


Saving Writing Classes from Extinction: ChatGPT as Part of the Teaching Pedagogy

Alexandra Jeikner ^a

Deree - The American College of Greece, 6 Gravias Street GR-153 42 Aghia Paraskevi, Athens, Greece

Keywords: AI-Based Writing Activities.


Abstract: The advent of generative AI (GenAI) tools such as ChatGPT in late 2022 shook the academic world to its core. Educators feared that students would rely on such tools instead of engaging in critical thinking and that objective assessment of writing and thinking skills would become impossible. Several educational institutions passed strict academic policies that labelled the usage of such tools forms of plagiarism. However, an increasing body of literature demonstrates that as long as specific parameters are considered, it is the educators' responsibility to include GenAI tools in the teaching process, using them to promote both critical writing skills and AI-literacy skills. This manuscript presents activities that involve low to moderate ChatGPT-use, where the students retain a leading role, and assessments rubrics that evaluate both critical writing and engagement with AI. It is a position paper which bases its evidence on existing literature, not experimental results, since the activities have not been yet tested owing to departmental restrictions regarding all use of GenAI tools.

1 INTRODUCTION

When ChatGPT was launched in late 2022, the academic world appeared irrevocably shaken, undermined by this new technology. Many educators expressed bewilderment and helplessness in response to what appeared to be skillful and undetectable use by students. Publications proliferated that condemned generative AI (GenAI), such as ChatGPT, as lacking educational value and numerous academic institutions implemented strict policies that banned all use. However, two years later, a significant body of research indicates that GenAI tools should be used within the academic environment to enhance learning. Less than a year ago, in an article published March 2024, Karataş et al. claimed that a review of the existing literature demonstrates “a landscape of cautious optimism tempered by skepticism” (p. 19344); it also indicates “the need for AI in education” (p. 19344). Today, bewilderment remains but is tempered with curiosity and even praise. Still, while most educational institutions have accepted authorized use, individual instructors and sometimes whole departments continue to prohibit all use. The main reasons, besides lack of familiarity, usually involve concerns about plagiarism and security. A

further reason, for instance in our Writing Program, is based on the pedagogical assumption that students must first develop their own writing skills, such as the drafting of thesis statements or the structuring of paragraphs, before they are asked to evaluate and use GenAI output.

Based on our experience in the Writing Program of a private undergraduate educational institution in S. Europe, where the language of instruction is English, we support that such attitudes toward GenAI are unrealistic and irresponsible. Students often struggle to draft well-organized texts in precise and academically appropriate language. Students for whom English is a foreign language (EFL-students) may be even more challenged. When writing essays in a second language (L2), they often have their first language (L1) in mind which, combined with limited language proficiency, can result in low linguistic precision and wordy sentences that obscure meaning (Chung & Ahn, 2021; Lee & Briggs, 2020; Kaur & Newell, 2024). This in turn increases anxiety and reduces self-confidence (Baek et al., 2024). In our experience, although academic policy prohibits it, students, and more so EFL-students, often turn to GenAI tools. The literature confirms this is a global phenomenon, since access-, time- and cost-efficiency

^a <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-0741-4916>

of GenAI tools outweigh concerns about output quality or academic integrity.

We need to accept that since as educators it is our responsibility to prepare students for their professional life, it is also our responsibility to help students use AI-tools. Just as once educational institutions “helped students acquire basic technological proficiency”, they now need to promote “more advanced digital competence” (Kohnke et al., 2023, p. 546). This involves teaching effective, safe and ethical GenAI use.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 GenAI Tools in University Writing Classes for L1 and L2 Students

Recent reviews indicate that the use of AI-tools can provide many benefits in the educational context. It is true that the use of GenAI tools is not without challenges, but as the discussion in the section below, regarding best practices of integrating GenAI tools into the classroom, should show, careful consideration of these challenges can help turn the latter into teaching opportunities.

Tools such as ChatGPT can be “used as a learning and educational tool” where “students can ask questions [...] to get explanations, guidance, or reference materials” (Prananta et al., 2023, p. 1034). In fact, ChatGPT is described as “promoting critical thinking and problem-solving abilities” (Graefen & Fazel, 2024, p. 51). Based on a review of studies, Nloy et al. (2024) identify ChatGPT as the choice of GenAI tools owing to its “high accessibility, being a free tool” and “easily accessible globally” as well as its user-friendly interface (p. 4). Access-disparity concerns mostly students from the lowest income group (Baek et al., 2024).

Several studies on the educational use of chatbots have shown that the integration of GenAI into the educational process can benefit educators and students, in all classes. This can range from “facilitating learning” and “creating rich learning environments” to “providing suggestions for improving teaching practices” and “instant feedback for students” (for a review of the literature, see for instance Kayalı et al., 2023, p.21 & p. 27). Chatbots such as ChatGPT can be used in the classroom to increase students’ efficiency in task-completion of the writing and the research process, by helping improve language and coherence, by providing textual and subject explanations, as well as by creating outlines and citations (Albadarin et al., 2023; Huang and Tan,

2023; Kohnke et al., 2023; You, 2024). Studies also show that educators can employ GenAI tools to engage students in reflective writing and encourage critical thinking (Albadarin et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2023). For instance, students can “review the changes made by ChatGPT and decide whether to accept or reject them based on their own judgment” (Barrot, 2023, p. 4). Of interest for writing classes such as ours, which are based on the flipped-classroom method, are findings that ChatGPT can help students improve student performance and attitudes toward learning and self-confidence (Li, 2023). Such classes promote critical engagement but also demand significant time investment from educators to provide “personalised learning guidance and instant feedback [...] when a teacher needs to interact with students at the same time” (Chang & Hwang, 2018, in Li, 2023, p. 42).

For EFL students, GenAI tools can be of particular assistance and should therefore become part of the teaching process (for a systematic review of studies on the use of ChatGPT for L2 learning, see Karataş et al., 2024; Yang & Li, 2024). Even before the advent of these tools, the use of technology in the classroom was described as helping students (Song & Song, 2023). For instance, even simple online machine translations (MT), such as *Google Translate (GT)*, can help improve linguistic accuracy and increase student satisfaction within the higher education (HE) environment (Chung & Ahn, 2021; Lee & Briggs, 2020). GenAI tools such as ChatGPT are said to “revolutionize language pedagogy” through the learner-centered nature (Karataş et al., 2024, p. 19355). They offer new and more effective ways to “address the challenges associated with developing writing proficiency through traditional training methods” by assisting in the development and internalization of academic writing skills (Song & Song, 2023, p.2). For instance, chatbots such as ChatGPT can be used to acquaint students with differences between academic and casual writing (Yan, 2023, in You, 2024), translate explanations into the L1-language and create vocabulary notes (Kohnke et al., 2023). Even prompt writing to be given to ChatGPT can enhance “the ability to effectively express ideas and communicate intentions” (Michalon & Camacho-Zuñiga, 2023, in You, 2024, p. 2).

Interestingly, ChatGPT instruction is claimed to benefit EFL students more than traditional instruction (Song & Song, 2023; Vera, 2023) and to be considered by students as improving “motivation and learning engagement” (Karataş et al., 2024, p. 19353). Students appreciate the personalized

responses as well as the instant and individualized feedback which in turn makes the learning experience more “meaningful and effective” (Karataş et al., 2024, p. 19358). Teng’s study (2024) shows that students viewed feedback provided by ChatGPT as more substantial than their educators’. Its ever-present accessibility furthermore provides “unlimited opportunities” for practice (Yang & Li, 2024, p. 8). Some studies claim it helps “learners to acquire [...] speaking, listening, reading, and writing [skills]” and improve their “grammar accuracy, vocabulary size, and formulaic sequence” (Hong, 2023, in Zhao et al., 2023). Other studies limit its value to “writing and grammar skills”, but not speaking or listening (Karataş et al., 2024).

We argue that the literature shows that for classes that involve writing, ChatGPT can clearly be helpful for both L1 and L2 writers, when used as a practice platform and a writing assistant tool (Barrot, 2023; Karataş et al., 2024; You, 2024). Instead of checking their writing for linguistic errors, students have time to invest in content writing (You, 2024).

2.2 Best Practices for Integrating GenAI Tools in EFL Writing Classes

Educators do not need to fear being replaced by GenAI tools, but they need to understand both the role of ChatGPT and their own in the classroom (Jeon & Lee, 2023). The literature demonstrates that it is vital for educators to “adopt innovative pedagogical practices” and use “a technology-integrated teaching approach” (Song & Song, 2023, p. 12). However, literature also shows that educators must carefully consider the strategies employed and activities designed. Just as the use of *GT* requires training, for instance teaching EFL-students to review word choice and translation accuracy (Kol et al., 2018; Lee & Briggs, 2020; Shin & Chon, 2023), so do students but also educators have to be trained on how to use GenAI tools (Baek et al., 2024). Reviewing the literature on the collaboration between educators and ChatGPT in language education, Jeon and Lee (2023) stress that benefits to learning depend on the educators’ decisions on how to integrate GenAI tools into the classroom, rather than the specific tool alone. Graefen & Fazal (2024) identify the need for “case-based advice” on the usage of GenAI (p. 49).

Overall, educators need to understand the differences in and levels of usage of GenAI tools within the specific teaching context so that these complement their pedagogical expertise. Several publications offer suggestions on this usage, but

overall, it requires educators to use their pedagogical expertise to a) effectively integrate ChatGPT into their teaching, b) teach the students to be active and effective “investigators” and not “passive recipients” and c) teach students ethical use (Jeon & Lee, 2023, p. 15885-6). ChatGPT can have four roles within the classroom: “interlocutor, content provider, teaching assistant, and evaluator”; within each role, ChatGPT can have a variety of functions (Jeon and Lee, 2023, p. 15881). A similar observation is made by Paulson (2024), who differentiates different usage-levels: “1) Limited or Guided, 2) Measured, and 3) Integrated”; the usage of AI is for “1) idea or design aid, 2) critical thinking or discussion partner, 3) editing or feedback partner, 4) research aid, 5) personal learning support, or 6) group work support.”

The level and usage selected depend on the learning outcomes of the respective task, the students’ familiarity with the topic and their AI literacy skills (Paulsen, 2024). For instance, limited or measured use is more appropriate when “learning outcomes primarily emphasize human capabilities” and low AI literacy skills and limited subject knowledge require guidance and scaffolding; a measured use is appropriate for students with intermediate AI literacy skills and some familiarity with the subject so that they can interact with ChatGPT as a “conversation partner” (Paulsen, 2024). Furthermore, limited or guided use is recommended when assessment is “AI-vulnerable” and student output can easily be replaced with AI output, while the measured use is recommended when assessment is “AI-tenable” and students cannot “shortcut” their learning” (Paulsen, 2024).

Clearly, if ChatGPT is to be used as a writing assistant, educators need to be trained in effective and responsible use. Since studies have shown that when educators lack AI-skills, the students’ learning experience is negatively impacted, educators need “to attain a high level of proficiency in incorporating chatbots, such as ChatGPT, into their classrooms to create inventive, well-structured, and captivating learning strategies” (Albadarin et al., 2023). They also need to set “clear rules and regulations regarding its usage” as well as create tasks where ChatGPT is a “supportive tool” so that cognitive engagement is not undermined (Albadarin et al., 2023). The existing research indicates that to discourage overreliance on GenAI tools and encourage critical engagement, educators need to create activities that ensure that students remain the authors of the work produced and ChatGPT the assistant or tutor (Yang & Li, 2024).

This can be achieved, as the literature indicates, by designing tasks with clear guidelines and specific

instructions on prompt phrasing which leads to desired output (Barrot, 2023; Bozkurt & Sharma, 2023; Jeon and Lee, 2023; Kayalı et al., 2023; Rowland, 2023; Yang & Li, 2024). Educators need to clearly convey the rationale for permitting or requiring GenAI use (Sharpe, 2024). To prevent overreliance, ChatGPT should have only a supplemental role (Albadarin et al., 2023; Barrot, 2023; Jeon and Lee, 2023; Karataş et al., 2024; Song & Song, 2023). This task for instance could require students to write their own material and then use ChatGPT as an editing tool (Barrot, 2023). Instructors also need to emphasize that when using ChatGPT, the output should be critically evaluated and not necessarily accepted, even if presented by ChatGPT as definitive (Albadarin et al., 2023; Graefen & Fazal, 2024; Kayalı et al., 2023; Kohnke et al., 2023; Yang & Li, 2024). Tasks therefore should require on the one hand (L2) students to review output produced by ChatGPT and on the other educators to maintain oversight over content generated (Huang & Tan, 2023).

Furthermore, when educators integrate GenAI into assignments, tasks must encourage relationships between students and educators. Studies confirm the importance of “human interaction and collaboration” (Albadarin et al., 2023). Students in fact do not appreciate the lack of “human touch” of “ChatGPT’s responses” (Teng, 2024, p. 9). The literature indicates that educators need to find a way “that incorporates both technology and human interaction” (Karataş et al., 2024, p. 19357). This can be done by using ChatGPT “in group projects and peer review sessions, where students refine their drafts with AI-generated feedback before engaging in peer discussion” (Teng, 2024, p. 9).

Another aspect that requires attention is ethical and safe usage. As Huang and Tan (2023) point out, GenAI tools do not “inherently increase the risk of plagiarism” (p. 1151). Breaches of academic integrity can be mitigated if students are taught to appropriately use and attribute AI-produced output (Barrot, 2023). Educators need to communicate the extent and manner to which students should employ ChatGPT (Yang & Li, 2024; You, 2024; Zhao et al., 2023) and explain the consequences of breaching academic integrity (Rudolph et al., 2023, in Graefen & Fazal, 2024). They also need to create an atmosphere that encourages students to indicate ChatGPT-output instead of hiding it (Jeon & Lee, 2023) or fearing they breached academic integrity principles (Bašić et al., 2023, in Graefen & Fazal, 2024). Besides the need to explain ethical usage, educators need to explain that copyright and privacy

laws do not apply when GenAI tools are used, which means that device data, usage data, log data as well as content may be stored (Kayalı et al., 2023; You, 2024).

Educators furthermore need to create assessment methods that evaluate both student and machine input. As Rowland (2023) explains, the goal is to develop and assess both disciplinary knowledge and AI-usage competence. Different proposals exist, such as the writing continuum model which assesses human involvement and use of AI on a one-dimensional continuum, ranging from no AI-assistance over to different levels of usage such as proofreading and writing-assistant, up to entirely AI-generated (Rowland, 2023). The “stages of writing + continuum model” is more nuanced, assessing the extent to which GenAI tools were used within each writing stage (Rowland, 2023, p. T36). Whatever the choice, assessment methods need to be communicated to students beforehand (Sharpe, 2024).

3 ACTIVITIES EXPLAINED

3.1 Rationale for the Proposed Activities

This manuscript responds to recent studies that emphasize the need for educators to redefine their role by including GenAI technology in their pedagogical approach as well as to contribute to the creation of a community where experiences and case-based activities are shared (Kasneci, in Graefen & Fazal, 2024). We acknowledge that (writing) courses should teach and promote critical writing, but also that it is vital to integrate GenAI tools into the teaching process. We fear that on the one hand, a refusal to do so only perpetuates surreptitious usage and that on the other, adamant support of the traditional college essay and traditional assessment practices will result in writing courses writing themselves out of existence.

This manuscript presents two AI-based activities for a first-year writing course at university, where the language of instruction is for most students L2, one designed by the author and one by a colleague. Both activities demonstrate how a GenAI tool such as ChatGPT can be used to acquaint students with effective but also ethical use. The activities also ensure human collaboration and critical thinking. This manuscript further provides an assessment-example that evaluates the writing

process, the use of AI, and the students' critical engagement.

The activities have not been implemented in the classroom since for the time being, our department prohibits all use of GenAI tools. They are based on the review of existing literature presented before which provides evidence for the need to design and implement Gen-AI based educational technologies in HE. They were inspired by resources and guidelines offered for instance by Alby (n.d.), Atlas (2023), Gibson (n.d.), Hernandez (2024), Rowland (2023); Schaper (2024), Wang et al. (2024). Similarly, material provided by universities such as NC State University (n.d.) and Brandeis University as well as the Teaching and Learning site of Conestoga, for instance by Sharpe (2024) and Paulson (2024), was of immense value.

We designed the activities using the active learning paradigm and the concept of learning and writing as a process as our theoretical framework. Our writing courses are already based on the active learning paradigm, where flipped classroom practices, which engage students actively, have been part of the course design for years. Similarly, our courses approach learning as a process instead of focusing only on the end product; we require students to produce prewriting and a first draft before the final version. Wegerif's proposal to approach teaching and learning as a dialogic practice provided further theoretical underpinnings. This approach posits that in the age of the internet, which disrupts the traditional approach to education as dependent on the concept of one true reality, education should introduce students to an environment of multiple perspectives and uncertainties and encourage them to engage in dialogue. Cao & Dede's proposal (2023), based on Wegerif's dialogic theory, to employ GenAI-tools as "dialogue partner" rather than output-provider (p.7). then offered further theoretical context. Ethan Mollick's concept of Co-Intelligence (2024) also offered theoretical context. Mollick (2024) posits that we should engage with AI as a creative partner, a co-worker, co-teacher and coach since the development of Large Language Models (LLMs) like ChatGPT means that we have created an artificial intelligence that can augment human abilities. For that to happen, according to Mollick (2024), we need to use AI in our activities, give it a specific role, maintain oversight, and be prepared for AI to improve rapidly.

The first activity addresses the challenges that students, particularly L2 students, face in terms of transitions and wordiness. The task requires students to ask ChatGPT to translate an introduction for an

essay written in L1 to L2 and then use it as a language assistant to improve transitions and reduce wordiness. In other words, they will use ChatGPT as a translation tool, not unlike *GT*, as well as an editing and feedback partner. The students will not be required to rate the translation provided; rather, the translation step was selected for the mere reason that L2 students may find it difficult to get the ideas they have in their native language on paper in the English language. They will evaluate the ChatGPT-output (its translation from L1 to L2) only after receiving specific guidelines.

The second activity addresses the difficulty L1 and L2 students have with effectively integrating sources into their writing. This is a crucial skill as it enhances the quality and credibility of students' work. However, integrating sources into academic writing requires both technical skills, such as for citations and paraphrasing, as well as critical thinking, such as for evaluating sources and connecting ideas. This activity is designed to address these concerns using ChatGPT but also to guide students to use ChatGPT as a supplementary tool, focusing on ethical usage, effective prompt engineering, and critical evaluation of AI-generated content. By doing so, students learn to integrate sources effectively and take ownership of their learning process while ensuring academic integrity.

These activities are considered appropriate for several reasons. First, both require development according to specific guidelines and this ensures that students are also given specific guidelines for ChatGPT-use. By asking students to carefully and critically engage with prompt-writing, students are also obliged to review the assignment and the evaluation criteria. Second, both tasks do not require students to develop their own arguments, which means students are not encouraged to turn to ChatGPT for critical thinking. Rather, students use ChatGPT to improve expression as well as source integration and citations. Educators thereby do not oblige students to upload their individualized intellectual property to a platform which does not guarantee copyright and privacy laws. Third, both tasks ask are appropriate for collaborative work and peer review – which, as the literature has shown – is important for maintaining a healthy relationship between students and machine learning.

3.2 Rationale for AI-Use

The activities do not give students the option of not using GenAI tools. They also require students to have access and upload personal output to an external AI-platform such as ChatGPT where privacy is not

ensured. The rationale is that since the literature indicates that educators need to redefine their role and include GenAI tools in the learning environment to prepare students for the future as well as to remain relevant as educators, GenAI tools must be integrated into the learning experience and the learning objectives must involve the use of GenAI tools. Critical reflection is encouraged through tasks that involve collaboration in evaluating ChatGPT output and reflecting on the experience in a final assignment. By asking students to keep track of the writing process and document each step, these activities also emphasize the importance of ethical usage. Students will be given clear guidelines on how to identify material written by ChatGPT by submitting screenshots of the chats and their use of this output.

Concerning issues of access, the rationale is that almost all students have access to a smartphone. Should this not be the case, the activities can be done in a computer lab. Since the activities will be completed on campus, students will have internet access through the free college wi-fi. Students will not be expected to use ChatGPT at home.

Concerning the choice of GenAI tool, ChatGPT was selected as the most useful tool. We draw attention to the fact that not every institution has a private and free AI-platform where privacy is ensured. The rationale for our choice is that ChatGPT has been identified in the literature as a popular tool among students and a substantial number of studies have used ChatGPT.

3.3 Rationale for Extent of AI-Use

These are AI-supported activities, where students retain the leading role and are responsible for the final product. ChatGPT has a supportive role as an assistant. GenAI could be used with less constraints, as a tool that exposes students to different ideas and alternatives, as a participant in a debate, thereby inviting exciting critical engagement. However, this choice was made with the rationale that this limited to measured usage is appropriate since first, the writing courses are directed at first-year, mostly L2, students with limited knowledge of academic writing conventions; as such, the students require clear guidelines and continuous scaffolding. Second, their AI literacy skills are usually limited owing to limited practice in high school. Furthermore, the rationale is that the proposed activities are meant to be used by instructors who might also feel insecure and uncertain about introducing such activities into their classroom.

3.3 Rationale for Duration of Activities

By being designed for three classes, these activities engage students in process writing. The scaffolding approach, which also breaks down the assessment into smaller tasks, encourages students to actively engage in each class and thereby prevents them from feeling overwhelmed. Independent writing is promoted by asking students to employ feedback they have received from both human and machine.

3.4 Learning Outcomes

Effective technology-integration into teaching has been shown to involve the creation of assignments which include the use of this technology in the learning outcomes. For this reason, the learning outcomes of our activities specify, beyond the specific writing skills that will be acquired, also that students will be able to:

1. Identify key aspects of [... writing task(s)].
2. Understand the limitations and dangers of ChatGPT.
3. Employ ChatGPT in contextually appropriate ways regarding extent and level of usage.
4. Demonstrate transparency and academic integrity about ChatGPT-use.
5. Formulate nuanced and effective prompts.
6. Analyze ChatGPT output thoughtfully.
7. Use ChatGPT to revise writing for clarity, coherence, and academic style.
8. Arrive at a holistic learning experience by reflecting on the writing process and the use of ChatGPT.

3.5 Assessment

The designed grading rubrics reflect the integration of ChatGPT into the learning environment. It is a two-tiered evaluation process that on the one hand evaluates the students' documentation of collaboration with ChatGPT as well as engagement with and evaluation of ChatGPT output during the writing process, while on the other, it also requires critically reflection on the learning experience. This can be achieved by approaching the first part as formative writing and the second part as summative writing; or, the whole proposed activity can be considered as formative writing, leading up to a summative essay-assignment. In either case, the assessment, communicated to students beforehand,

ensures that students understand the repercussions of inappropriate use of such tools.

Points:

0: None

1: Basic

2: Satisfactory to competent

3: Good

4: Very good

Table 1: Documentation of the writing process.

	0	1	2	3	4
Submission of all required documents					
Assigned prompt reproduction					
Collaborative engagement with ChatGPT output					
Individual writing					

Table 2: Critical reflection of the writing process.

	0	1	2	3	4
Description					
Reflection					
Structure					
Language					

4 SAMPLE INSTRUCTIONS PAGE

Note: This document may be downloaded and reused as long as it is cited as a model

Guidelines for Instructors

The activities were created for a Writing course but can be adjusted to any class involve writing. The activities should be completed over the course of three 50-minute classes and the steps outlined below be followed. Students should be provided with activity guidelines in print and/or electronic format from the start of the activity.

Guidelines for Students

Assignment Rationale

As students in a higher educational institution, you are expected to produce several written assignments. However, many of you may not have been exposed to academic writing in high school. Furthermore, for many of you, English is a second language which makes writing even more challenging. You may have considered using generative AI (GenAI) tools such as ChatGPT, hoping to achieve a higher grade, even if you know this is considered cheating. This assignment is intended to show you how to employ AI-tools in an effective as well as ethical manner, thereby helping you acquire AI-literacy skills that you will need in your future career.

Choice of GenAI Tool

ChatGPT was chosen to acquaint you with GenAI-tools. The reason is its high accessibility due to free access and user-friendly interface. You should not use other AI-tools for this activity.

Activity Structure

This assignment will be completed over three classes. Your task will be to [...]. At the end of the assignment, you will submit a reflective essay, analyzing and evaluating your learning experience.

Security Considerations

Be aware that privacy and intellectual property are not protected on free GenAI platforms. Do not upload full assignments, yours or someone else's, to such platforms. Furthermore, since device, usage and log data are stored, do not share personal information, yours or someone else's.

Authorized and Unauthorized Use of ChatGPT

The extent of permitted use of ChatGPT and the required documentation apply to this course and activity. Other courses may have other policies. See College policies on academic integrity: [link]

All use of ChatGPT needs to be documented.

Authorized use:

- Translation.
- Identification of linguistic weaknesses.

- Recommendations for linguistic improvements, transitions, and source integration.

Unauthorized use:

- Production of complete essay versions
- Use of other GenAI tools

As defined in the Student Handbook, the unauthorized use of GenAI tools is considered to grant unfair advantage and to constitute an academic offence. As such, and just as breaches of academic integrity, any unauthorized use is reported to the Committee on Standing and Conduct. If you have any questions regarding un/authorized use, please contact me.

Learning Objectives

[...]

Submissions & Evaluation

At the end of each class, you will upload material produced by you and a copy of your ChatGPT chat sessions to Blackboard (BB), E-Portfolio. Once the three-class activity has been completed, you will submit to Bb, Dropbox, a reflection paragraph.

Assessment Rubrics

[...]

5 SAMPLE ACTIVITIES

5.1 Activity 1, Phrased for Students

Table 3: Sample Activity 1.

Class 1

- Write the introduction in your native language, using the prompt received. 20 min.
- To make sure that you use ChatGPT ethically and effectively, you must:
 - Be clear and straightforward in articulating what you want it to do and not do.
 - Set the context.
 - Include key details.
 - Do not include personal information.
- Tell ChatGPT in your native language that:

- You are a student at a university where English is the language of instructions, in a writing course, in the first semester.
- You have to write an introduction to a [specify type of] essay that [essay task].
- You are uploading the introduction to this essay in your native language.
- You need a translation into English.
- It should not change or improve anything.
- Upload to ChatGPT the prompt, the introduction in your native language and the grading criteria.
- Read ChatGPT output (translation). 5 min.
- Class discussion. 15-20 min.
- End of class: Upload the conversation with ChatGPT to E-Portfolio.

Learning outcomes of this class are to:

- Write effective and ethical prompts for ChatGPT.
- Use ChatGPT as a writing assistant, but not an author.

Class 2

- You receive a handout on wordiness and transitions. Discussion. 20 min.
- Return to the ChatGPT-output written in the previous class (the translation) and using the handouts received, work with a peer to locate instances of wordiness and weak transitions in each other's translated introductions. 20 min.
- Ask ChatGPT to identify weaknesses regarding wordiness and transitions in its own output, but not provide suggestions. 5 min.
- With your peer, in bullet form, compare what you identified and what ChatGPT identified – note down similarities and differences: 15 min.
- End of class: Upload to E-Portfolio:
 - Original translation with weak instances underlined and highlighted.
 - ChatGPT output on weaknesses.
 - Your comparison and notes.

Learning outcomes of this class are to:

- Identify and improve weak transitions and instances of wordiness.
- Use ChatGPT as a writing assistant, but not an author.

Table 3: Sample Activity 1 (cont.).

<p>Class 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask ChatGPT for improvement suggestions. 5 min. • Rewrite the passage on your own, using the handouts received, the work done in class, and the suggestions provided by ChatGPT. 20 min. • Upload the passage to E-Portfolio. • Ask ChatGPT for a revised version of the <u>original</u> passage it wrote, addressing the weaknesses identified and suggestions offered. • With your peer, compare each other's rewritten passage with that of ChatGPT and identify differences and similarities. Write these down in bullet form. 20 min. • End of class: Upload the document with the similarities and differences to E-Portfolio. <p>Learning outcomes of this class are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage in process writing. • Use feedback to revise. • Engage with ChatGPT critically. <p>Reflective assignment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write a reflective paragraph discussing the value of working with ChatGPT and its output. You should now consider in three body paragraphs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Regarding your writing in general: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Any challenges you experienced initially when asked to write the introduction. ○ The experience of the revision process in general. • Regarding ChatGPT use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The experience of using ChatGPT as an assistant. • Regarding ChatGPT output: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The value of using ChatGPT. ○ The limitations of using ChatGPT. • Submit this writing to Dropbox. <p>Learning outcomes of this class are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze the writing process and the engagement with ChatGPT. • Connect your thinking to your writing to arrive at a holistic learning experience. • Use AI-tools as an assistant. • Use AI-tools ethically.

5.2 Activity 2, Phrased for Instructors

Table 4: Sample Activity 2.

<p>Class 1: Writing and Analysis</p> <p>1. Introduction to the task (10 min): Explain the goal of integrating sources into an academic essay. Provide a handout with guidelines on effective source integration (e.g., quoting, paraphrasing, and summarizing).</p> <p>2. Writing Exercise (20 min):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students write a short paragraph integrating at least two sources provided by the instructor (e.g., excerpts from articles or books). - Students are told to focus on using proper citation methods (APA) and connecting sources to a central argument. <p>3. AI-Assisted Review (15 min):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students upload their paragraph to ChatGPT, asking for suggestions on improving integration, transitions, and clarity. <p>Example Prompt for ChatGPT</p> <p>Here is a paragraph where I've integrated two sources. Please identify areas where the integration of sources, transitions, or clarity could be improved, and suggest how I might revise it to strengthen my argument.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students review ChatGPT's suggestions, noting what aligns with the guidelines provided. <p>4. Class Discussion (5 min): Students are encouraged to discuss common issues identified by ChatGPT and how they relate to effective source integration.</p>
<p>Class 2: Peer Review and Revision</p> <p>1. Review of Key Concepts (10 min): Provide examples of strong and weak source integration. Discuss strategies for improving.</p> <p>2. Peer Review (20 min):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students exchange paragraphs with peers. - Each pair identifies areas where source integration could be clearer, better cited, or more effectively connected to the argument. <p>3. Revision (20 min): Using feedback from their peers and suggestions from ChatGPT, students revise paragraphs.</p> <p>4. Submission: Revised paragraphs are uploaded to the Bb for instructor feedback.</p>

Table 4: Sample Activity 2 (cont.).

Class 3: Reflection and Comparison**1. Final AI Check (10 min):**

- Students ask ChatGPT to rewrite their revised paragraphs for clarity and conciseness.
- They compare ChatGPT's version with their own, noting differences and improvements.

2. Group Activity (20 min):

In small groups, students discuss the strengths and weaknesses of their paragraphs versus ChatGPT's version.

3. Reflection Writing (20 min):

- Each student writes a reflective paragraph discussing their experience with source integration and how ChatGPT influenced their learning process.
- Questions to guide reflection:
 - What did you learn about integrating sources?
 - How did ChatGPT's suggestions help or hinder your understanding?
 - What would you do differently in future assignments?

4. Submission:

All materials (original, revised, ChatGPT version, and reflection) are compiled and submitted as part of the activity portfolio.

6 CONCLUSIONS

Despite the significant body of literature emphasizing the need to integrate AI tools into the teaching process and improve the students' literacy skills, our experience demonstrates that many instructors are still hesitant to do so. Reasons range from a fear of rendering human educators and writing classes obsolete to a fear of the impact on student learning and integrity up to a simple lack of knowledge of how to use GenAI tools. It is hoped that this manuscript can contribute to a community that shares experiences on the integration of GenAI into the classroom by providing two very specific examples that might help such hesitant educators. The choice of ChatGPT is only indicative and we agree with the literature that emphasizes that the educators' focus should be the effective integration of GenAI tools into their teaching pedagogy rather than the choice of a specific GenAI tool.

Looking into the future, we see the only solution of remaining relevant as writing educators and ensuring that students do not sacrifice their critical thinking and their writing skills to the ease of GenAI

tools such as ChatGPT. We also agree with the literature, with the caveat that familiarity with usage must first be established, that suggests that using GenAI tools as a creative partner and a dialogue partner will usher in exciting new educational opportunities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank my colleague Dr. Sakellari for the second activity as well as her suggestions. I wish circumstances would have allowed her to be more involved.

GenAI tools were not used to write this manuscript. ChatGPT was used only in the context of the presented activities.

REFERENCES

- Albadarin, Y., Saqr, M., Pope, N., & Tukianen, M. (2024). A systematic literature review of empirical research on ChatGPT in education. *Discover Education*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00138-2>
- Alby, C. (n.d.). *AI prompts for teaching: A spell book*. <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Lo4aeiWT4f5xhcsAbWafQRITghBhcmFN2m-JEX5OkJA/edit?tab=t.0>
- Atlas, S. (2023). ChatGPT for higher education and professional development: A guide to conversational AI. *College of Business Faculty Publications*. https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/cba_facpubs/548?utm_source=digitalcommons.uri.edu%2Fcba_facpubs%2F548&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages
- Baek, C., Tate, T., & Warschauer, M. (2024). "ChatGPT seems too good to be true": College students' use and perceptions of generative AI. (2024). *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100294>
- Barrett, A., & Pack, A. (2023). Not quite eye to AI: Student and teacher perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence in the writing process. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00427-0>
- Barrot, J.S. (2023). Using ChatGPT for second language writing: Pitfalls and potentials. *Assessing Writing*, 57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100745>
- Bozkurt, A., & Sharma, R. C. (2023). Generative AI and Prompt Engineering: The Art of Whispering to Let the Genie Out of the Algorithmic World. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 18(2), i-vii. <https://www.asianjde.com/ojs/index.php/AsianJDE/article/view/749>
- Brandeis University. (n.d.). *Center for teaching and Learning*.

- <https://www.brandeis.edu/teaching/resources/syllabus/ai-statements.html>
- Cao, L., & Dede, C. (2023). *Navigating a world of generative AI: Suggestions for educators*. Next Level Lab. Harvard University. <https://nextlevellab.gse.harvard.edu/2023/07/28/navigating-a-world-of-generative-ai-suggestions-for-educators/>
- Chang, P., Chen, P.-J., & Lai, L.-L. (2024). Recursive editing with Google Translate: the impact on writing and error correction. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 37(7), 2116–2141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2147192>
- Chung, E. S., & Ahn, S. (2021). The effect of using machine translation on linguistic features in L2 writing across proficiency levels and text genres. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 34(3), 2239–2264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1871029>
- Gibson, R. (n.d.). *AI prompt book*. https://rise.articulate.com/share/rd3oV4df9xf5hr_7gVtBL_O4_ZcDzU-K#
- Graefen, B., & Fazal, N. (2024). From Chat bots to Virtual Tutors: An Overview of Chat GPT's Role in the Future of Education. *Archives of Pharmacy Practice*, 15(2), 43–52. <https://doi.org/10.51847/TOuppjEDSX>
- Hernandez, M. (2024). *Generative AI prompt book*. https://docs.google.com/document/d/1xRAmnya_exvqCcIwTV78JAZqCpX5jz2ko574R3SWuE/edit?tab=t.0#heading=h.f234k44nnc1c
- Huang, J., & Tan, M. (2023). The role of ChatGPT in scientific communication: writing better scientific review articles. *American Journal of Cancer Research*, 13(4), 1148–54. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10164801/>
- Jeon, J., & Lee, S. (2023). Large language models in education: A focus on the complementary relationship between human teachers and ChatGPT. *Education and Information Technologies: The Official Journal of the IFIP Technical Committee on Education*, 28(12), 15873–92. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11834-1>
- Karataş, F., Yaşar Abedi, F., Ozek Gunyel, F., Karadeniz, D., & Kuzgun, Y. (2024). Incorporating AI in foreign language education: An investigation into ChatGPT's effect on foreign language learners. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29, 19343–66. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10639-024-12574-6>
- Kayalı, B., Yavuz, M., Balat, S., & Çalısan, M. (2023). Investigation of student experiences with ChatGPT-supported online learning applications in higher education. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(5), 20–39. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.8915>
- Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023). ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. *RELC Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868>
- Kol, S., Scholnik, M., & Spector-Cohen, E. (2018). Google Translate in academic writing courses. *The EUROCALL Review*, 26(2), 50–57. <https://doi.org/10.4995/eurocall.2018.10140>
- Lee, Sangmin-Michelle; Briggs, Neil. (2020). Effects of using machine translation to mediate the revision process of Korean university students' academic writing. *ReCALL First View*, 33(1), 18–33. [doi:10.1017/S0958344020000191](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344020000191)
- Li, H. (2023). Effects of a ChatGPT-based flipped learning guiding approach on learners' courseware project performances and perceptions. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(5), 40–58. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.8923>
- Mollick, E. (2024). *Co-intelligence: living and working with AI*. WH Allen.
- NC State University. (n.d.). Teaching resources. <https://teaching-resources.delta.ncsu.edu/designing-assignments-with-ai-in-mind/>
- Paulsen, E. (2024). *The optional use of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in assessments*. Faculty Learning Hub. Teaching and Learning Conestoga. <https://tlconestoga.ca/spectrum-ai-learning-tasks/>
- Prananta, A. W., Megahati S, R. R. P., Susanto, N., & Raule, J. H. (2023). Transforming Education and Learning through Chat GPT: A Systematic Literature Review. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan IPA*, 9(11), 1031–1037. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jppipa.v9i11.5468>
- Rowland, D. R. (2023). Two frameworks to guide discussions around levels of acceptable use of generative AI in student academic research and writing. *Journal of Academic Language & Learning*, 17(1), T31–T69. <https://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/view/915/435435577>
- Schaper, N. (2024). Using ChatGPT to Create Constructively Aligned Assessment Tasks and Criteria in the Context of Higher Education Teaching. *Artificial Intelligence and Education - Shaping the Future of Learning*. doi: 10.5772/intechopen.1005129
- Sharpe, A. (2024). *The optional use of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in assessment*. Faculty Learning Hub. Teaching and Learning Conestoga. <https://tlconestoga.ca/the-optional-use-of-generative-artificial-intelligence-genai-in-assessments/>
- Shin, D., & Chon, Y. V. (2023). Second language learners' post-editing strategies for machine translation errors. *Language Learning & Technology*, 27(1), 1–25. <https://hdl.handle.net/10125/73523>
- Song, C., & Song, Y. (2023). Enhancing academic writing skills and motivation: assessing the efficacy of ChatGPT in AI-assisted language learning for EFL students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1260843>
- Teng, M. F. (2024). “ChatGPT is the companion, not enemies”: EFL learners' perceptions and experiences in using ChatGPT for feedback in writing. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100270>
- Thompson, K., Corrin, L., & Lodge, J. M. (2023). AI in tertiary education: Progress on research and practice. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 2023, 39(5), 1–7. <https://ajet.org.au/index.php/AJET/article/view/9251/2054>
- Vera, F. (2023). Enhancing English language learning in undergraduate students using ChatGPT: A quasi-experimental study. *Red Internacional de*

- Investigadores en Educación, I Congreso Internacional de Aprendizaje Activo CIAA 2023, pp. 18-21. <https://apolo.unab.edu.co/ws/portalfiles/portal/27240222/Libro-de-actas-CIAA-2023.pdf#page=18>
- Wang, S. J., Bankard, J. S., Bui, E., & Nye, B. (2024). Writing with AI: What college students learned from utilizing ChatGPT for a writing assignment. *Education Sciences*, 14(9), 976. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14090976>
- Wegerif, R. (2019). Toward a dialogic theory of education for the internet age. In Mercer, N., Wegerif, R., Major, L., Mercer, N., Wegerif, R., & Major, L. *The Routledge International Handbook of Research on Dialogic Education* (1st ed, pp.1-13). Routledge. <https://www.perlego.com/book/1596775>
- Yang, L., & Li, R. (2024). ChatGPT for L2 learning: Current status and implications. *System*, 124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103351>
- You, S. (2024). A systematic review of the impact of ChatGPT on higher education. *International Journal of Technology*, 3(1), 1-14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4018/IJTEE.343528>
- Zhao, R., Yunus, M. M., & Rafiq, K. R. M. (2023). The impact of the use of ChatGPT in enhancing students' engagement and learning outcomes in higher education: A review. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(12), 3734-3744. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v13-i12/20258>

