TESOL GRADUATES' VIEWS ON THE IMPACTS AND ETHICAL ASPECTS OF CHATGPT IN ACADEMIC WRITING

Vo Phan Thu Ngan

Foreign Languages Faculty, Dong Thap University, Cao Lanh 870000, Vietnam
Email: vptngan@dthu.edu.vn

Abstract

The integration of ChatGPT into education is gaining global attention from researchers. Several studies have explored this issue in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam; however, further graduate research is needed to fully understand its impacts. Therefore, this research was conducted at one of the universities in the Mekong Delta to investigate TESOL graduates' views regarding the benefits, challenges and ethical considerations of using this tool in supporting their academic writing. A mixed-methods approach was adopted, involving surveying 68 students and interviewing 9 participants. Findings indicate that students find ChatGPT helpful for their academic writing such as proofreading, improving coherence and paraphrasing. However, there exist certain limitations like potential plagiarism, data accuracy and reliability and learners' passivity. The study suggests the necessity for clear guidelines and training to maximize ChatGPT's benefits while maintaining academic honesty. These insights highlight the importance of balanced AI integration in education to foster students' critical thinking and writing skills.

Keywords: *ChatGPT use, ethical concerns, perceptions, TESOL graduates.*

QUAN ĐIỂM CỦA HỌC VIÊN SAU ĐẠI HỌC CHUYÊN NGÀNH GIẢNG DẠY TIẾNG ANH VỀ CÁC TÁC ĐỘNG VÀ KHÍA CẠNH ĐẠO ĐỨC CỦA CHATGPT TRONG HỖ TRỢ VIẾT HỌC THUẬT

Võ Phan Thu Ngân

Khoa Ngoại ngữ, Trường Đại học Đồng Tháp, Việt Nam
Email: vptngan@dthu.edu.vn

Tóm tắt

Việc tích hợp ChatGPT vào giáo dục đang thu hút sự chú ý của các nhà nghiên cứu trên toàn cầu. Một số nghiên cứu đã khám phá vấn đề này ở Đồng bằng sông Cửu Long, Việt Nam; tuy nhiên, cần có thêm các nghiên cứu sau đại học để hiểu rõ hơn về những tác động của ChatGPT. Do đó, nghiên cứu này được tiến hành tại một trong những trường đại học ở Đồng bằng sông Cửu Long nhằm tìm hiểu quan điểm của học viên sau đại học chuyên ngành giảng dạy tiếng Anh về lợi ích, thách thức và các cân nhắc đạo đức khi sử dụng ChatGPT để hỗ trợ viết bài học thuật. Nghiên cứu áp dụng phương pháp hỗn hợp, bao gồm khảo sát 68 học viên và phỏng vấn 9 người tham gia. Kết quả cho thấy học viên cho rằng ChatGPT hữu ích trong việc viết bài học thuật, chẳng hạn như việc hiệu đính, cải thiện sự mạch lạc và diễn đạt lại. Tuy nhiên, có một số hạn chế khi sử dụng ChatGPT, bao gồm nguy cơ đạo văn, độ chính xác và tin cậy của dữ liệu, cũng như sự thụ động của người học. Nghiên cứu đề xuất cần có hướng dẫn và đào tạo cụ thể để tận dụng tối đa lợi ích của ChatGPT mà vẫn duy trì tính trung thực trong học thuật. Những phát hiện này nhấn mạnh tầm quan trọng của việc tích hợp AI một cách hợp lý trong giáo dục để phát triển tư duy phản biện và kỹ năng viết của người học.

Từ khóa: *Lo ngại về mặt đạo đức, học viên sau đại học chuyên ngành tiếng Anh, nhận thức, sử dụng ChatGPT.*

1. Introduction

Academic writing is a distinct form of communication characterized by its technical nature, coherent organization, and scholarly purpose (Barasa, 2024; Gurung, 2022). It involves critical analysis, evidence-based argumentation, and engagement with existing knowledge (Barasa, 2024). Key features include clear structure, task achievement, cohesion, and appropriate language use (AL-Muslimawi). Academic writing is essential for graduate students' success in their studies, research and professional careers. It enables them to express their ideas clearly in research papers, reports, and proposals (Wijaya & Mbato, 2020), contributing to the scholarly discussion in their fields (Hass & Lenong, 2021). In this academic setting, graduates are required to use critical thinking and actively analyse and synthesize research methods (Wijaya, 2022). Academic writing improves their analysis, argumentation, and evaluation (Wijaya, 2022; Zanaty, 2021) by teaching them data retrieval, appraisal, and citation (Fakhry, 2023). Although writing courses are available for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) graduates, they face many challenges in writing their assignments (Aldabbus & Almansouri, 2022; Ebadi & Pourahmadi, 2019; Tran, Hogg, & Marshall, 2022). Li (2023) found that the challenges EFL learners encounter in academic writing not only involve linguistic issues such as the selection of words and sentence patterns, but also literature processing such as the selection of topics, the processing of literature, the collection and analysis of data, discussion, and logical reasoning.

The advent of AI tools like ChatGPT, a language model chatbot, has introduced new ways to assist students with academic writing assignments. These tools can generate text that closely mimics human writing, making the writing process easier, enhancing writing abilities, and providing timely, relevant information (Rababah et al., 2024). With the rising usage of ChatGPT in higher education, it is essential to understand graduates' views on the benefits, drawbacks and overall perceptions of AI technology in academic writing tasks. Some critics argue that the use of this tool may lead to dishonest behaviour such as plagiarism, while proponents argue that the tool can enhance student learning and reduce the workload for teachers (Kirk, 2023). In short, there is no agreement on the role of ChatGPT in education.

Recently, the application of artificial intelligence has attracted increasing attention in Vietnam, especially in the fields of education, TESOL, and linguistics. Several studies have shown that Vietnamese students consider ChatGPT a useful tool to improve writing quality, if the tool is properly integrated into the education system and students are adequately trained (Nga, 2022; Nguyen et al., 2022; Nguyen, 2024; Thanh Quy et al., 2019). It is important to consider issues such as the accuracy of information from ChatGPT and the potential risk of students becoming too dependent on this tool, which may potentially hinder critical thinking and problem-solving skills (Ngo, 2023; Onal, 2023). This suggests that there is a need for a study focusing on the views of TESOL graduates on the use of ChatGPT in thesis writing in Vietnam. To address the current research problem and the gaps in the literature, this study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the benefits and challenges of ChatGPT for academic writing?

2. What are the ethical aspects of using ChatGPT for academic writing?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Benefits of Using ChatGPT in Academia

ChatGPT has become an important tool in academic settings, significantly improving writing and research efficiency. It assists in the development of scientific papers, from searching for literature, developing ideas, to drafting sections of the paper (AlZaabi et al., 2023; Shijun et al., 2023). In particular, for non-native English learners, ChatGPT helps them achieve the high language standards required to be recognized in academic journals, increasing the likelihood of acceptance (AlZaabi et al., 2023; Himel & Shaikat, 2023; Osama et al., 2023; Sung Il et al., 2023; Xiangmin et al., 2023). In addition, ChatGPT also acts as a useful research assistant, quickly solving various academic questions, making the research process smoother and more efficient (Bu, 2022; Rizvi, 2023; Silva & Janes, 2021; Yu & Yu, 2023). Its user-friendly interfaces promote the integration of AI technologies, not only simplifying administrative tasks but also offering personalized feedback, thus improving educational methods and outcomes (Bu, 2022; Yu & Yu, 2023). The applications of ChatGPT extend to proofreading, brainstorming, and translating, further enhancing

its utility in academic writing (Yihan, 2024). These comprehensive capabilities make ChatGPT a key resource in academia, significantly enhancing the quality and efficiency of academic work.

2.2. Challenges of Using ChatGPT in Academic Research

Despite its benefits to academic research, several challenges occur with this tool in use. One significant concern is data accuracy and reliability generated by ChatGPT. There are cases where ChatGPT may produce incorrect or misleading information, which could lead researchers lost inaccuracies (AlZaabi et al., 2023; Himel & Shaikat, 2023). This necessitates that experts accurately verify any content created by ChatGPT before incorporating it into their academic writing. Additionally, most of the instructors prohibit or discourage its use, which may lead students to limit their use of the tool to avoid penalties or to ensure they do not upset their lecturers (Crcek & Patekar, 2023).

Another issue is the risk associated with plagiarism and the generation of non-original content (Ismail et al., 2023; Rahman et al., 2023). This not only damages the credibility of academic work but also breaks copyright laws, which could reduce the value of scholarly research (Himel & Shaikat, 2023; Xiangmin et al., 2023).

2.3. Ethical Concerns with Using ChatGPT in Academia

Using ChatGPT in academic settings can really help with research, but it also brings up some important ethical issues. First, while ChatGPT is great for helping with many academic tasks, it cannot replace the deep thinking and detailed judgment that only people can provide. Researchers should use ChatGPT carefully to make sure their work stays transparent and keeps its quality and trustworthiness (AlZaabi et al., 2023; Sung Il et al., 2023). Also, it is very important for the academic community to create clear rules on how to use ChatGPT correctly in research and writing (Rahman et al., 2023).

Another big ethical issue is about who really creates the content when ChatGPT is used. If ChatGPT writes big parts of a paper, some might wonder if it should be listed as a co-author. However, to be considered an author, someone must contribute their own original ideas and take responsibility for the content of the paper, which ChatGPT is unable to do (Himel & Shaikat, 2023). Using ChatGPT in writing

also makes it difficult to distinguish what is made by humans from what is produced by the machine. This calls for clear ethical rules to ensure that academic work remains honest and clear (AlZaabi et al., 2023; Himel & Shaikat, 2023). Furthermore, there are issues like keeping data private when using ChatGPT, which requires careful attention to maintain honesty in education (Zouhaier & Beatriz Villarejo, 2023).

In Vietnam, AI tools like ChatGPT are gaining attention from educators and researchers. The two common research methods used to evaluate this tool in English language learning are the quantitative method and the mixed one. Quantitative studies on using ChatGPT in language learning show mixed perceptions among university students. Vo (2024) found that English major students thought it was easy to use and helpful for developing their English language skills, but their views on its overall usefulness were neutral. Similarly, Nhan (2024) revealed that the students perceived ChatGPT as a highly user-friendly tool that can save time, enhance their English language learning experience, but they also concern about the reliability of information provided by ChatGPT and its ability to accurately cite sources. Pham (2024) discovered that Vietnamese students in both Vietnam and the United States had a positive attitude toward ChatGPT, as it helped engage them in the learning process and supported their learning and knowledge enhancement but warned that relying too much on it could reduce critical thinking and creativity.

Mixed-method studies also provide a range of perspectives regarding the role of ChatGPT. Nguyen (2023) conducted an online survey and structured interviews with 20 EFL teachers at Van Lang University. The study showed that the teachers were excited about using ChatGPT in writing classes, but they believed professional training was necessary to address its limits. Some teachers see ChatGPT as a complementary tool and others predict that it will replace teachers in certain aspects. While ChatGPT could reduce teachers' workloads and offer useful feedback, teachers were still concerned about students relying too much on it and about academic honesty. A year later, Nguyen (2024) explored university English teachers' perceptions of using ChatGPT in language teaching and assessment. The researcher found that teachers had limited knowledge of ChatGPT, often confusing its functions with other apps. They had

more negative than positive views on using it in teaching and assessment. They were concerned about cheating and believed more training was needed to use the tool effectively in teaching.

Regarding student perceptions and attitudes on the ChatGPT use, recent mixed method research mainly focusses non-English major student group. Ngo (2023) noted that university students generally had a positive perception of using it in saving time, providing information across various domains, offering personalized tutoring and feedback, and helping with writing. However, they recognized several barriers to using ChatGPT, including concerns about assessing source quality and reliability, accurately citing sources, and using language appropriately. In 2024, Ho found that although IT students have positive attitudes towards using ChatGPT for certain aspects of English learning, such as translation, vocabulary acquisition, grammar checking, and paraphrasing, they still preferred learning from teachers and interacting in the classroom. In addition, the students strongly oppose the idea of ChatGPT replacing English teachers or being used as a complete substitute for English classes.

While previous studies have highlighted the perceived benefits and challenges of ChatGPT for teachers, undergraduates, and non-English majors, there is limited research on graduate students, particularly those in TESOL programs, where academic writing is essential for their success in education, research, and future professional careers. Therefore, more research should be conducted to understand how TESOL graduate students perceive the impacts and ethical issues related to the use of ChatGPT in academic writing. This research will not only help clarify how the tool is integrated into postgraduate education, especially in the field of TESOL, but may also contribute to the development of specific guidelines and teaching strategies. This will promote the ethical use of ChatGPT and increase its educational benefits.

3. Research Method

3.1. Research design and participants

This study employed a mixed method approach to collect and analyze data on how TESOL graduate students perceived the ChatGPT use in their academic writing at Song Tien University, a state-run university located in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam. The survey reached potential participants through a non-probability convenience sampling method. While there were 71 responses to the survey, three participants did not use ChatGPT, which left 68 participants who completed the entire survey. At the end of the questionnaire, participants were asked to indicate if they wish to be further involved in this research study by participating in an interview. For the qualitative phase, a random stratified sample of nine graduates was invited to participate. The selection criteria included their age, gender, working place, frequency of ChatGPT use, whether they had received formal training in using ChatGPT. Additionally, participants were selected based on their shares both the benefits and challenges of using the tool in the survey.

3.2. Data collection and analysis

This study collected data from two sources: questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. The questionnaire was adapted from the previously validated one used in a study by Crcek and Patekar (2023). Permission was obtained from the original authors to use this survey. The resulting questionnaire was piloted with a small group of EFL experts and graduates to ensure clarity and appropriateness of the items. Feedback from this pilot was used to revise and improve the questionnaire, addressing any ambiguities or inconsistencies.

The questionnaire combined closed-ended and open-ended questions, utilizing a five-point Likert scale, including 5 background items, 11 items in ChatGPT effectiveness, 11 items in ethical aspects and open-ended questions about benefits and challenges. Quantitative data were gathered through a Google Form and analyzed with a statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) to generate descriptive and inferential statistics. Besides checking Cronbach's Alpha, other steps were taken to ensure the reliability of the questionnaire. An Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was done to check the structure of the questions, followed by a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to confirm this structure with a larger group of participants.

Semi-structured interviews were then conducted to gather deeper insights, with questions adjusted based on participants' responses. These interviews helped clarify and expand on the benefits, challenges for better analysis. An interview guide, developed

with advice from EFL lecturers, included prepared questions, prompts, and probes. All interviews were conducted in Vietnamese.

With the participants' permission, audio recordings of the interviews to get deeper information about the research questions were made and subsequently transcribed word for word before analysis. The study setting and participants' identities were coded to ensure anonymity and confidentiality.

4. Findings and discussion

4.1. Findings

4.1.1 Graduate students' views of ChatGPT effectiveness for academic writing tasks

The next section explores the views of TESOL graduate students at the University on utilizing ChatGPT for their assignment writing. Regarding to the effectiveness, the mean values for all the items in Table 1 range from 2.87 to 3.26. The data shows that students had neutral opinions on the effectiveness of ChatGPT in developing their academic writing skills.

Table 1. Graduate students' perceptions of using ChatGPT

	Items	Mean	SD
	ChatGPT supports		
1.	Generating ideas and structure	2.97	0.930
2.	Writing introductions	2.87	0.879
3.	Critiquing the previous research	2.87	0.845
4.	Designing the research methods	2.87	0.862
5.	Summarizing and presenting the data	2.99	0.906
6.	Discussing the data	2.87	0.879
7.	Writing conclusions	2.99	0.855
8.	Paraphrasing	3.09	0.973
9.	Improves the coherence and organization	3.13	0.945
10	Using academic style	3.15	0.919
11.	Proofreading written assignments	3.26	0.956
	Average	**3.0**	**0.904**

Note: N=68

The results reveals that the graduate students rate proofreading written assignments, using academic style and improves the coherence and organization as the highest effective item (means value 3.26, 3.15 and 3.13 respectively). This suggests a significant appreciation for the tool's capability to assist in finalizing their texts, ensuring academic style and coherence. On the contrary, students consider writing introductions, critiquing previous research, designing research methods, and discussing data as the least effective activities, with an average mean score of only 2.87. This indicates that the students disagree that ChatGPT can really support them in completing the key components of academic research writing. ChatGPT, therefore, needs improvement in solving complex analytical tasks in the academic writing process.

The table shows the diversity in students' opinions on the effectiveness of using ChatGPT, with standard deviations ranging from 0.845 to 0.973. The highest standard deviation score was 0.973 for paraphrasing item, indicating that students had very different responses to ChatGPT's paraphrasing capabilities. Similarly, the 0.945 standard deviation for improving consistency and organization indicates that students had mixed feelings about the tool's impact on the structure of their writing. These differences highlight areas where views of ChatGPT's usefulness varied significantly.

In terms of ChatGPT advantages in academic writing, the findings of open-ended questions were categorised into four sub-themes: (1) Quick Access to Information, (2) Ideation and Planning, (3) Language Learning Improvement, (4) Writing quality Development. Table 2 presents these themes and the number of responses.

Table 2. Sub-themes of ChatGPT benefits in academic writing

	Sub-themes	N
1.	Quick Access to Information	23
2.	Ideation and Planning	17
3.	Language Learning Improvement	5
4.	Writing quality Development	4

Note: N=68

In the table above, ChatGPT's improvements in academic writing are divided into four sub-themes. The topic "Quick Access to Information" is the most popular with around one third. The remaining "Ideas and Plans" is mentioned by 17 participants, while "Improving Language Learning" and "Developing Writing Quality" are mentioned by only 5 and 4 ones, respectively.

The survey results are complemented by qualitative data from the interviews. It is interesting to note that over half of the interviewees (5/9) highlighted ChatGPT's ability to save time and provide fast response. Additionally, most of them (6/9) believe that ChatGPT is ideal for different writing stages of their assignments. As Interviewee 7 shared, "ChatGPT is a good tool that gives me fast and varied answers. ChatGPT also suggest new and useful ideas for writing the basic sections like suggesting research topics, summarizing the previous studies and clarifying the research steps. And "It can review, provide vocabulary options and develop the writing style. Although there are still weaknesses, this a good tool for those who know how to exploit and use it", as Interviewee 3 shared.

The combination of quantitative and qualitative data provides varied perspectives of ChatGPT's effectiveness. While the quantitative data suggests neutral thoughts, graduate student experiences reveal value in specific ChatGPT functions, such as time saving, creating ideas, explaining and proofreading. At the same time, they also believe that support for advanced analytical tasks needs to be improved.

4.1.2 Graduate students' views of ChatGPT challenges in academic writing tasks

The findings of open-ended questions on the disadvantages of ChatGPT in academic writing were categorised into five sub-themes: (1) Inaccurate Responses, (2) Dependency and Passive Engagement, (3) Decline in Creativity, (4) Plagiarism Risks, (5) Monotony in Responses. Table 3 presents these themes and the number of responses.

Table 3. Sub-themes of ChatGPT challenges in academic writing

	Sub-themes	N
1.	Inaccurate Responses	22
2.	Dependency and Passive Engagement	12
3.	Decline in Creativity	10
4.	Plagiarism Risks	5
5.	Monotony in Responses	5

Note: N=68

The survey results highlight the challenges that users face when using ChatGPT for academic writing. Inaccurate responses were the most common issue, cited by nearly a third of the participants, indicating a major concern about reliability. Dependence and passivity were also cited significantly at 12 times, indicating the need to promote more active and independent participation in users. Although plagiarism risk and monotony in responses were the least reported, each with only 5 items, these are still important areas that need to be improved to enhance the tool's usefulness and ethical use in educational settings.

The interview results supported the information from the survey in terms of the quality of information and articles. Interviewees were also concerned about the impact of ChatGPT on users' passivity or creativity as Interviewee 8 said "Over-reliance on ChatGPT can affect a person's ability to think independently and be creative." And Interviewee 5 shared:

"ChatGPT responses are often not as accurate or as emotional as human analysis. When using ChatGPT to assist in writing a research paper, you should carefully consider the content that ChatGPT provides, even when using ChatGPT version 4.0. Most of the information from ChatGPT is just explanations or examples to illustrate your research, not completely accurate data. Therefore, you should not rely entirely on ChatGPT, but only consider it as a temporary support tool when you have difficulty finding ideas or explanations".

The results from both surveys and interviews highlight pressing concerns about using ChatGPT for academic writing, particularly the accuracy and reliability of its responses. There are also significant challenges related to users becoming dependent and passive, highlighting a need for encouraging more active and creative engagement. Although concerns like plagiarism risks and monotony in responses are less frequent, they still point to the importance of using ChatGPT thoughtfully and critically in educational settings.

4.1.3 Graduate students' views of the ethical implications on using ChatGPT

Next, in line with the second research question, investigating TESOL graduates' opinions of the ethical implications of employing ChatGPT in academic writing tasks. As seen in Table 4, the highest ethical approval is for using ChatGPT to improve academic style (91.2%) and enhance coherence and organization (89.7%), indicating strong support for its

use in refining language and formal aspects of writing. Proofreading assignments and paraphrasing also have high approval (89.7% and 85.3%, respectively), as they support clarity and accuracy in writing. Several tasks received a consistent approval rating of 76.5%, including designing research methods, summarizing and presenting data, and writing conclusions. This indicates a moderate acceptance of ChatGPT for structuring and presenting research information.

However, critiquing previous research has the lowest approval (72.1%), indicating students' worries about relying on ChatGPT for analytical and critical tasks. Overall, the ethical approval for using ChatGPT in academic writing is 81.7%, showing that most students generally believe that using ChatGPT in academic writing should be acceptable in educational institutions but cautious about its use. This is echo to data from Table 3 about Plagiarism Risks with only around 0.7 percentage (5) concerns about ethical aspects of ChatGPT use.

Table 4. Ethical Perceptions of Using ChatGPT in Academic Writing

Items	Percent (%)
ChatGPT supports	Yes
1. Generating ideas and structure	85.3
2. Writing introductions	80.9
3. Critiquing the previous research	72.1
4. Designing the research methods	76.5
5. Summarizing and presenting the data	76.5
6. Discussing the data	75.0
7. Writing conclusions	76.5
8. Paraphrasing	85.3
9. Improves the coherence and organization	89.7
10. Using academic style	91.2
11. Proofreading written assignments	89.7
Average	**81.7**

Note: N = 68; Yes = Ethical; No = Unethical

The results of the interview about students' opinions on the ethical aspects of using GPT chat were divided into 3 equal groups. While three students thought that using GPT chat was not a violation of research ethics, three others thought the opposite and the rest reveal that they have not much knowledge or did not hear about it. Some users expressing concerns about potential plagiarism and the writing might not reflect the writer voice. For instance, Interviewee 8 said, "Using ChatGPT may lead to misuse of content created by others without ensuring copyright and creativity." And Interviewee 4 noted, "Plagiarism is likely the most noticeable issue, as ChatGPT often provides similar answers for the same topics, including some direct quotations. If users do not carefully set the context and properly summarize the content, plagiarism can easily occur. Furthermore, there is a risk of passivity among learners. Many users copy all the information they find and pasting it directly into their work. This practice not only leads to misinformation but also directly affects the quality of the learners' assignments." This comment underscores the need for both training on ChatGPT's ethical use, particularly in ensuring that academic work remains original and ethically sound.

4.2. Discussion

This study primarily examines TESOL graduates' views on the impacts and ethical implications of using ChatGPT in academic contexts. To better understand the results, it's essential first to explore the participants' backgrounds. They come from a diverse range of areas, with over 51 percent (35) from rural regions and about 49 percent (33) from urban settings. In addition, only about 23 percent (16) of the respondents were officially trained how to use of ChatGPT. This may be due to their rural background where there may be less exposure to advanced digital technologies.

The first research question sought to identify the TESOL graduates' views on ChatGPT impacts on academic writing. First, the participants derive various advantages of ChatGPT, including time saving, ideas generation, research explanations, corrections and developing writing quality to meet high language standards. These findings support previous studies (AlZaabi et al., 2023; Himel & Shaikat, 2023; Ngo, 2023; Nhan, 2024; Silva & Janes, 2021; Sung Il et al., 2023) which noted its role as a productivity-boosting research assistant. However, the graduates' overall views on the role of ChatGPT in supporting the writing process are neutral. This could be since most participants may not have received sufficient guidance on how to effectively use ChatGPT before evaluating its impact. The finding contributes to what Vo (2024)

found. Therefore, formal instructions on ChatGPT use should be provided to help the users fully realize the benefits of ChatGPT. Second, the above findings shows that ChatGPT is less effective for supporting writing introductions, critiquing previous research, designing research methods, and discussing data, areas in which Bu (2022); Yu and Yu (2023) generally appreciate its support.

Besides these advantages, the current study also highlights the limitations related to accuracy and reliability which are similar to AlZaabi et al. (2023); Himel and Shaikat (2023), Nhan (2024); Pham and Le (2024); Nguyen (2023); Ngo (2023) who warn about the risks of incorrect or misleading information produced by ChatGPT. Moreover, there are also significant challenges associated with users becoming reliant and passive that is also warned by the previous researchers (Nguyen, 2023; Pham & Le, 2024). In general, the researchers share the same concerns about reliability and potential plagiarism.

Regarding ethical concerns, less than 20% of the students believe that using ChatGPT to complete essays is unethical. This result is similar to Rahman et al. (2023) who found that there is a moderate acceptance of ChatGPT for tasks such as designing research methods and summarizing data. However, critiquing previous research received the lowest approval, aligning with earlier findings that stress the importance of human judgment in analytical tasks (Himel & Shaikat, 2023). Although there are not many participants concern about the ethical aspects of ChatGPT like citing sources, copy right and potential plagiarism as in studies by Ngo (2023) and Nhan (2024), they still underscore the necessity of utilizing ChatGPT thoughtfully and critically in educational environments. Therefore, educational institutions should develop policies and guidelines that not only take advantage of AI for educational use but also protect academic integrity.

5. Conclusion and implications

In conclusion, this study investigated the views of TESOL graduates at the University on utilizing ChatGPT for their assignment writing. The integration of ChatGPT in academic settings brings various positives, negatives as well as ethical concerns. To maximize the benefits of this digital tools, it is essential for administrators, lecturers, graduates and AI investors to collaborate and reach a agreement.

Administrators should enhance the digital skills of lecturers and students, along with developing clear policies on technology use in education. Lecturers must understand ChatGPT's limitations and critically adapt the information it provides to become a role model for students in the ethical use of ChatGPT. For graduates, ChatGPT has been proven a helpful in their studying, researching and working journey. However, they should use ChatGPT cautiously and be aware of its limitations. Besides, they must avoid copying directly from ChatGPT and instead, develop their critical reading and writing skills to use it as a tool that enhances both academic writing ability and publication chances.

The study also found that students rated ChatGPT highly for tasks such as topic suggesting, reviewing and editing but found it less useful for more complex tasks such as analysing previous research or synthesizing information. The significant differences in how students rated the tool's effectiveness across different writing tasks suggest that improvements in AI capabilities are needed to ensure they can fully meet the diverse demands of academic writing.

This study only focused on a single university, which may not reflect the views of all TESOL graduates. Additionally, the sample size for this study was quite limited; therefore, future research should include a larger and more representative sample of the general student population. This approach will enhance our understanding of the widespread impacts and acceptance of AI tools like ChatGPT in educational contexts.

References

AL-Muslimawi, I. A. J. *Features and discourse functions of good academic writing*.

Aldabbus, S., & Almansouri, E. (2022). Academic writing difficulties encountered by university EFL learners. *British journal of English linguistics, 10*(3), 1-11.

AlZaabi, A., Amira, A., Halima, A., Ruqaya, A., & AAlAbdulsalam, A. (2023). ChatGPT applications in Academic Research: A Review of Benefits, Conce rns, and Recommendations. *bioRxiv*.

Barasa, D. (2024). Demystifying the Discourse: Techniques to Effective Academic Writing. *Journal of Research and Academic Writing, 1*(1), 13-21.

Bu, Q. (2022). Ethical Risks in Integrating Artificial Intelligence into Education an d Potential Countermeasures. *Science Insights, 41*(1), 561-566. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.15354/si.22.re067. doi:10.15354/si.22.re067.

Crcek, N., & Patekar, J. (2023). Writing with AI: University students' use of ChatGPT. *Journal of Language and Education, 9*(4), 128-138.

Ebadi, S., & Pourahmadi, F. (2019). Exploring challenges in writing EFL master theses: students and supervisors' perspectives. *Journal on English Language Teaching, 9*(2), 42-51.

Fakhry. (2023). Common linguistic mistakes in academic writing among researchers. *Scientific Journal of the College of Education*. Retrieved from https://sjsw.journals.ekb.eg/article_288029_bdd7558d604882666dbb1d357238eeb4.pdf. doi:10.21608/sjsw.2023.288029.

Gurung, R. K. (2022). Why academic writing? *Pursuits: A Journal of English Studies, 6*(1), 75-82.

Hass, A. B., & Lenong, B. (2021). Assessing the academic writing skills of final year English second language (Esl) educations students to determine their preparedness as language teachers: A practical approach at a university of technology. doi:10.36315/2021end079.

Himel, M., & Shaikat, M. (2023). ChatGPT in academic writing: Maximizing its benefits and minimizing th e risks. *Indian Journal of Ophthalmology*.

Ho, P. X. P. (2024). Using ChatGPT in English language learning: A study on I.T. students' attitudes, habits, and perceptions. *International Journal of TESOL & Education, 4*(1), 55-68. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.54855/ijte.24414. doi:10.54855/ijte.24414.

Ismail, D., Chamari, K., Żmijewski, P., & Saad, H. B. (2023). From human writing to artificial intelligence generated text: examinin g the prospects and potential threats of ChatGPT in academic writing. *Biology of Sport*.

Kirk, T. (2023). ChatGPT (We need to talk) https://www.cam.ac.uk/stories/ChatGPT-and-education.

Li, L. (2023). Challenges, causes and solutions in the process of writing English academic papers for English postgraduates. *Journal of Education and Educational Research, 3*(2), 211-214.

Nga, P. T. (2022). Using artificial intelligence applications For teaching and learning foreign language: Facts and solutions. *International Journal of English Language Education and Literature Stu dies (IJEEL), 1*(4), 12-15. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijeel.1.4.2. doi:10.22161/ijeel.1.4.2.

Ngo, T. T. A. (2023). The perception by university students of the use of ChatGPT in education. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (Online), 18*(17), 4.

Nguyen, G., Nguyen, N., & Giang, N. T. H. (2022). Situation and proposals for implementing artificial intelligence-based instructional technology in Vietnamese secondary schools. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (Ijet), 17*(18), 53-75. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v17i18.31503. doi:10.3991/ijet.v17i18.31503.

Nguyen, T. C. (2024). University teachers' perceptions of using ChatGPT in language teaching and assessment. *Proceedings of the AsiaCALL International Conference, 4*, 116-128. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.54855/paic.2349. doi:10.54855/paic.2349.

Nguyen, T. T. H. (2023). EFL teachers' perspectives toward the use of ChatGPT in writing classes: A case study at Van Lang University. *International Journal of Language Instruction, 2*(3), 1-47. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.54855/ijli.23231. doi:10.54855/ijli.23231.

Nhan, L. K. (2024). Vietnamese university students' perceptions in learning English using ChatGPT. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies (IJSMS)*, 142-148. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.51386/25815946/ijsms-v7i1p121. doi:10.51386/25815946/ijsms-v7i1p121.

Onal, S. (2023). *Exploring the potential benefits and risks of ChatGPT in engineering education*. Paper presented at the 2023 IL-IN Section Conference.

Osama, M., Sabah, A., & Muhammad, M. (2023). ChatGPT: Transcending language limitations in scientific research using artificial intelligence. *Journal of the College of Physicians and Surgeons--Pakistan: JCPSP*.

Pham, V. P. H., & Le, A. Q. (2024). ChatGPT

in language learning: Perspectives from Vietnamese students in Vietnam and the USA. *International Journal of Language Instruction, 3*(2), 59-72. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.54855/ijli.24325. doi:10.54855/ijli.24325.

Rababah, L. M., Rababah, M. A., & Al-Khawaldeh, N. N. (2024). Graduate students' ChatGPT experience and perspectives during thesis writing. *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy (iJEP), 14*(3), 22-35. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v14i3.48395.

Rahman, M., Terano, H. J. R., Rahman, N., Salamzadeh, A., & Rahaman, S. (2023). ChatGPT and academic research: A review and recommendations based on practical examples. *Journal of Education, Management and Development Studies, 3*(1), 1-12. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.52631/jemds.v3i1.175. doi:10.52631/jemds.v3i1.175.

Rizvi, M. (2023, 2023/6/8/). *Exploring the landscape of artificial intelligence in education: Chall enges and opportunities*.

Shijun, H., Fan, Y., Jian-ping, Z., & Zemin, L. (2023). ChatGPT for scientific paper writing-promises and perils. *Innovation (Cambridge (Mass.))*.

Silva, A. d. O., & Janes, D. d. S. (2021). The emergence of ChatGPT and its implications for education and academic research in the 21st century. *Review of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 2*(00), e06. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.37497/rev.artif.intell.education.v2i00.6. doi:10.37497/rev.artif.intell.education.v2i00.6

Sung Il, H., Joon Seo, L., Lee, R., Matsui, Y., Iguchi, T., Hiraki, T., & Hyungwoo, A. (2023). Is ChatGPT a "Fire of Prometheus" for non-native English-speaking researchers in academic writing? *Korean Journal of Radiology*.

Thanh Quy, N. T., Thu Thuy, N. T., Ngoc Anh, T. T., & Quoc, D. K. (2019). Develop tools and softwares for the assessment of ethnic minority Viet namese primary school students. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1340*(1), 012064. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1340/1/012064. doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1340/1/012064.

Tran, M. N., Hogg, L., & Marshall, S. (2022). Understanding postgraduate students' perceptions of plagiarism: a case study of Vietnamese and local students in New Zealand. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 18*(1), 3.

Vo, T. K. A., & Nguyen, H. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence and ChatGPT in language learning: E. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, 21*(06). Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.53761/fr1rkj58. doi:10.53761/fr1rkj58.

Wijaya, K. F. (2022). English education master students' perceptions on developing critical thinking skills in academic writing. *Saga Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. doi:10.21460/saga.2022.32.116.

Wijaya, K. F., & Mbato, C. L. (2020). Graduate students' perceptions on their self-efficacy in writing academic papers. *Elt Worldwide Journal of English Language Teaching*. doi:10.26858/eltww.v7i1.13010.

Xiangmin, G., Haoming, S., & Joan Huiqiong, D. (2023). A study on ChatGPT to alleviate the difficulties in writing scientific technology papers. *ICCD*.

Yihan, W. (2024). Reviewing the usage of ChatGPT on L2 students' English academic writing learning. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*.

Yu, L., & Yu, Z. (2023). Qualitative and quantitative analyses of artificial intelligence ethic s in education using VOSviewer and CitNetExplorer. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14.* Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1061778. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1061778.

Zanaty, D. (2021). Utilizing process approach through IELTS essay practice in teaching writing for medical students through online teaching. *International Journal of Linguistics Literature and Translation*. doi:10.32996/ijllt.2021.4.10.11.

Zouhaier, S., & Beatriz Villarejo, C. (2023). Navigating the ethical challenges of artificial intelligence in higher education: An analysis of seven global AI ethics policies.