, research matrix development, proposal outline preparation, PowerPoint preparation for proposal seminars and thesis defenses, academic language improvement, and scholarly reference searching and verification.

The interview findings indicated that all participants considered the training helpful, particularly in preparing their final assignments. Based on facilitator observations, approximately 75% of participants were able to use AI to assist in preparing the initial sections of a research proposal independently, while approximately 75% understood and were able to practice journal reference verification. These figures represent observational estimates rather than results from formal competency assessments.

The challenges encountered included difficulties in formulating prompts, verifying information accuracy, confirming reference validity, limited laptop availability, and internet connectivity problems. Limited device availability was addressed by using participants' own mobile phones, while internet disruptions were handled by waiting until connections became available again.

Overall, this activity indicates that AI training can provide practical support for students preparing academic writing. However, its use needs to be accompanied by strengthened prompt formulation skills, information verification, reference checking, and academic responsibility. Future activities are recommended to provide more adequate devices and internet access and to use practical assessment instruments so that training outcomes can be documented more systematically.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank STIKES Namira Madina for providing the opportunity and support to conduct this training activity. Appreciation is also extended to all students of the Diploma III Midwifery Program who actively participated in the activity, as well as to everyone who contributed to the implementation of this community service program.

REFERENCES

Adarkwah, M. A., Badu, S. A., Osei, E. A., Adu-Gyamfi, E., Odame, J., & Schneider, K. (2025). ChatGPT in healthcare education: A double-edged sword of trends, challenges, and opportunities. *Discover Education, 4*, Article 14. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s44217-024-00393-3

Baig, M. I., & Yadegaridehkordi, E. (2024). ChatGPT in the higher education: A systematic literature review and research challenges. *International Journal of Educational Research, 127*, Article 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*(16), 21501–21522. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10639-024-12723-x

Bouteraa, M., Bin-Nashwan, S. A., Al-Daihani, M., Dirie, K. A., Benlahcene, A., Sadallah, M., Zaki, H. O., Lada, S., Ansar, R., Fook, L. M., & Chekima, B. (2024). Understanding the diffusion of AI-generative (ChatGPT) in higher education: Does students' integrity matter? *Computers in Human Behavior Reports, 14*, Article 100402.

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.

Franzoni Velázquez, A. L., Huerta, E., & Jensen, S. (2024). Retracting ChatGPT: Completeness and relevance of academic references. *Discover Education, 3*, Article 226. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s44217-024-00333-1

Hale, J., Alexander, S., Wright, S. T., & Gilliland, K. (2024). Generative AI in undergraduate medical education: A rapid review. *Journal of Medical Education and Curricular Development, 11*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1177/23821205241266697

Han, Z., Battaglia, F., Udaiyar, A., Fooks, A., & Terlecky, S. R. (2024). An explorative assessment of ChatGPT as an aid in medical education: Use it with caution. *Medical Teacher, 46*(5), 657–664.

Hersh, W. (2025). Generative artificial intelligence: Implications for biomedical and health professions education. *Annual Review of Biomedical Data Science, 8*, 355–380. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-biodatasci-103123-094756

Hosseini, M., Resnik, D. B., & Holmes, K. (2023). The ethics of disclosing the use of artificial intelligence tools in writing scholarly manuscripts. *Research Ethics, 19*(4), 449–465. https://doi.org/10.1177/17470161231180449

Kim, J., Yu, S., Detrick, R., & Li, N. (2025). Exploring students' perspectives on generative AI-assisted academic writing. *Education and Information Technologies, 30*(1), 1265–1300. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12878-7

Lee, D., & Palmer, E. (2025). Prompt engineering in higher education: A systematic review to help inform curricula. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 22*, Article 7. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00503-7

Li, J., Zong, H., Wu, E., Wu, R., Peng, Z., Zhao, J., Yang, L., Xie, H., & Shen, B. (2024). Exploring the potential of artificial intelligence to enhance the writing of English academic papers by non-native English-speaking medical students – The educational application of ChatGPT. *BMC Medical Education, 24*, Article 736. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-05738-y

Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research

Mitchell, K. M., Zumbrunn, S., Berry, D. N., & Demczuk, L. (2023). Writing self-efficacy in postsecondary students: A scoping review. *Educational Psychology Review, 35*(3), Article 82. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-023-09798-2

Naznin, K., Al Mahmud, A., Nguyen, M. T., & Chua, C. (2025). ChatGPT integration in higher education for personalized learning, academic writing, and coding tasks: A systematic review. *Computers, 14*(2), Article 53. https://doi.org/10.3390/computers14020053

O'Dea, X., Ng, D. T. K., O'Dea, M., & Shkuratskyy, V. (2026). Factors affecting university students' generative AI literacy: Evidence and evaluation in the UK and Hong Kong contexts. *Policy Futures in Education, 24*(1), 13–34. https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103241287401

Park, J., & Choo, S. (2025). Generative AI prompt engineering for educators: Practical strategies. *Journal of Special Education Technology, 40*(3), 411–417. https://doi.org/10.1177/01626434241298954

Thomae, A. V., Witt, C. M., & Barth, J. (2024). Integration of ChatGPT into a course for medical students: Explorative study on teaching scenarios, students' perception, and applications. *JMIR Medical Education, 10*, Article e50545. https://doi.org/10.2196/50545

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*, Article 15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00237-x

Walters, W. H., & Wilder, E. I. (2023). Fabrication and errors in the bibliographic citations generated by ChatGPT. *Scientific Reports, 13*(1), Article 14045.

Wang, J., Liao, Y., Liu, S., Zhang, D., Wang, N., Shu, J., & Wang, R. (2024). The impact of using ChatGPT on academic writing among medical undergraduates. *Annals of Medicine, 56*(1), Article 2426760.

Yusuf, A., Pervin, N., & Román-González, M. (2024). Generative AI and the future of higher education: A threat to academic integrity or reformation? Evidence from multicultural perspectives. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21*, Article 21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00453-6