

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

<https://llrjournal.com/index.php/11>

**UNIVERSITY TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF AI-GENERATED
WRITING AND ITS IMPACT ON ACADEMIC WRITING
INSTRUCTION**



Sadaf Bibi^{*1}, Mehak Muneer², Sadia Noreen³

*^{*1}MPhil Scholar, Department of English, Abdul Wali
khan University Mardan
^{2,3}Lecturer, University of Management and Technology
Lahore*

*^{*1}sadafbibi9999@gmail.com*

²mehak.muneer@umt.edu.pk,

³sadia.noreen@umt.edu.pk

Abstract

This study aims to explore university teachers' perceptions of AI-generated writing and its impact on academic writing instruction in Pakistani higher education. The key aims are to investigate the perceptions of teachers regarding the use of AI, determine the perceived advantages and disadvantages of its use, and discuss the impact that these perceptions have on the practices of teaching, feedback, and assessment. The research design embraced in the study is a qualitative research design and within an interpretivist paradigm. The sample is comprised of university teachers, who teach courses related to writing, such as academic writing, English, and communication. The information rich participants of the study with pertinent experience and awareness of AI tools were selected through a purposive sampling technique. The sample size was between 12 and 20 respondents, and this was due to data saturation. Semi-structured interviews were used to collect data, which was flexible and deep. The data obtained were analysed through thematic analysis to find the recurring patterns, meanings and themes. The theoretical perspective of the research is based on interpretivist, which underlines subjective knowledge and social construction of realities. The significant conclusions include that teachers have ambivalent and conditional attitudes to AI-generated writing. They acknowledge its applicability in generating ideas, language support, and writing support, in particular, to ESL learners. Yet, they also raise serious concerns with academic honesty, over reliance, ambiguity in authorship, student voice loss, and critical thinking. The results also suggest that there has been a change in pedagogy with teachers engaging in process-based instruction, reflective feedback, and redesigned assessment practices to guarantee authenticity and transparency. The research has significant pedagogical, policy and practice implications. It highlights the need for clear institutional guidelines, AI literacy, and professional development for teachers. It further proposes the incorporation of AI as an aiding tool and not a alternative to human thought in the teaching of academic writing.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, Academic Writing, Teacher Perceptions, Higher Education, Pakistan, Generative AI, Writing Pedagogy, Assessment Practice.*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Generative artificial intelligence (AI) has rapidly infiltrated the academic community, specifically through tools that may produce outlines, summaries, explanations, and full draughts of academic prose. In the fields connected to writing, this development is consequential in that academic writing is not an artefact completed but a process in which students are trained to produce ideas, to organise evidence, to build arguments and also to develop the voice of an academic. The current literature indicates that instructors and learners currently correlate generative AI with various steps of the

writing process brainstorming, outlining, drafting, revising, feedback, and evaluation. At the same time, according to the literature, there is still a certain level of uncertainty about the issue of acceptable use, institutions preparedness, and the pedagogical implications of such tools (Moorhouse, Yeo, and Wan, 2023; Rashid, Malik, Abbas, and Khan, 2025).

The case has special weight to the faculty in universities, because their beliefs influence the pedagogy of academic writing, assignment construction, and evaluation of student compositions. A comparative analysis of teachers and university learners have shown the existence of minor differences in the use of generative AI in writing between the two groups, however, it also highlighted the need of providing explicit classroom training and focused professional development to instructors (Moorhouse et al., 2023). A more recent study of faculty and student attitudes revealed that the perception of ease of use, ethical concerns, and beliefs about the effects of generative AI on learning affected the attitudes to generative AI in higher education, and that there was a significant difference in attitude across role, gender, and field (Bennett, 2024). These results suggest that teachers react to AI-generated text in complex ways by weighing the possible value against the issues related to ethics, the quality of learning, and equity.

The problem becomes more relevant in Pakistan. A recent survey of the Pakistani higher education students reported high levels of awareness and use of AI tools and that students felt the presence of an apparent impact of AI on their academic writing. The authors, in turn, encouraged the combination of the pedagogical approach and the creation of policy initiatives (Abdullah et al., 2026). Another research article devoted to higher education in Pakistan argued that generative AI applications like ChatGPT, Gemini, and Copilot are becoming new influential forces in educational practise and should be discussed more contextually in universities (Khan et al., 2025). These observations suggest that AI is already apparent in the Pakistani higher education, but its role in teaching on academic writing is still unresolved, especially according to the faculty of universities.

Despite the general discussion of AI in education on a large scale, there is also a strong desire to focus on the research of faculty perceptions in writing classrooms. A lot of the available literature scans AI in higher education generally, attitudes by students, or general institutional issues. There are less studies that explore the specific way that university instructors judge AI-generated writing and how judgments influence academic composition teaching. This gap is particularly vital, as the writing pedagogy is directly concerned with the issues of authorship, originality, revision, feedback, and evaluation. As such, the current research will focus on the faculty of Pakistani large universities and will analyse their perception of AI-generated writing and its effects on teaching academic writing.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

An emerging number of AI-powered writing aids have created confusion among professors in higher education who have to teach academic writing. They might assist students in generating, drafting, and refining their ideas, but also pose quite significant concerns about originality, authorship, academic integrity, overreliance, and development of critical thinking. Current literature already indicates that teachers are already aware of the opportunities and risks and that there is a high number of institutions that are not sufficiently equipped to offer concise information regarding proper use (Moorhouse et al., 2023; Bennett, 2024).

In Pakistan, the available literature substantiates the fact that AI is already known and used in institutions of higher education, and that scholars propose to respond to the use and policy of AI

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

more clearly. However, the qualitative study of the specific perceptions of AI-generated writing by the university faculty in Pakistan regarding the academic composition instruction remains limited. In the absence of such evidences, it is difficult to identify how teachers change their pedagogy, assessment strategies and expectations of student writing. The issue, therefore, lies not in the existence of AI-created writing, which is whether there is a context-specific interpretation of how the educators perceive and react to such writing in the context of university writing classrooms in Pakistan (Rashid et al., 2025; Khan et al., 2025).

Research Questions

This study will address the following questions:

1. How do university teachers in major universities in Pakistan perceive AI-generated writing in the context of academic writing instruction?
2. What benefits and concerns do university teachers associate with students' use of AI-generated writing tools?
3. How do these perceptions influence teachers' approaches to teaching, feedback, and assessment in academic writing courses?

Research Objectives

The study aims to:

1. To explore university teachers' perceptions of AI-generated writing in academic writing instruction.
2. To identify the major perceived benefits and challenges associated with students' use of AI-generated writing tools.
3. To examine how teachers' perceptions shape their instructional, feedback, and assessment practices in academic writing courses.

Significance of the Study

The study is of great significance in pedagogical, institutional, and research aspects. On its part, pedagogically, it emphasizes the role of teachers in developing academic writing and in reacting to AI-written scripts (Moorhouse et al., 2023; Bennett, 2024). Institutionally, it provides context-specific information that can be used to create policies, AI literacy and assessment practises of Pakistani universities (Rashid et al., 2025; Khan et al., 2025). It fills a gap in the research level by providing some qualitative facts about the views of Pakistani university teachers who would help in bringing locally based understanding on AI in higher learning to the global discourse.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Changing Landscape of Higher Education and Generative AI

With the emergence of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) and especially large language models like ChatGPT, higher education has undergone significant change by making advanced text writing accessible to students and instructors with a low cost and relatively limited technical skills. The recent systematic reviews show that GenAI is no longer only a productivity aid but a transformative agent that can change the pedagogical practises, assessment techniques, academic support systems, and institutional policies. In the reviewed literature, two main trends are apparent: first, GenAI is viewed as potentially beneficial to personalised learning, idea generation, feedback,

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

and efficiency, and second, it brings up a significant concern about academic integrity, assessment validity, and overreliance on algorithms (Aljuaid, 2024; Xiao et al., 2025).

This strain presupposes specific importance on the field of higher education since university education is supposed to develop a sense of reasoning, disciplinary thinking, and independent academic expression. An analysis of faculty attitudes revealed that the teachers recognise the usefulness of AI tools, at the same time indicating ethical concerns, technical insecurity, lack of institutional backing, and lack of policies. In addition, the review reported how the role of the instructors changed to the mediation and supervision of AI-generated output as well as critical review, highlighting that AI is not a supplementary component but a driving force in the redefinition of the instructional duties of instructors.

2. Artificial Intelligence Writing and Teacher-Led Writing.

As the studies on AI in writing teaching indicate, the question is not whether the students use AI or not, but how AI changes the very purpose of writing an academic paper on its own. The purpose of academic writing courses is to achieve the skills provided in argumentation, organisation, evidence-based reasoning, citation practises, revision, and authorial voice. One systematic review determined that, despite their potential to aid grammar, style, and drafting, AI tools will not replace the role of academic writing teaching since such classes do not only teach students critical thinking, originality, creativity, research competence, and ethical judgement. Stated differently, AI can be used to assist in certain phases of writing, yet it is not the substitute that the intellectual work which academic writing programmes aim to inculcate.

This statement is further supported by studies that specifically addressed the research topic of writing process. Comparative analysis of educators and university students found that acceptable applications of GenAI in 6 stages of brainstorming, outlining, drafting, revising, feedback provision, and evaluation aroused slight disagreement among teachers and students only. Nevertheless, the study revealed the obvious lack of classroom and institutional readiness as well, and the authors suggest the specific guidelines and teacher training. The given study is especially relevant to the present proposal since it depicts that the applications of AI to writing are already varied and normalised, and yet teachers often do not have a consistent pedagogy to regulate it.

The literature also proposes that AI can have a selective but not a uniform effect on the teaching of writing. The strengths of ChatGPT are reported as being in support of generating ideas, providing automated help, explaining clarification, and assessing writing, whereas the weaknesses of the system include providing wrong information, creating fabricated references and references and lacking critical thinking. During the product stage of learning, the association with assessment support and feedback (ChatGPT) has associated threats like academic dishonesty and unfair advantage. These results are quite applicable to the academic writing teaching as writing assignments are especially prone to the invisible hand of AI support and the pretentious pretence of originality.

4. Academic Integrity, Authorship, and Assessment

The greatest issue reported in literature is the one of academic integrity. In a qualitative research of students and higher education staff, it was observed that AI tools were recognised to increase productivity and interactive learning, however, they were simultaneously seen as an immediate threat to academic integrity. The need to have explicit institutional policies, ethical direction and

systematic support was highlighted by the authors (Zhai et al., 2024). This is important to writing instruction because the problems of authorship and originality are not marginal issues in the context of writing classes; but they are the essence of the instruction, evaluation and appreciation of writing.

Extended analyses support the fact that this is not anecdotal. In a systematic review of GenAI and academic integrity in higher education, Xiao et al. (2025) found the common themes of AI-assisted cheating, ethical application in education, and effects on engagement and honesty. The review reasoned that the institutions of higher education are under pressure to strike a balance between the educational value of GenAI and the dangers it poses to assessment validity and honest scholarship. This creates an exceptionally acute dilemma in the case of academic writing teachers who often have to not only evaluate the quality of a text, but also evaluate the genuineness of the effort that underlies it.

The problem of assessment indicated in the literature is also not only disciplinary but pedagogical one. In case a teacher cannot easily identify which parts of the text are student created and which text is AI generated, then the traditional take-home essays may cease to be the intended measure. Therefore, more process-based, reflective, oral and in-class assessment designs have been promoted by scholars. Even though some of these pieces of advice are generally based, they suggest a more widespread change: teachers might be forced to assess the writing process, explanations, and decision-making more than finalised products (Aljuaid, 2024; Xiao et al., 2025).

5. The Pakistani Higher Education Context

This study is required in the context of Pakistan. A study carried out on students at higher institutions of learning in Pakistan reveals that AI has been already incorporated into academic writing. Rashid, Malik, Abbas, and Khan (2025) have conducted the survey of 229 university students, and the majority of them agreed about knowledge, use, and effect of AI on their academic writing. Their research advised that educational institutions should implement AI as a learning device and at the same time establish a more detailed policy. This observation is noteworthy in that it demonstrates that student use is not hypothetical, but it has become so extensive that it is already influencing writing behaviour and expectations.

The other studies that have been related to the higher education system in Pakistan show that there is an increasing acceptance of AI-based academic support. Shamim et al. (2024) found that performance expectancy, effort expectancy, information accuracy, pedagogical fit, and interaction were variables that affect the acceptance of AI tools, and the utilisation of AI tools is related to increased student satisfaction and better learning outcomes. In spite of the fact that the research was conducted among students and not teachers, it is still significant as it shows that the adoption of AI in higher education in Pakistan is associated with the perceived usefulness and educational fit, but not novelty.

Most importantly related to the present proposal, Jomezai, Baloch, Jaffar, and Khilji (2025) discovered that the faculty of Pakistani universities linked generative AI with opportunities and threats. Anticipated opportunities were better learning results, research productivity, personalised learning, and generation of content; challenges that were anticipated included data privacy, unreliable results, overreliance, cheating, plagiarism, and loss of critical thinking. This research is one of the nearest to the current project due to its qualitative orientation and the target of the research being on Pakistani faculty of the university. Nevertheless, it is not limited to academic-

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

writing instruction; it addresses the nature of teaching and learning in general instead of focusing on writing pedagogy, feedback and assessment. This creates a gap with which the present study fits.

6. Gap in the Literature

There are 5 patterns that are identified in the literature. Generative AI is a major problem in the university education sector. The area that is largely affected is writing especially during the brainstorming, drafting, revision and feedback stages. Instructors also have ambivalent attitudes, where some believe that the advantages are significant but they have issues over ethics, critical thinking and assessment. There is still lack of institutional preparedness and policy. Utilisation of AI can be observed in Pakistan, but the studies on the academic writing pedagogy are scarce. Therefore, qualitative interviews were needed to explore the perception, boundaries, and pedagogical reaction of the teachers.

Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The research design used in this study was qualitative. It was selected since the study aimed at investigating the perceptions and experiences of the teachers. The qualitative research fits well in identification of senses in context (Creswell, 2014). The simplicity of interpretive method was used to examine understanding of classroom by teachers. The quantitative design was eliminated as the study was not a test of variables. Mixed methods were also omitted because depth was considered to be the most important compared to breadth. Thus, the purpose of the study best corresponded with qualitative design (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016).

3.2 Research Paradigm

The paradigm the study was based on was the interpretivist paradigm. Interpretivism assumes that reality is constructed socially in a way that is based on experience. This was appropriate since the opinions of teachers are formed in practise and situation. This research focused more on meanings and not objective measurement (Creswell, 2014). Positivism was not chosen since it aims to obtain measurable and general laws, which cannot be done when dealing with subjective aspects of teacher perceptions. Based on this, interpretivism was the most appropriate in this study (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016).

3.3 Research Setting

The research was carried out in Pakistani higher institutions. The reason behind the selection of these institutions is that AI writing is more apparent in the higher education field. The classrooms at the university present the pertinent locations of writing training and evaluation. This environment corresponded to the academic writing pedagogy. The schools were not included as the research involved writing at the level of the university. Participants were also given the direct exposure to digital tools in major universities. Therefore, the environment was suitable to the purpose of the research.

3.4 Population

The sample included the teachers of writing-related courses at the university. These included academic writing, English and communication teachers. They were chosen as these directly teach

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

and evaluate student writing. The research questions were relevant to them because of their professional role. Main population did not include teachers who taught other unrelated subjects. This would have provided less pertinent pedagogical input by such participants. Thus, the population that was chosen was logical to the study.

3.5 Sampling Technique

The research utilised the purposive sampling. The method is suitable in the selection of information rich participants (Patton, 2002). The researcher needed teachers who had the pertinent teaching experience and AI awareness. In this qualitative study, random sampling was inappropriate. It could have involved people who had low awareness about the issue. In qualitative researches, relevance and depth are valued more than statistical representation. In such a way, the objectives of this research were the best to be met by purposive sampling (Creswell, 2014).

3.6 Sample Size

It was a sample of about 12-20 teachers. This scale was appropriate in producing qualitative data in details. Qualitative researches normally favour depth rather than numbers. The ultimate size was based on data saturation (Guest, Bunce, and Johnson, 2006). An interpretive interview study did not require a bigger sample. The very limited sample would have limited their development of themes. In this regard, this was an adequate range of analysis.

3.7 Inclusion Criteria

The participants were required to deliver writing related courses in the university. They were also required to have the bare minimum knowledge of AI writing tools like ChatGPT. Such criteria were relevant to the research problem. The participants needed to have experience on student writing and assessment practises. Those teachers who did not have such exposure were not included. Their replies may not have touched the subject matter on a meaningful basis. Therefore, the standards boosted the quality of the gathered information.

3.8 Data Collection Tool

The semi-structured interview was used as the major instrument of data collection. It gave the ease of common questions and open-ended probing (Kallio et al., 2016). It was appropriate to examine beliefs, areas of concern and experiences in classrooms. The main tool was not to utilise structured questionnaires. They restrain discussion and narrow the answers. The focus groups were also not used as individual perspectives were needed. Thus, the most suitable option of the study was the semi-structured interviews.

3.9 Interview Guide

A pre-data collection interview guide was made. It included questions of meaning, advantages, dangers, and instructional reactions. The guide was able to keep the research questions in mind. It also put out the option of follow-up questions to elucidate and expand. Unstructured interview format was not chosen fully. This kind of format may decrease consistency among participants. Therefore, the guide enhanced focus and flexibility (Kallio et al., 2016).

3.10 Data Collection Procedure

Before collecting the data, permission was sought with the relevant departments. The potential participants were then contacted and informed on the study. The interviews were held either online or face to face. The interviews were about 3045 minutes each. Audio recording of interviews was done with permission. Detailed analysis could not be carried out using field notes. Therefore, a good data collection process was provided by recording and transcription.

3.11 Data Analysis

The thematic analysis was employed to conduct the analysis of the data. It is a technique that helps in determining trends in qualitative data (Braun and Clarke, 2006). It was suitable as the research was required to investigate recurring ideas and senses. The researcher had to make familiarity by initially reading transcripts several times. The meaningful statements were then coded and formed into themes. It did not apply statistical analysis on the data since the data were not numerical. As a result, the most appropriate method was thematic analysis.

3.13 Ethical Considerations

The whole research was conducted with reference to ethical principles. The participants were advised about the study before the interviews. Informed consent was used as the basis of participation. Data confidentiality by not using names and identification information was maintained. The respondents also had the right to drop out at any point. Such precautions were necessary since professional opinions were at stake. In this regard, the research followed the normal ethical principles of research (Belmont Report, 1979).

Findings and Discussion

4.1 Findings: A Thematic Analysis of University Teachers' Perceptions of AI-Generated Writing

The data received during the semi-structured interview provided a complex picture of how the teaching staffs of big universities in Pakistan views AI-generated writing and its impact on the teaching of academic writing. The analysis gave out three superordinate themes that had sub-themes that elaborated on the finer details of how teachers see, feel and respond to the situation.

Table 4.1

Thematic Map of Findings adopted from Shahabullah et al., (2025)

Superordinate Theme	Sub-themes
Theme 1: The Paradox of AI-Generated Writing: A Source of Both Support and Pedagogical Unease	1.1 AI as a scaffold for idea generation and language support 1.2 Academic writing as intellectual process: why AI cannot become the author
Theme 2: The Benefits–Risks Continuum: Efficiency, Integrity, and the Erosion of Writerly Agency	2.1 Practical gains: speed, accessibility, and independent support 2.2 Ethical and epistemic risks: overdependence, authorship ambiguity, loss of voice, fairness, and

Theme 3: Reconfiguring Academic Writing Pedagogy in the AI Era	weakened critical thinking
	3.1 Process-based teaching and reflective feedback
	3.2 Assessment redesign for authenticity, transparency, and oral accountability

Theme 1: The Paradox of AI-Generated Writing: A Source of Both Support and Pedagogical Unease

The first overarching theme is the theme of the inconsistent and still ambiguous attitudes of the teachers toward AI-generated writing. The participants did not develop AI as something that is either harmful or beneficial. They rather referred to it as pedagogical innovation which can be employed to assist students in particular elements of the writing process and at the same time, threatens the more serious educational roles of academic writing. Their answers show that AI is deemed to be acceptable when it is submissive to the student thinking.

1.1 AI as a Scaffold for Idea Generation and Language Support

Among the general tendencies in responses, there was a tendency that the use of AI in writing is deemed to be helpful in helping students to begin writing, organize their thoughts, and improve linguistic expression. This was especially so among the students who find it hard to write academic texts in the English language. In this respect, educators do not consider AI as the illegitimate tool because it can provide scaffold at the low and superficial levels of writing.

One participant explained:

“I believe that writing AI-generated is both good and bad, on the one hand, it assists students in generating ideas, to construct their sentences and organize their thoughts quicker, whereas on the other hand, academic writing is not only about writing a clean paragraph or an essay; it is also about learning to think critically, to construct an argument, and to express personal thoughts.” (Participant 1)

Another participant similarly emphasized its value for weaker writers:

“The AI-written writing is not entirely bad, in my case, since it can be useful with weak students, in terms of grammar, vocabulary, and sentence structure. Meanwhile, I am afraid that the students will believe that the language correction is at par with the writing skills, as far as the university is concerned. Language correction is not the only writing, but also argument, evidence and critical thought, and voice..” (Participant 4)

According to these testimonies, teachers admit that AI can be used pedagogically on the support level and only in the situations when the learner is actively involved in meaning-making and text-building.

1.2 Academic Writing as Intellectual Process: Why AI Cannot Become the Author

The second sub-theme is connected with the distinction which the teachers made between writing as a finished product and writing as a learning process. The respondents mentioned several times that their perception of AI is defined by the conceptualization of academic writing. However, as long as the writing can be regarded as a sophisticated product, AI appears effective and attractive. However, in case writing is considered as a reflective, revisionary, argumentative, and voice-making process, AI is even worse.

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

This was clearly articulated by one respondent:

“It is possible that depending on how teachers define writing will make the difference between the perceptions of AI by them. Writing as a final product can be considered to be most efficient with the help of AI. The process of writing will be more complicated and demanding when it is regarded as a learning, reflection, and revision process. As an individual, I would consider AI as a support, rather than an author.” (Participant 5)

Another participant linked this directly to the current reality of higher education:

“My perception is that AI-generated writing has become a reality in higher education, and teachers cannot ignore it anymore. Many students are already using tools like ChatGPT for writing assignments, whether openly or secretly. I do not think complete rejection is practical. However, I also believe its use must be controlled because otherwise students may stop engaging with the actual learning process.” (Participant 2)

Together, these responses show that teachers perceive AI-generated writing through a framework of **conditional legitimacy**: it may assist writing, but it cannot legitimately replace the student as the intellectual author of the text.

Theme 2: The Benefits–Risks Continuum: Efficiency, Integrity, and the Erosion of Writerly Agency

The second overarching theme deals with the advantages and issues that teachers have about the use of AI-generated writing tools by students. The feedback of participants demonstrates a great duality: AI is perceived as effective, convenient, and even empowering, yet as being ethically dangerous and pedagogically poisonous when abused.

2.1 Practical Gains: Speed, Accessibility, and Independent Support

Respondents found several tangible advantages of writing aids generated by AI. They comprised the assistance in brainstorming, outlining, grammar correction, vocabulary improvement, coherence, and immediate help during the hours beyond the classroom. These affordances were especially appreciated in an ESL setting where learners frequently find it difficult to communicate in English using complex thoughts.

One teacher explained:

Among the key advantages, one can mention that AI can assist students with getting started in writing. A significant number of students are afraid of the blank page, so AI can provide them with a basic idea of how the paper should be structured or what their introduction should look like, or what their outline should contain. (Participant 6)

Another participant focused on language support:

“I believe that AI can be useful in language support. In Pakistan, most students learn the language in universities, but they are not entirely at ease with the idea of expressing their complex thoughts in English, AI can assist ESL learners to communicate better. (Participant 7)

A third respondent highlighted the value of immediacy:

Speed and accessibility is another advantage. Students can receive immediate feedback at any time without having to wait till they see the teacher. When used correctly, AI can become an assistant, suggesting their corrections, rephrasing clumsy sentences, and providing advice on how to make their writing coherent. (Participant 8)

These responses indicate that teachers do not deny the practical utility of AI. Instead, they understand that it is able to decrease the anxiety about writing, offer linguistic mediation and extend

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

classroom-based assistance.

2.2 Ethical and Epistemic Risks: Overdependence, Authorship Ambiguity, Loss of Voice, Fairness, and Weakened Critical Thinking

Although they recognized such advantages, interviewees raised more profound and detailed concerns about the impact of AI-dependent students. The most noticeable issues were the overreliance, the lack of authorship, the scholarly honesty, the false or fake information, the loss of the authentic student voice, unfair benefit and the lack of critical thinking.

One participant defined overdependence as the central danger:

Overdependence is my greatest fear: when the students over-rely on AI, they might not think or learn anymore; they might present a well-written piece of writing, but it might not reflect their personal thoughts or learning. (Participant 10)

Another respondent tied this directly to assessment problems:

“The issue of academic integrity is another concern. It is hard to determine that the writing is actually written by the student or it is created by the AI. This raises serious concerns in assessment as we might be assessing the performance of the tool and not the student. (Participant 11)

The epistemic quality of AI-generated text was also questioned:

Among them is a worry that AI tends to create content that appears to be academically solid, but on closer inspection, might be filled with ambiguous thoughts, lack of accuracy, or even forged lines of reference. Students can sometimes believe it too readily and fail to scrutinize the content. (Participant 12)

The loss of voice and fairness emerged in equally strong terms:

I am concerned about losing student voice. Academic writing must reflect the thinking, tone, and interest of the learner in the subject matter but AI-generated text often comes across as generic. When used excessively, their writing might become sterile but far less genuine. (Participant 13)

“Fairness is another concern as some students are better than others at using AI prompts, and it could be an unequal learning process. (Participant 14)

Finally, one participant made the cognitive risk explicit:

I believe that critical thinking is in danger; students often write independently, reflect, revise, and get better at the process of academic writing, but when it is AI-giving them ready-made answers, they might not go through the deep thinking process that academic writing is meant to train. (Participant 15)

This theme thus demonstrates that concerns of teachers are not confined to plagiarism in a strict sense. They reach to authorship, epistemic reliability, learning equity, and long-term development of student agency as writers.

Theme 3: Reconfiguring Academic Writing Pedagogy in the AI Era

The third higher order theme is the way the perception of AI-generated writing by teachers is transforming pedagogy. The respondents did not identify themselves as passive observers of technological change; instead, they indicated that they have been actively changing their teaching, feedback, and assessment patterns as a reaction to AI.

3.1 Process-Based Teaching and Reflective Feedback

One significant pedagogical change that is apparent in the interviews is the move to no longer rely

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

on the final written product alone and instead making the writing process more visible. The teachers stated that they needed outlines, drafts, and brainstorming notes, classroom writing, and reflective explanation to learn more about the development of their texts by the students.

One participant stated:

The participant has begun to structure writing tasks more processually, that is, by requesting students to provide outlines, drafts, brainstorming notes, and revision stages of their writing. It enables the participant to see how the writing process is occurring and whether students are actually engaging in the process (Participant 17)

Another respondent emphasized classroom writing and oral follow-up:

Due to AI, I have started paying more attention to classroom writing. In-class assignments enable me to evaluate the true writing capacity of the students. I also pose questions regarding their arguments to be able to assess whether they really did comprehend what they have handed in or not. (Participant 18)

The same shift appears in feedback practices:

As AI has increased my ability to focus more on reasoning and originality, as opposed to just grammar, I will attempt to assess whether the student has an actual argument, support that is relevant, and a personal grasp of the subject. (Participant 19)

Another participant described feedback as reflective dialogue:

I also get students to justify their decisions in writing, such as why they chose a particular source, how they came up with the thesis, or why they amended a paragraph in a particular manner. This sort of reflective feedback process can help minimize blind reliance on AI. (Participant 20)

These reactions indicate that AI is hastening a pedagogical transformation towards writing as a traceable, explainable and developmental practice.

3.2 Assessment Redesign for Authenticity, Transparency, and Oral Accountability

The second sub-theme in this superordinate theme is that of assessment. The respondents all stated that AI has made them more aware of take-home writing and more attracted to multimodal, process-based and transparent assessment.

One teacher explained:

I have learned to be more cautious with take-home assignments in assessment since they are the simplest to complete with AI support, which is why now I want to use mixed assessment, including presentations, in-class writing, viva, and draft-based assessment, so that I can evaluate the product and the process. (Participant 22)

Another respondent stressed the need to redefine assessment criteria themselves:

I believe that now teachers should redesign assessment standards. We cannot test only polished language since AI can do that. We should test the development of ideas, the level of analysis, use of evidence, thought, and the capability of the student to support writing. (Participant 23)

Transparency was also presented as an ethical principle of assessment:

The attitude toward AI has made me more open to using it, as well as more skeptical. I do not want AI to be banned, but I think that evaluation needs to be transparent because students need to state whether they have used it or not and how they used it to make the process more ethical and more realistic. (Participant 24)

Finally, one participant captured the changing logic of evaluation succinctly:

The participant 25 is of the opinion that she has learned to appreciate authenticity over perfection;

she used to think that a well-written and refined essay is always impressive, but now she pays more attention to the fact that the writing should be on the level of the student, whether he/she has taken part in the classroom, and whether he/she has actually understood the material. (Participant 25)

This last theme reveals that teachers are not merely instinctively responding defensively to AI-generated writing. They are reconstructing pedagogical and evaluative methods of authenticity, explanation and visible engagement.

4.2 Discussion

The first noteworthy implication of this study is that the attitude of teachers in universities towards AI-generated writing was conditional and ambivalent. They did not make it to be good or bad, but they just accepted it as the partial support.

means not without stimulating its use as a substitute to intellectual work of students. This explanation is quite in line with Cabellos, de Aldama, and Pozo (2024), who have found that the teachers of the university considered GenAI not only as an opportunity but also as a threat, as the two sides were almost equalised. It also backs the position of Barrett and Pack (2023) whose work has shown that both teachers and students were more permissive in the application of the GenAI to only a limited amount of writing process, but not to the process of submitting work written by AI as original. Kohnke, Moorhouse, and Zou (2023) also identified that in the realm of language teaching, university language educators were aware of the possibilities and the challenges of using GenAI. The current study reinforces these results by demonstrating that teacher ambivalence in Pakistani academic writing classrooms is not haphazard, but rather based on a process-based conceptualization regarding writing, whose focus is on authorship, argumentation, and critical interaction.

The second significant result is about the perceived advantages of AI-written texts. The individuals who were interacted with AI attributed it to assistance with brainstorming, sorting of thoughts, better grammar and vocabulary, faster revision process and receiving a non-classroom based support more readily. This is consistent with Maphoto et al. (2024) who concluded that the academic writing environment with the use of generative AI has a positive impact on the teaching and learning process and offers a chance to establish new pedagogical directions. It also coincides with the scoping review by Law (2024) that said that GenAI in language teaching and learning is related both to practical advantages and pedagogical opportunities, as long as its usage is responsibly managed. At that, the research article under consideration confirms an important tendency of the existing body of applied linguistics research: the teachers do not deny the pertinence of AI, especially when it comes to the students who need to speak English as a second language. The unique aspects of the data are that this usefulness is considered scaffolding, rather than the fact that AI can substitute the teaching of academic writing per se.

At the same time, the findings also show that the issues that teachers were concerned with were more present and elaborate than optimism. They raised the issues of excessive reliance, academic honesty, lack of clarity about the authorship, loss of student agency, inequality, misdirection, inability to think critically on a number of occasions. This tendency is quite similar to the research by Jomezai et al. (2025) conducted in Pakistan which found the opportunities and challenges, however, singling out overreliance, cheating, plagiarism, unreliable results, and the loss of critical thinking. The present study aligns with the findings of Fleckenstein et al. (2024), who found that the educators did not necessarily succeed in identifying the AI-generated essays, and they were very

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

sure about their choice. This point is reinforced by Perkins et al. (2024) who found out that simple forms of manipulation progressively reduced the accuracy of the detector generating AI-detection devices as an independent integrity measure. Collectively, these studies describe why the concerns surrounding authenticity among teachers in the research were so high: these issues are not hypothetical, but various pieces of evidence indicate that AI-generated writing may be difficult to identify and easy to abuse.

One of the most significant pieces of evidence provided by the present study is that teachers are not reacting to AI with the sense of anxiety only, but are reorganising the pedagogy as well. The participants claimed that they utilized more outlines, draughts, brainstorming notes, in-class writing, oral questioning, and reflective explanation. This can be directly compared to the analysis of the world-leading universities by Moorhouse, Yeo, and Wan (2023), who found out that the new wave of assessment advice suggests two things: placing testing tasks into the domain that GenAI can analyze, and revamping assessment to make the application of AI conspicuous and instructive rather than hidden. The results also relate to Rahimi and Sevilla-Pavon (2024) that discovered that the willingness of teachers to utilise ChatGPT was associated with innovation and responsibility in language teaching. In addition, Law (2024) says that in order to successfully integrate GenAI, one has to continuously evolve as a teacher. The present study takes this knowledge a step further in demonstrating how this is already being imagined at the classroom level in Pakistan: teachers are moving towards process, reflection, oral defence and transparency as more sure methods of learning.

The results of the feedback and assessment are also significant. The teachers interviewed in this paper reported that they emphasized less on grammatical polish and more on reasoning, originality, use of evidence and the student in that particular writing decision. This position is closely related to the results of Cabellos et al. (2024), who discovered that the teachers were especially optimistic about GenAI in relation to the role of a teacher teacher, but they were more negative concerning the learning processes of the students. This difference can also be observed in the figures: teachers were relatively willing to implement AI as a supporting asset, but much less willing to accept it when it comes to situations where the integrity of learning and testing was jeopardized. Similarly, Barrett and Pack (2023) also highlighted the lack of institutional and classroom-based readiness and the need to have clear instructions. The findings carry on the same line of research by revealing the practical consequences of such ill equipping in academic writing courses: teachers are increasingly valuing authenticity and not perfection and they are discovering learning in justification, writing and defence and polished prose.

In general, it is possible to say that the discussion indicates that the current study is a good fit in the emerging international literature; however, there is also a contribution that is context-specific. Similar to other researchers, it shows that the perceptions of AI by teachers are ambivalent, negotiated, and pedagogical. In contrast to larger-scale studies of a faculty, this report is narrowed down to the topic of academic writing teaching in Pakistani universities, thus covering the issues which are of particular interest to the applied linguistics area: the topic of authorship, voice, revision, argumentation, and the purpose of writing as a developmental activity. In this respect, the study supplements the larger Pakistani results of Jogezei et al. (2025) by demonstrating how the opportunities and threats of GenAI are more accentuated through the prism of academic writing pedagogy and not higher education; in general. It also echoes the synthesis of the Shahabullah paper that is posted that thematic findings are not merely descriptive but instead interpreted to be a pointer

to an underlying problem between the goal of education and the changing learning environments.

Conclusion

This paper finds that AI writing has brought a major change in writing practices of academic writing in Pakistani universities. University educators do not perceive AI as a purely positive or negative thing. Rather, they have ambivalent and conditional perceptions. AI is welcomed as a facilitating device in generating ideas, language proficiency, and writing assistance, especially among students with low levels of English proficiency. Meanwhile, educators are deeply concerned with issues of academic integrity, overdependence, ambiguity of authorship, and degradation of critical thinking. These issues point to the fact that academic writing is not merely the act of writing a polished work but that it involves the establishment of reasoning, voice, and intellectual thought processes. The student cannot be, therefore, substituted by AI as the knowledge author. The results also indicate that teachers are in the process of changing their pedagogical methods actively. Product based evaluation is being replaced by process based teaching. Teachers are focusing on drafts, reflections, in-class writing, and oral explanations so that they can promote real learning. The practice of assessment is also being redesigned with transparency, originality and accountability of the student being given priority. In general, the research confirms that AI is no longer a matter of choice in the field of higher education. It is a fact that must be intelligently incorporated as opposed to being rejected. The role of teachers is shifting towards being not content evaluators, but facilitators of critical interaction with AI-assisted writing.

References

- Abdullah, A., Alam, A., & Rafi, K. (2026). Gendered participation and voice in an ESL classroom: A qualitative case study of feminist pedagogical practices. *Journal of Media Horizons*, 7(1), 143–156.
- Aljuaid, H. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence tools on academic writing instruction in higher education: A systematic review. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on ChatGPT*, 26–55. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/ChatGPT.2>
- Barrett, A., & Pack, A. (2023). Not quite eye to A.I.: Student and teacher perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence in the writing process. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20, 59. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00427-0>
- Bennett, L. M. (2024). Examining faculty and student perceptions of generative AI in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education*.
- Buele, J. B., & Llerena-Aguirre, L. L. (2025). Transformations in academic work and faculty perceptions of artificial intelligence in higher education. *Frontiers in Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2025.1603763>
- Cabellos, B., de Aldama, C., & Pozo, J.-I. (2024). University teachers' beliefs about the use of generative artificial intelligence for teaching and learning. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1468900. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1468900>
- Jogezai, N. A., Baloch, F. A., Jaffar, M., & Khilji, G. (2025). Generative AI in higher education: University faculty perspectives on opportunities and challenges. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 26(3), 128–143. <https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.1530814>
- Khan, ——. (2025). Impact of generative models on higher education: Exploring pedagogical practices in Pakistani higher education institutions. *Education and Information Technologies*.

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

- Kim, J., Klopfer, M., Grohs, J. R., Eldardiry, H., Weichert, J., Cox, L. A., II, & Pike, D. (2025). Examining faculty and student perceptions of generative AI in university courses. *Innovative Higher Education*, 50, 1281–1313. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-024-09774-w>
- Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023). Exploring generative artificial intelligence preparedness among university language instructors: A case study. *Computers & Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 5, 100156.
- Law, L. (2024). Application of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in language teaching and learning: A scoping literature review. *Computers and Education Open*, 6, 100174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2024.100174>
- Mai, D. T. T., Da, C. V., & Hanh, N. V. (2024). The use of ChatGPT in teaching and learning: A systematic review through SWOT analysis approach. *Frontiers in Education*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1328769>
- Mamo, Y., Crompton, H., Burke, D., & Nickel, C. (2024). Higher education faculty perceptions of ChatGPT and the influencing factors: A sentiment analysis of X. *TechTrends*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-024-00954-1>
- Maphoto, K. B., Sevnarayan, K., Mohale, N. E., Suliman, Z., Ntsopi, T. J., & Mokoena, D. (2024). Advancing students' academic excellence in distance education: Exploring the potential of generative AI integration to improve academic writing skills. *Open Praxis*, 16(2), 142–159. <https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.16.2.649>
- Moorhouse, B. L., Yeo, M. A., & Wan, Y. (2023a). Not quite eye to A.I.: Student and teacher perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence in the writing process. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20, Article 59.
- Moorhouse, B. L., Yeo, M. A., & Wan, Y. (2023b). Generative AI tools and assessment: Guidelines of the world's top-ranking universities. *Computers and Education Open*, 5, 100151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2023.100151>
- Perkins, M., Roe, J., Vu, B. H., Postma, D., Hickerson, D., McGaughran, J., & Khuat, H. Q. (2024). Simple techniques to bypass GenAI text detectors: Implications for inclusive education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21, 53. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00487-w>
- Rahimi, A. R., & Sevilla-Pavón, A. (2024). The role of ChatGPT readiness in shaping language teachers' language teaching innovation and meeting accountability: A bisymmetric approach. *Computers & Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 100258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100258>
- Rashid, S., Malik, S., Abbas, F., & Khan, J. A. (2025). Pakistani students' perceptions about knowledge, use and impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on academic writing: A case study. *Journal of Computers in Education*, 12, 1053–1078. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40692-024-00338-7>
- Shahabullah, S., Abdullah, A., & Hussain, A. (2025). A qualitative analysis of English language learning in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, 14(2), 1765–1778.
- Shamim, A., Akhter, N., et al. (2024). Investigating AI-based academic support acceptance and its impact on students' performance in Malaysian and Pakistani higher education institutions. *Education and Information Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12599-x>

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

Xiao, X., et al. (2025). Generative AI and academic integrity in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda. *Information*, 16(4), 296.

Zhai, X., et al. (2024). ChatGPT unveiled: Understanding perceptions of academic integrity in higher education—A qualitative approach. *Journal of Academic Ethics*.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-024-09543-6>