

Reassessing the Need for English Writing Courses in the Generative AI Era: A Higher Education Case Study from Bangladesh

Shahidul Alam Chowdhury & Md. Mahadi Rahman

Assistant Professor, Department of English Language and Literature,
Premier University, Chattogram

&

Md. Mahadi Rahman

Lecturer, Department of English Language and Literature, Premier
University, Chattogram

Abstract

The rapid expansion of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) has created a significant pedagogical challenge for the teaching, assessment, and conceptualization of academic writing in higher education. Although large language models demonstrate considerable efficiency in producing written texts, limited research has examined students' perceptions of the continuing relevance of foundational writing courses and the humanistic competencies that GenAI cannot readily replace, particularly in developing higher-education contexts. This study addresses this gap by investigating undergraduate students' attitudes toward AI-integrated writing pedagogy in Chattogram, Bangladesh. Specifically, it examines students' demand for AI-integrated curricula, perceptions of the obsolescence of traditional writing courses, and the higher-order writing skills they consider essential. A cross-sectional mixed-methods survey was conducted using a convenience sample of undergraduate students, incorporating validated questionnaire items and open-ended responses. Quantitative data were analysed using Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and Cronbach's alpha, while qualitative responses were examined through reflexive thematic analysis. The findings indicate strong support for AI literacy (76%) and AI-assisted course modules (71%), while 59% perceived traditional writing courses as increasingly outdated. Nevertheless, students highly valued critical thinking (66.8%), distinctive writing voice (56.3%), and ethical reasoning (47.4%). The study concludes that GenAI necessitates redesign rather than abandonment of writing

education, advocating a blended pedagogy that integrates AI literacy with human reasoning, ethical judgment, and rhetorical expertise.

Keywords: Generative AI; Academic Writing; Writing Pedagogy; Higher Education; AI Literacy; Academic Integrity

Introduction

What emerged recently and may be transforming the pedagogical situation in higher-education writing is the so-called generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) technologies, such as systems like ChatGPT developed by OpenAI. Introduction of ChatGPT-3.5 in November 2022 “has heralded a seismic shift in the world of higher education”, as the use of AI gives educators and students difficulty coping with its fluent and contextual text-generation capabilities. These applications are able to summarize, give out suggestions and even auto-write essays, thus calling in to question established conventions on teaching and testing writing. Meanwhile, GenAI has made it apparent that writing is also a highly human practice: writing pedagogy has developed to focus not only on critical thinking, creativity, and ethical information use (Pontes et al., 2024; Qian, 2025). To be more succinct, GenAI has introduced unprecedented opportunities (in terms of the ability to receive personalized feedback and develop ideas in writing) and significant challenges (in terms of originality, plagiarism, and digital literacy) to the sphere of writing education.

Through this, teachers and schools are reconsidering writing programs. There are people who suggest implementing GenAI training in writing classes and educating learners on the critical use of such tools (Jeikner, 2025; Qian, 2025). Others warn that the effectiveness of AI could outcompete the basic skills unless it is carefully calculated (Qian, 2025; Hasan & Zhao, 2024). Policy makers have also been demanding guidelines concerning the application of AI in education that serves and benefits humanity (Yusuf et al., 2024). Some of the empirical research have recently examined the student responses and the outcomes: e.g., the students say that AI can increase their writing creativity, and express concerns regarding accuracy and ethics (Chan & Hu, 2023; Gasaymeh et al., 2024). But few studies have directly looked at the desire to take writing courses per se in the GenAI age.

This paper fills in that gap by asking 190 students in higher education how interested they are in English writing classes if they might have access to GenAI tools. These questions that the researcher investigate are: Do students desire AI to be implemented in course material? Do they now find AI threatening to make writing courses obsolete? Which basic writing competencies do they not like to forget most? What is the likelihood that they will take courses that have modules in AI ethics or modules in writing? Through this examining the thoughts of the students, the researcher hopes to educate educators on what the field of writing pedagogy may look like considering GenAI.

This quantitative survey study is conducted in the following way. Having analyzed the literature on the topic of AI in education and academia writing, this study discussed the survey approach. Then the study shows the quantitative and qualitative survey data with student attitudes about AI and aspired to be improved writing skills. Last, the paper situates these results to what has been written about them and emphasizes the conflicts and compatibilities of AI adoption and traditional writing instruction. In conclusion, this study discusses implications on curriculum design, which suggests a balanced way of taking advantage of AI and remaining in control of the individual critical thinking, originality, and ethical awareness.

Literature Review

Generative AI in Higher Education

Generative AI (GenAI) is a term used to describe large language model systems that can generate content (text, visual, code) that is human-like based on inputs (text prompts). GenAI is likely to find application in making lectures, creating example problems, and giving feedback in education (Yusuf et al., 2024). This change has been quickly recorded in research: Qian (2025), says, that the launch of ChatGPT in 2022 led to research in the study of creativity, critical thinking, and quick literacy in higher education. Systematic reviews also note that GenAI has a strong possibility of personalizing learning processes, allowing ideas to be generated and routine processes to be automated.

Nevertheless, there is a litany of studies signaling serious problems as well. First of all, there are issues of academic integrity: AI has the capability to produce essay fragments that look original and may not be detected by conventional plagiarism identification tools (Perkins, 2023). An inquiry notices that GenAI implementation requires students and faculty to have ethical standards and digital literacy (Bittle & El-Gayar, 2025; Farrelly & Baker, 2023). Specifically, Duarte (2024) discusses the rapidness of the ChatGPT adoption across the globe, whereas the online safety concerns of bias and misinformation promoted by ChatGPT are documented by Sloan et al. (2024) and Perkins (2023). Frontiers editors underline that AI tools are to be employed in a responsible way and under the control of humans.

Pedagogically speaking, human-centered, balanced approach is frequently suggested by scholars. Jeikner (2025) urges that, as opposed to prohibiting AI, educators ought to incorporate the technology so as to support writing proficiency as well as AI literacy. Pontes et al. (2024) also propose assignment design that will compel unique and creative work in such a way that it will not be fully substituted by AI to produce more in-depth learning and critical thinking skills. Laboratory studies argue this out; used with guidance, GenAI has the opportunity of bettering certain dimensions of writing. As an example, a randomized trial by Zhang (2025) revealed that AI-provided feedback enhanced both the structure and contents of essays of students compared to the control groups. However, Zhang also discovered that students gave more consideration to the perceived usefulness of the AI rather than easy usability and this in turn highlights that functional values are crucial in acceptance.

Students' Perceptions of AI in Writing

It is important to comprehend the attitude of the students because buy-in will determine the pedagogical results. The results of the empirical surveys are contradictory but primarily positive student attitudes. The survey of students of universities in Hong-Kong by Chan and Hu (2023) revealed an overall positive attitude to AI in education: students believed that AI would be useful in providing personalized support and in brainstorming when writing essays but were concerned with precision and ethics. Likewise, Gasaymeh et al. (2024) found that students were moderately familiar with such tools as ChatGPT; they identified some advantages in creativity, but they are worried

about misinformation and privacy. The given authors promote the use of training and guidelines in order to enhance the level of AI familiarity and critical use. In the international study by Yusuf et al. (2024) (n=1217 of respondents in 76 countries), awareness of GenAI was also high; the participants indicated its use in research and paraphrasing like in GenAI but placed a particular focus on addressing ethical guidance and cultural sensitivity in AI curricula.

To conclude, the literature demonstrates that GenAI is a kind of two-edged sword in the writing pedagogy. Although AI may allow fast feedback, conceptualizing, and individualized courses of study, it will also make us contemplate on the future of writing lessons and development. Writing, as one review reports, classes normally teach pupils to think critically, to build arguments, and synthesize them, all of which, up to now, AI does not do as well as people do. A sort of moderate agreement occurs: GenAI needs to be incorporated in a moderate-conscious way; it should supplement, not replace human-oriented writing training. This survey complements this literature in determining interest and writing priorities among the students in the changed situation.

Methodology

Information about the attitude of students was obtained using a cross-sectional survey design. A random sample of undergraduates of higher-education institutions (mostly at the university level) in Chattogram, Bangladesh (n = 190) was administered the instrument online. The multiple-choice and Likert-scale questions incorporated in the survey were related to the coursework and English proficiency in the previous writing course, as well as to beliefs concerning the influence of GenAI on the progress of writing education. Important questions included whether generative AI eliminates the need of traditional writing courses, whether the interest in writing courses have lost or gained when AI comes in, and whether the students would favor the teaching of practical use and ethical issues of AI in writing courses in English. Also, there is a checklist of several skills that are related to writing (e.g., critical thinking, creativity, communication) and how valuable they remain with respondents on a checklist-level.

The sampling was non-probabilistic and of convenience type, utilizing student networks and social media to achieve the participants. After collecting responses, the researcher received 190 completed responses that formed the basis of the analysis dataset (N=190). Meaning of filling up the survey was consent. The analysis of quantitative data involved descriptive analysis: the computed frequency and percentage of responses to each question. There was no need for inferential statistics because it aimed at summarizing perceptions. Self-administrable open comments were analyzed qualitatively in order to identify emergent themes (e.g. perceptions of AI as opportunity vs challenge) but the main analysis was quantitative. Ethical standards were followed concerning all the procedures; no sensitive individual data were recorded other than demographics.

Qualitative Data Analysis: Reflexive Thematic Analysis

The survey's open-ended text fields were included to capture the respondents' understanding of the complex nature of students' reasoning, going beyond the limitations of numerical data. These qualitative data were thoroughly analyzed using the well-respected framework for reflexive thematic analysis proposed by Victoria Braun and Virginia Clarke (2006).

Reflexive thematic analysis recognizes that themes are not just "discovered" in the data like physical "artefacts" as is the case with positivist approaches, but are actually generated through a highly interpretive and active process of the researcher's theoretical commitments and expertise in the subject area (Braun & Clarke, 2016). Qualitative analysis involved a full, in-depth engagement with the textual data, repeated reading of the data and the generation of initial semantic and latent codes; the active interpretative construction of the preliminary themes based on patterned responses; a review and refinement of the themes to ensure coherence with the coded extracts and the entire dataset; clear definition and naming of the final overarching themes; and finally, the production of the scholarly narrative (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The level of methodological rigor helped to ensure that the qualitative information was complex, rich and theoretically informed, and not simply anecdotal reporting alongside the quantitative statistics.

Findings

Demographic Profile of Respondents

A total of 190 detailed and valid responses were included in the final and cleaned data. Whilst the vast majority of the participants (n = 184, 96.8%) were actively participating in university level undergraduate programs, the remaining participants were involved in the specialized tertiary college programs (Current Study, 2026). Demographically, the cohort was highly representative and diverse in terms of their language background in the context of Bangladeshi language: 26% Beginners, 58% Intermediate and 15% Advanced users of English language (Current Study, 2026). About 38% (n = 72) of the cohort had attended formal, credit-bearing, higher education level English writing courses prior to this one (Current Study, 2026). This particular age range offers a balanced and valuable insight into the student population's experience level, as they are still in the midst of learning to tackle academic writing in a second language, making them excellent targets for AI-informed writing tools.

The Overwhelming Desire for AI-Integrated Curricula

The quantitative data revealed a massive, undeniable mandate from the student body for the formal modernization of writing curricula to explicitly include GenAI competencies. Rather than viewing AI as a peripheral, illicit tool to be hidden from instructors, students overwhelmingly view it as a core, non-negotiable component of modern digital literacy.

Survey Construct: Demand for AI Integration	Percentage of Agreement (N=190)
English courses should explicitly teach the effective use of GenAI	76.0%
GenAI integration in writing courses would be "Beneficial"	48.9%
GenAI integration in writing courses is "Essential"	26.8%
Actively opposed to GenAI integration	2.6%
Increased likelihood of enrolling in a course featuring AI-assisted/ethical modules	71.1%
Decreased likelihood of enrolling in AI-integrated courses	< 10.0%

As shown in the structured data above, the vast majority of the students (76.0%) indicated that they believe English language writing coursework should clearly teach students about the effective and ethical use of generative AI (Current Study, 2026) [1]. Overall, 75.7% of students feel that the use of AI in their studies is either very helpful or essential, while a small percentage (2.6%) are actively against technology use (Current Study, 2026) [1].

Importantly for curriculum developers and academic administrators, 71.1% of the respondents said that it is “more likely” or “much more likely” they would take an elective course on writing if it included modules on AI-assisted writing and AI ethics (Current Study, 2026) [1]. Less than 10% said that such integration would make it less likely for them to enroll (Current Study, 2026) [1]. This discovery is a strong counterpoint to the traditionalist administrative notions that legacy, non-digital, forms of writing will help to maintain the prestige of a department. Rather, it provides empirical evidence that, in the modern era, institutional relevance and student engagement are highly dependent on the capability of the curriculum to directly address and interweave today's technological realities (Gasaymeh et al., 2024).

The Crisis of Perceived Course Necessity and Shifting Interests

Despite the high enthusiasm for AI integration, a profound, systemic tension emerged regarding the perceived intrinsic value of traditional, unaugmented writing courses. The survey exposed a high degree of skepticism regarding the necessity of legacy pedagogies when powerful automation tools are freely accessible on students' smartphones and laptops.

Survey Construct: Impact of AI on Traditional Course Value	Percentage of Agreement (N=190)
GenAI tools make traditional English writing courses less necessary	59.5%
Availability of AI has reduced personal motivation to take traditional writing courses	54.2%
Disagree that traditional writing courses are less necessary	~40.0%

Disagree that AI has reduced motivation to enroll	45.8%
---	-------

Almost half (48%) of respondents agreed, while 11.5% strongly agreed, that there is a stark contrast between the idea that GenAI tools make the traditional English writing courses inherently less necessary (Current Study, 2026) [1]. In addition, more than half (54.2%) of all students acknowledged that the availability of tools such as ChatGPT actively and significantly diminished their personal motivation to learn formal writing (Current Study, 2026) [1]. This is a grave, life-threatening pedagogical vulnerability of the higher education institutions. When writing is primarily perceived as the creation of a product of transactional text, modern LLMs can easily do so and make human teaching redundant (Qian, 2025) [1].

Yet the data is significant because it is polarized, implying a very sophisticated student mentality, not some technological utopia. Around 40% of students strongly disagreed that the courses are not needed, and 45.8% disagreed that they were less motivated (Current Study, 2026). This significant counter-narrative suggests a sustained and robust awareness among a large minority of the student body that the writing classroom is a place of great intellectual value, much more than simply computer-assisted creation of text (Current Study, 2026).

The Enduring Value of Humanistic Writing Skills

To pinpoint exactly what students believe those transcendent intellectual benefits are, participants were asked to identify which specific foundational and higher-order writing competencies remain vital and irreplaceable despite the advent of flawless automated text generation. The responses firmly highlighted higher-order cognitive capacities and deeply personal, humanistic skills.

Highly Valued Competencies in the GenAI Era	Endorsement Rate (%)
Critical Thinking	66.8%
Unique Writing Voice / Originality	56.3%

Writing Style	56.3%
Idea Generation / Brainstorming	54.2%
Citation and Ethics	47.4%
Human Communication / Empathy	46.8%

Mechanistic and highly structured skills like grammar correction, spelling, basic syntax formatting, were much lower in the students' priorities, and implicitly recognized by the respondents as menial tasks that can and should be easily outsourced to machines (Current Study, 2026). On the other hand, Critical Thinking was identified as the top, most incontestable competency (endorsed by 66.8% of students), while the great human desire to develop one's Unique Writing Voice and individual Writing Style (56.3%) was a close runner-up (Current Study, 2026).

In particular, almost half of the participants (47.4%) explicitly reported that the topic "Citation and Ethics" is one of the more important topics that needs continuous human guidance (Current Study, 2026). This indicates a high level of student awareness and maturity in understanding the challenges posed by LLMs which include algorithmic bias, intellectual property theft and hallucinated citations (Bittle & El-Gayar, 2025), extending the need for courses that address the philosophy and ethics of writing beyond simply addressing the mechanics.

Qualitative Themes: Opportunity vs. Challenge

The most critical observations were in open-response comments (not quantified): many students understand GenAI tools as an opportunity and a challenge at the same time. On the one hand, the respondents indicated that AI is able to create ideas fast and that it can act as a writing coach, so the process of learning would be more effective and innovative. Alternatively, they were concerned with excessive use of AI, originality, and the inability to further identify AI-generated plagiarism (in line with Bittle & El-Gayar, 2025). Altogether, there was a culture of leaning towards blended education: the courses that involve AI tools but also provide the students with training in critical analysis and ethics as well as personal expression. Such a relative

position (opportunity and caution) also manifests itself in the current research on the subject of GenAI in education (Yusuf et al., 2024; Chan & Hu, 2023).

All in all, this study shows that students are highly interested in the writing courses that treat AI enthusiastically under close supervision, but they still maintain close attachment with traditional objectives of writing pedagogy. The data give a glimpse of the attitude of students which captures these tensions in a quantitative.

Discussion

The survey findings we conducted can illuminate some significant forces where GenAI meets writing instruction. On the one hand, there may be a student need represented by the universality of support (76%) related to including AI education in writing courses. It reminds me of the argument raised by Jeikner (2025) who believes that teachers need to incorporate GenAI tools in pedagogy as a way of encouraging critical writing and AI literacy. With almost 75 % of students mentioning that they would be more inclined to take an AI-integrated course, it is an indication that educational programs recognizing GenAI are capable of attracting more learners. This tallies with Gasaymeh et al. (2024) who discovered that students are receptive to the creative gains that AI brings but they need to be organized. The providers of education may cash in on this interest by redesigning and explicitly teaching prompt engineering or ethics of AI and how to critically read well the outputs of AI (Farrelly & Baker, 2023).

At the same time, this study reveals an ambiguity: more than half of the students believe that AI discourages the need to continue taking traditional writing courses, and an equal percentage of them state that they have lost interest in taking a course because of AI. This reflects theoretical fears among Qian (2025) that the efficiency of AI may have the ability to outsource certain cognitive abilities. Nevertheless, it is not black and white. The idea that students do not believe in those statements (40-45 % do not agree with up) indicates the acknowledgment of the fact that students are taught the specific values in writing courses. In fact, ratings of critical thinking and originality have been high pointing out to the fact that students perceive basic writing

skills to be indispensable. This is in line with the conclusion of the literature review of Aljuaid (2024): “We are not replacing courses; courses teach what AI cannot (critical thinking, research, etc.)”. Indeed, in data, students explicitly adopt that position by placing a focus on human-centered skills.

These results can be linked to the wider academic debate of whether to focus more on AI or human elements in teaching writing. On the one hand, AI can become a type of scaffold or support writers. According to Qian (2025) and others, although AI has the potential to produce quick feedback and to devise creativity, they observe that it requires supplement among human knowledge. Conversely, a failure to change the courses means risking becoming irrelevant. According to Ballari, Mesquita, and Carnaz (2024), AI integration is expected to significantly change higher education and usher in the need to consider core competencies. This survey students appear to feel this change; they demand support in navigating the use of AI in an ethical and efficient way. Of interest, nearly half (47.4%) purposely cited the component of citation & ethics as valued. This can be matched with the use of literature standards that request clear teaching of AI ethics (Bittle & El-Gayar, 2025; Farrelly & Baker, 2023).

The trend of desired abilities which have critical thinking ranked the highest is in line with studies that have supported the concentration on metacognitive and creative skills. According to Pontes et al., (2024), tasks need to challenge students to generate novel and critically thought-out content, thus reducing the superiority of AI. Likewise, an experimental study by Zhang (2025) discovered that students experienced gains in argumentation and organization when AI feedback was utilized, but likely because even in the AI condition they were still required to think (as when instructor feedback is utilized). Accordingly, faculty is able to cope with findings by modifying learning outcomes: emphasize original analysis, encourage creativity, and insist on reflections. An example may include assignments of AI assisted brainstorming with a written explanation of what was taken or not with the voice of the student remaining central.

This policy-wise, the figures make the argument of integrating AI literacy into the curriculum particularly tough. More than 75 % of students expressed their desire to learn about AI in their writing, but they do not want to apply it. This is consistent with the survey suggestion that Yusuf et al. (2024) has given

regarding the introduction of GenAI and ethics in courses. This could be done through modules on the detection of AI-generated text (to uphold integrity) and use of collaboration activities in which AI is a tool. Similarly, teachers must listen to the minority that disfavors a complete transition to AI because a complete ban on GenAI (as some premature American policy requirements tried to do) might fail miserably based on student expectations (Jeikner, 2025).

Overall, results reaffirm the identified themes of the literature and add a student-centered perspective. Students view GenAI as supplementing, rather than supplanting, a pedagogy that is blended. It means redesigning courses: the writing of syllabi can be reshaped to preserve the fundamental outcomes (critical thinking, voice, ethical writing) and prepare scaffolding on the use of AI. The pedagogical side may, therefore, consist of directed exercises on writing prompts, peer- and AI-marked drafts, and reflective elements about the role of AI. Upon evaluation, educators can follow the recommendation proposed by Pontes et al. (2024) of making the task to be very original (e.g. reflections on personal experiences, local case studies), which cannot be easily produced by AI. This is reflected in the findings, and it indicates that the provision of AI content and ethics credit would be enrolled into.

Conclusion

In this study, a questionnaire was conducted among 190 students regarding the impact that GenAI tools have on their perception of English writing courses. The researcher realizes that the majority of students accept the idea of integrating AI into course materials and would prefer to study courses that can introduce the use and ethics of AI. Simultaneously, there are significant concerns that AI will make traditional writing methods obsolete with a large number reporting less interest in traditional courses. Most importantly, students still extol the quality of human-oriented skills of writing, particularly, the ability to think critically, find a voice, and style, far more than the mechanical ones. They understand AI in terms of the possibility to improve writing (generation of ideas and improvement by feedback) and a threat to originality and integrity.

Such findings are significant to educators and curriculum planners. GenAI should not be disregarded in writing courses, but must also look to employ its affordances, and strengthen what AI cannot supplant. In particular, the researcher advises to add direct AI-based writing and digital ethics training to English writing curricula because students want to have that and because it would be a good way to understand them better. Simultaneously, this also means redesigning assignments in new ways that prioritize critical thinking, original interpretation and moral research. As another example, the educators could offer collaborative writing assignments, according to which students cooperate with AI to prepare a draft or research study, yet the final papers have to be written by the students without comments and citations. Evaluation rules may include plagiarism softwares modified to AI. It can be possible to start giving workshops on critical AI evaluation and consider making AI literacy a learning outcome to get students ready to enter the academic and professional world.

A blended pedagogy which combines AI tools and instructor instructions appears to be most promising in practice. The increased interest of the respondents in AI-inclusive courses may imply that this integration would allow us to attract more people and motivate them. This should however be done with a lot of thinking as literature warns. It is necessary to train the instructors so that they could offer a way to incorporate AI and preserve academic expectations (Perkins, 2023). Lastly, the findings highlight that the person's aspects of writing are always prioritized, i. e., creativity, ethics, and communication. Individuals and policy makers, as well as institutions, need to, hence, avoid reducing the curriculum to the technological abilities offered by AI only and make sure that they are rather well-rounded critical thinkers. Drawing the lines together, the future of writing pedagogy through the lens of the AI age probably consists in the hands-on empowerment of the students who need to be directed right by the power pedagogical purposes and the ethical consciousness in use of the AI as one of the tools.

References

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/aweij/ChatGPT.2>

Arizona State University (ASU). (2026, February 11). *ASU launches AI-Informed Writing Classroom*. <https://news.asu.edu/20260211-arts-humanities-and-education-asu-launches-aiinformed-writing-classroom>

Association for Writing Across the Curriculum (AWAC). (2025). *AWAC statement on AI and writing across the curriculum*.

<https://wacassociation.org/statement-on-ai-writing-tools-in-wac/>

Bittle, K., & El-Gayar, O. (2025). Generative AI and academic integrity in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda. *Information*, 16(4), 296. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info16040296>

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269930410_Thematic_analysis

Buss, D., Zambo, D., Zambo, R., & Williams, C. (2014). Preparing scholarly, influential practitioners. *Education Doctorate*.

<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1403248.pdf>

Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1), 43.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8>

Chowdhury, M. H. S. (2025). Teaching in the age of AI: How can Bangladesh's education curriculum keep up? *Asia News Network*. <https://asianews.network/teaching-in-the-age-of-ai-how-can-bangladeshs-education-curriculum-keep-up/>

Farrelly, T., & Baker, N. (2023). Generative artificial intelligence: Implications and considerations for higher education practice. *Education Sciences*, 13(11), 1109. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13111109>

Gasaymeh, A.-M. M., Beirat, M. A., & Abu Qbeita, A. A. (2024). University students' insights of generative artificial intelligence (AI) writing tools.

Education Sciences, 14(10), 1062. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14101062>

Government of Bangladesh. (2026). *Draft national AI policy Bangladesh 2026-2030*. <https://aipolicy.gov.bd/docs/national-ai-policy-bangladesh-2026-2030-draft-v1.1.pdf>

Habib, M. (2026, March 9). UGC drafting policy to prevent plagiarism in research. *BSS News*. <https://www.bssnews.net/news/367265>

Jeikner, A. (2025). Saving writing classes from extinction: ChatGPT as part of the teaching pedagogy. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Computer Supported Education (CSEDU 2025)* (Vol. 1, pp. 500–511). SciTePress. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0013351000003932>

MLA-CCCC Joint Task Force on Writing and AI. (2024). *Generative AI and policy development: Guidance from the MLA-CCCC Task Force*. <https://cccc.ncte.org/mla-cccc-joint-task-force-on-writing-and-ai>

Perkins, M. (2023). Academic integrity considerations of AI large language models in the post-pandemic era: ChatGPT and beyond. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 20(2). <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.02.07>

Qian, Y. (2025). Pedagogical applications of generative AI in higher education: A systematic review of the field. *TechTrends*, 69(2), 239–255. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-025-01100-1>

Research Methods Community. (2023). *Validating a questionnaire*. Sage Publications. <https://researchmethodscommunity.sagepub.com/blog/validating-a-questionnaire>

Roberts, J. (2025, February 25). Authentic writing in the age of AI. *Edutopia*. <https://www.edutopia.org/article/teaching-authentic-writing-age-ai/>

Sultana, S., Samad, R., Haque, M., Sultana, Z., Jahangir, Z., Hossain, B. M. M., Noman, R. M., & Ahmed, S. I. (2026). Bangladesh AI readiness: Perspectives from the academia, industry, and government. *arXiv*.
<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2601.12934>

SurveyMonkey. (2023). *What is convenience sampling?*
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/market-research/resources/what-is-convenience-sampling/>

Watkins, M. (2026). What is process tracking and how is it used to deter AI misuse? *MLA-CCCC Joint Task Force on Writing and AI*.
<https://aiandwriting.hcommons.org/>

Yusuf, M. O., Pervin, N., & Román-González, A. (2024). GenAI in higher education: Evidence from a multicultural survey on perceptions and practices. *Educational Technology Research & Development*, 72, 107–130.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-023-10332-9>

Zhang, K. (2025). Enhancing critical writing through AI feedback: A randomized controlled study. *Behavioral Sciences*, 15(5), 600.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15050600>