

University academic writing in the era of artificial intelligence technologies

Escritura académica universitaria ante la irrupción de las tecnologías de inteligencia artificial

Regina Julia Ramírez Nina

ramirezninaregina@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-6862-2436>

Universidad Pública de El Alto. La Paz, Bolivia

Claudia Mavel Mollinedo Silva

claudiamavel4@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-6513-2083>

Universidad Pública de El Alto. La Paz, Bolivia

Received date: June 20, 2025 | Reviewed date: July 18, 2025 | Accepted date: August 15, 2025 | Published date: September 5, 2025

Abstract

University academic production is undergoing a process of reconfiguration due to the proliferation of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies. This study synthesizes theoretical contributions to understand how academic writing and university learning are related in the context of the emergence of artificial intelligence. The methodology consisted of a literature review covering databases such as Dialnet, SciELO, and Redalyc, from which 29 sources were selected. A narrative synthesis was carried out using data collection sheets. The findings indicate structural difficulties in academic writing, patterns of artificial intelligence use that range from practical support to technological dependence, and the need for pedagogical responses that promote reflective co-authorship. It is concluded that artificial intelligence transforms academic writing without eliminating it and highlights the importance of developing an "augmented writer" with an analytical and responsible stance when interacting with these tools, within a framework of digital literacy that preserves meaningful learning.

Keywords:

Digital literacy; University learning; Reflective co-authorship; Academic writing; Artificial intelligence; Academic production.

Resumen

La producción académica universitaria atraviesa una etapa de reconfiguración por la proliferación de las tecnologías de inteligencia artificial. Este trabajo sintetiza aportes teóricos para entender cómo se relacionan la escritura académica y el aprendizaje universitario ante la irrupción de la inteligencia artificial. La metodología consistió en una revisión bibliográfica, que abarcó bases como Dialnet, SciELO y Redalyc; donde se seleccionaron 29 fuentes. Se realizó una síntesis narrativa por medio de fichas para la recopilación de datos. Los hallazgos señalan las dificultades estructurales en la escritura, patrones de uso de inteligencia artificial que varían entre apoyo práctico y dependencia tecnológica, y la necesidad de respuestas pedagógicas que impulsen una coautoría reflexiva. Se concluye que la inteligencia artificial transforma la escritura académica sin eliminarla, y destaca la importancia de desarrollar un "escritor aumentado" con un ente analítico y responsable al interactuar con estas herramientas, dentro de un marco de alfabetización digital que preserve el aprendizaje significativo.

Palabras clave:

Alfabetización digital; Aprendizaje universitario; Coautoría reflexiva; Escritura académica; Inteligencia artificial; Producción académica.

INTRODUCTION

Academic writing constitutes a fundamental tool in teaching–learning processes at the university level because it facilitates the acquisition, appropriation, construction, and transmission of disciplinary knowledge. For this reason, it ceases to be an isolated skill and becomes an integrative element of educational practices that promote learning. It is important to integrate the teaching of writing transversally into university educational work, so that it accompanies and articulates with the classes of each discipline. That is, students need to be supported in appropriating the content specific to each discipline, while simultaneously strengthening their capacities to organize ideas, debate arguments, and communicate results with clarity and precision. Writing must interconnect theory and practice, content assimilation, and the demonstration of understanding (Magne & Uño, 2024).

However, studies point to the persistence of difficulties in academic writing among university students. A considerable proportion of students experience difficulties when producing academic texts in diverse contexts and procedures (Anaya et al., 2023). Likewise, they face multiple challenges, among which the organization of information, argumentative depth and cohesion, adequate articulation of ideas, and mastery of citation and referencing practices stand out. These limitations affect text quality and influence concept comprehension, meaningful learning, and academic performance. As a result, academic writing constitutes a competence that must be addressed explicitly and deliberately within university pedagogical strategies, as it is a core component of professional and disciplinary training.

These difficulties are linked to the idea that writing is a skill acquired at previous educational levels. Based on this notion, many attribute its teaching exclusively to language-related subjects, without incorporating its development across all courses. Consequently, this situation contrasts with academic assessment practices, which frequently require written responses to questionnaires, reports, and monographs. It thus becomes evident that students have not received adequate training to perform effectively in these tasks, generating a gap between academic demands and the competencies developed throughout their prior education.

Therefore, it is necessary to rethink curricular and pedagogical practices in order to incorporate the teaching of writing at all levels and areas of knowledge, especially in higher education (Murrieta, 2024).

In the Bolivian context, Zárate (2017) confirms that approximately 96% of university students present difficulties in fundamental aspects of writing. These figures reveal a structural problem that spans the period of university education and requires pedagogical responses that go beyond isolated or punctual interventions. This author argues that identifying these weaknesses provides a starting point for developing institutional and teaching strategies that promote deliberate, contextualized writing practices aligned with the demands of each discipline, with the aim of improving learning and the quality of academic production.

With the emergence of technologies based on artificial intelligence (AI), a new and complex dimension is added to academic writing. University students increasingly and more frequently resort to AI tools, such as ChatGPT, to carry out various tasks related to the writing process: information searching, idea generation and organization, revision and style correction, and support in text drafting (Vicente et al., 2023; López et al., 2025). These practices facilitate certain processes and increase efficiency, but they also entail risks, including technological dependence, the reduction of autonomous writing practices, and the potential distortion of the development of critical reading, analysis, and argumentation skills.

This situation raises concern among faculty, as the indiscriminate use of these tools generates forms of academic illiteracy, understood by Rodríguez (2007) as the inability to reason, evaluate, and produce knowledge independently, relying excessively on automated systems. This framework of tension between opportunities and risks places academic writing in a dynamic terrain, where technology does not replace competence but transforms it and demands technological and cognitive literacy that accompanies traditional academic literacy.

In light of the above, the objective of this article is to analyze, through a literature review, the most relevant theoretical contributions explaining the

relationship between academic writing and learning in the university context during a period marked by the diffusion of AI (González, 2024). The justification for this review is based on the idea that academic writing is a central competence for academic and professional success, influencing the ability to search for, process, and communicate knowledge rigorously and persuasively. Moreover, the growing integration of AI tools in educational processes requires an understanding of their effects on university education, as well as the design of pedagogical strategies that harness their potential without losing sight of the importance of autonomous and reflective writing.

Additionally, it is necessary to consider that the educational reality in Latin America, with its cultural and structural particularities, demands interventions that take into account students' prior educational conditions and the need for sustained and contextualized pedagogical support (Rodríguez, 2024). By articulating these elements, the present literature review contributes to the creation of a theoretical and practical framework that allows for rethinking the teaching of writing in higher education from an integrated and results-oriented perspective, in which writing ceases to be an isolated requirement and becomes a transversal and strategic competence for professional training.

METHODOLOGY

The research was based on a review of specialized literature with the purpose of analyzing academic productions related to university writing and AI in a comprehensive manner. This methodological approach was considered the most appropriate for collecting, evaluating, and synthesizing existing knowledge in an emerging and dynamic field of study. The process was meticulously planned through a predefined protocol that defined each stage, ensuring thoroughness and transparency throughout the research. Document collection was carried out intensively using a search strategy implemented progressively, beginning with a general exploration to refine terminology and subsequently conducting searches in high-impact bibliographic databases.

Specifically, Scopus, Web of Science, Dialnet, SciELO, and Redalyc were consulted to ensure coverage that included international publications as well as regional scientific production from Latin

America. In addition, Google Scholar was used to identify complementary literature, and reference tracking of the selected articles was conducted to locate relevant studies not identified in the initial searches. The search equation combined terms such as "academic writing," "academic literacy," "AI," "ChatGPT," "higher education," and "university," using Boolean operators to optimize results. A temporal filter was applied to include only publications from 2007 to 2025, prioritizing evidence relevant to the context of rapid AI evolution.

Study selection followed predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria applied sequentially. Inclusion criteria required that documents be articles, reviews, or theoretical essays published within the specified period, explicitly addressing the intersection between academic writing processes and the use of AI tools in higher education. Full texts had to be available in Spanish or English. Exclusion criteria included studies focused on AI without a clear application to writing, research conducted at non-university educational levels, and duplicate publications or those whose full texts were inaccessible after several attempts.

The selection process resulted in a final sample of 29 sources integrated into the qualitative analysis. For information extraction, a data collection sheet was designed to synthesize and analyze the main findings reported in the literature. Data analysis was oriented toward a thematic narrative synthesis, chosen for its suitability in integrating and interpreting findings from studies with diverse methodological designs. The process involved in-depth and repeated reading of the sources, identifying and coding relevant text segments. Codes were then grouped into broader analytical categories capturing recurring patterns in the literature.

As a result of this inductive process, three central thematic axes emerged to structure the presentation of results: structural difficulties in academic writing, uses and perceptions of AI, and pedagogical responses to this new scenario. This methodological approach made it possible not only to summarize the available evidence across databases, but also to contrast perspectives and construct a grounded discussion of the tensions and opportunities identified in the consulted scientific

literature.

RESULTS

The analysis of the reviewed literature allows the findings to be organized around three central dimensions defining the interaction between university academic writing and AI: (1) pre-existing structural limitations in university writing that AI may aggravate or mitigate; (2) uses, perceptions, and effects of AI tools in students' writing processes; and (3) pedagogical, ethical, and institutional responses emerging to incorporate AI critically and formatively.

Structural Difficulties of Writing in Academic Contexts

The reviewed sources indicate that the problem of academic writing in higher education has identifiable origins and structures. Studies consistently report a lack of writing competencies among students, attributed to a combination of historical and pedagogical factors. According to Anaya et al. (2023) and Belinche et al. (2023), students face challenges in organizing ideas, sustaining solid arguments, linking paragraphs clearly, and mastering citation and referencing standards. Zárate's (2017) study in the Bolivian context quantifies this problem, noting that approximately 96% of university students

experience difficulties in basic writing aspects, highlighting a critical disconnect between prior schooling and higher education demands.

From a theoretical perspective, these difficulties persist because writing has traditionally been treated as a general and terminal skill acquired in basic education, rather than as a social and epistemological practice specific to each discipline that must be cultivated throughout the university trajectory. This transversal view of academic writing as learning support contrasts with curricular realities, where its teaching is rarely integrated explicitly and systematically into disciplinary courses (García et al., 2022).

As a result, a gap emerges between institutional expectations and students' actual ability to produce complex academic texts (monographs, reports, articles), for which no gradual and contextualized training has been provided (Murrieta, 2024). This vulnerable context forms the framework in which AI emerges, adding both complexity and opportunities for integration and development. Table 1 summarizes the main difficulties related to university academic writing identified in the literature review.

Table 1. Main difficulties in university academic writing

Difficulty dimension	Common manifestations	Documenting sources
Organization structure	Difficulty constructing a logical structure (introduction, development, conclusion); disconnected paragraphs; problems with idea hierarchy.	Anaya et al. (2023); Belinche et al. (2023); Zárate (2017)
Argumentation depth	Superficial analysis; inability to support claims with evidence; lack of critical thinking and originality.	García et al. (2022)
Norms and citation	Lack of knowledge of citation standards (APA, Vancouver, etc.); confusion between paraphrasing and plagiarism; persistent grammatical and spelling errors.	Belinche et al. (2023); Rodríguez (2007)
Cohesion and coherence	Deficient use of connectors; loss of thematic continuity; fragmented ideas that fail to construct a unified discourse.	Anaya et al. (2023); Zárate (2017)

The table shows that one of the main difficulties in academic writing at the higher education level lies in text organization and structure. Weaknesses in argumentation and analysis are also evident, as well as lack of knowledge of citation norms, grammatical errors, and insufficient discursive cohesion.

The Emergence of AI: Uses, Perceptions, and Impact on the Writing Process

The use of generative AI tools such as ChatGPT is now widespread and transversal. The reviewed literature indicates that adoption is not uniform but occurs across different stages of the writing process, creating a new textual production ecosystem (Baldrich et al., 2024). Usage patterns range from instrumental to strategic applications. Díaz and Rodríguez (2024) report that students use AI for brainstorming, information search and synthesis (sometimes with limited reliability), style revision, and text restructuring. According to Loayza (2024), students perceive these tools as “assistants” that increase efficiency and productivity while reducing time spent on mechanical tasks.

However, this perceived efficiency entails documented risks. Vicente et al. (2023) warn that uncritical use generates technological dependence that undermines writer autonomy. When AI substitutes rather than complements intellectual effort, development of fundamental skills such as

deep analysis, personal argument construction, and discursive decision-making declines. Al-Zahrani (2023) adds that this dynamic fosters a false sense of understanding, whereby students submit well-written but superficial texts they cannot adequately explain or justify.

AI thus has a dual impact on text quality. On one hand, tools like ChatGPT help overcome barriers by improving grammatical cohesion and academic vocabulary, particularly benefiting students with linguistic difficulties or for whom Spanish is not a first language (Ossa & Willatt, 2023; Santana et al., 2023). On the other hand, AI-generated texts often lack authorial voice, present generic positions, and avoid controversial stances, lacking the critical tone and idiosyncrasy of experienced writers (Martínez & González, 2024). Additionally, risks of fabricated data or misinformation (“hallucinations”) necessitate source verification—a skill insufficiently developed when AI dependence is high (Alonso, 2024).

Authorship and academic integrity are central concerns. Alonso (2024) argues that generative AI forces reconsideration of plagiarism and authorship concepts. “Algorithmic plagiarism,” where machine-generated text is presented as one’s own, poses new challenges for assessment systems, blurring boundaries between permitted use and academic dishonesty (VanderLinde & Mera, 2023). Table 2 summarizes key student and faculty perceptions regarding AI use in academic writing.

Table 2. Student and faculty perceptions of AI use in academic writing

Aspect	Student perception	Faculty concern
Utility	Viewed as a useful tool to streamline tasks, generate ideas, and improve writing; perceived as an efficient shortcut.	Considered a tool that inhibits deep cognitive skill development if used substitutively.
Quality	Texts show high surface quality (grammar, fluency) but are superficial; satisfaction with immediate results.	Texts are generic, lack authorial voice, critical depth, and personal engagement.
Ethics and integrity	Use perceived as “help,” similar to an advanced spell-checker.	Concern about plagiarism, academic dishonesty, and inability to assess real learning.
Future of writing	AI is here to stay and should be integrated into education.	Teaching and assessment methodologies must adapt to an era of AI co-writing.

Source: Elaborated from López et al. (2025); Díaz & Rodríguez (2024); Loayza (2024); Vicente et al. (2023).

The table highlights differences between students' perceptions and instructors' concerns regarding the use of AI in university academic writing. Students emphasize the usefulness of AI for facilitating tasks, generating ideas, and improving writing. In contrast, instructors warn that its use may limit the development of cognitive skills and express concerns about the superficial quality of texts and the absence of an authorial voice. Moreover, while students view AI as an advanced proofreading tool, instructors fear plagiarism and academic dishonesty. Both groups agree that AI is here to stay and underscore the need to adapt teaching methodologies toward responsible co-writing with these technologies.

Toward a New Paradigm: Pedagogical Responses and Ethical Considerations

The literature does not merely describe the problem but proposes responses. There is consensus that banning AI is neither viable nor appropriate. Instead, strengthening academic digital literacy and incorporating critical AI use as a core 21st-century competence is proposed (Baldrich et al., 2024). González (2025) and Santiago (2025) suggest conceptualizing AI as a “dialogic partner” or “cognitive scaffold” within supervised writing processes. This entails explicitly teaching critical use: training faculty to design activities that teach effective prompt writing, evaluation and verification of AI-generated information, and identification of biases and limitations.

Writing tasks should be redesigned to resist passive AI resolution, favoring process-based assessment (drafts, portfolios), metacognitive reflections on writing and tool interaction, and analysis of local cases, personal data, or experiences AI cannot replicate (Alcántara, 2023). Promoting “reflective co-authorship” involves modeling how AI can generate an initial draft that is then critically reviewed, expanded, refuted, and rewritten in a personalized manner. This approach—termed the “cyborg paradigm” by Santiago (2025)—values human-machine collaboration while preserving student intellectual agency.

Institutional and ethical challenges extend beyond the classroom. Clear policies on AI use in assessment are required to define permitted practices and consequences of academic dishonesty (Alonso, 2024; Juca, 2023). Concurrently,

investment in faculty professional development is necessary so that instructors not only manage digital tools but also adopt pedagogical philosophies supporting formative AI use (Vimos et al., 2024; Mendoza et al., 2025).

Ultimately, as emphasized by Villacreses et al. (2025) and Torres et al. (2025), the central objective is meaningful learning. AI is not an end in itself but a means to enhance students' capacity to construct, communicate, and critically and creatively engage with knowledge. Writing is not obsolete; it becomes a complex practice in which dialogue, negotiation, and personal sense-making of automated production constitute key competencies. From the author's perspective, AI does not create new content by itself but exposes and intensifies pre-existing pedagogical tensions while offering tools to address them provided implementation is purposeful and committed to forming autonomous, critical, and ethical writers.

DISCUSSION

The analysis conducted in this literature review enables a profound discussion of how university academic writing is changing in the AI era. The evidence confirms that pre-existing structural difficulties persist while illuminating the complex interaction between these limitations and the transformative impact of AI tools (González, 2024). The discussion is organized around three central axes: AI as an amplifier of latent problems, redefinition of the writer's role within co-authorship frameworks, and implications for pedagogical practice and educational policy in Latin America.

First, results show that AI does not create an unprecedented crisis in teaching but intensifies structural flaws already identified by authors such as Zárate (2017). The “academic writing crisis” predates the popularization of ChatGPT. The persistent gap between university demands and students' entry-level competencies created fertile ground for massive, often uncritical, adoption of these tools.

Students primarily use AI not to “cheat” but to compensate for real deficiencies: overcoming initial blocks, organizing ideas, and improving grammatical accuracy (Díaz & Rodríguez, 2024; Loayza, 2024). In this sense, AI functions as a symptom of deeper academic ecosystem issues. The technological dependence warned of by Al-Zahrani

(2023) partly reflects insufficient cultivation of prior writing autonomy. This reinforces the need for transversal and sustained academic literacy expanded to include critical digital dimensions.

A key tension emerging from the findings lies between efficiency and authenticity. On one hand, AI facilitates mechanical tasks and surface language processing, freeing cognitive time for higher-level analysis, synthesis, and critical argumentation (Ossa & Willatt, 2023). On the other hand, there is a real risk that efficiency is achieved at the expense of authorial voice, originality, and deep engagement, as noted by Martínez and González (2024).

“Algorithmic plagiarism” (Alonso, 2024) is not merely a new form of dishonesty but an extreme manifestation of disconnection between students and knowledge construction processes. This necessitates rethinking authorship itself. The “cyborg paradigm” proposed by Santiago (2025) accurately describes the present: academic writing is becoming a practice of constant co-authorship and negotiation with non-human systems. The pedagogical challenge is no longer producing a “pure” text but managing this collaboration reflectively and ethically.

Transitioning toward augmented writing requires radical transformation of teaching and assessment practices. Prohibition is limited and impractical. Instead, tasks must be reimagined to require local application, personal experience integration, and metacognitive reflection—elements resistant to AI automation (Alcántara, 2023). Assessment should shift from final product focus to process-oriented models incorporating portfolios, iterative drafts, and reflective documentation of tool interaction. This entails moving from a pedagogy of suspicion to one of transparency and guidance, recognizing student individuality and teaching contexts (VanderLinde & Mera, 2023; Hernández & Marín, 2018).

This review contributes by synthesizing dispersed recent evidence into a coherent framework linking structural writing problems and AI’s transformative impact (González, 2024). It transcends simplistic narratives portraying AI as either threat or panacea, positioning it instead as a catalyst demanding pedagogical rethinking. The proposed framework—structured around structural difficulties, uses and impacts, and pedagogical

responses—provides a basis for institutions and educators to develop contextualized integration strategies.

Limitations include the theoretical nature of the study as a literature review, deriving conclusions from prior research rather than direct classroom data. Future studies should employ mixed or qualitative methodologies to observe co-writing processes in real educational settings and measure long-term impacts of AI use on deep competencies. Potential publication bias is also acknowledged, as literature may overrepresent certain experiences not reflective of diverse global university contexts, particularly those with limited technological resources or faculty training (Ossa & Willatt, 2023).

Overall, this study reinforces the view that AI represents a turning point for academic writing. Far from rendering it obsolete, AI highlights its central epistemological importance. The future belongs neither to the technology-rejecting human writer nor to the passive algorithm-dependent user, but to the augmented writer: a professional with critical capacity and digital literacy to engage productively with AI tools while maintaining intellectual responsibility. Higher education’s immediate task is to train this new writer through renewed pedagogical commitment and integrity-focused practices (Villacreses et al., 2025).

CONCLUSIONS

University writing stands at a decisive historical moment marked by coexistence between classical practices and emerging AI capabilities. This analysis makes clear that structural problems in forming competent writers have not been solved but reconfigured through widespread adoption of tools such as ChatGPT. The gap between university demands and student competencies now manifests as technological dependence which, without critical guidance, may erode intellectual autonomy and authorial voice.

The response cannot be prohibition but strategic integration and advanced digital literacy. Higher education institutions must evolve from product-centered assessment models toward approaches valuing writing processes, metacognitive reflection, and responsible AI co-authorship. This requires creative task design resistant to passive resolution, transparency in tool use, and faculty capable of guiding human-machine collaboration.

Within this framework, the ideal academic writer profile shifts toward an empowered professional possessing intellectual agency, critical capacity to evaluate automated outputs, and ethical commitment to transparent technology use. Writing becomes a dialogic practice of negotiation with AI systems. Text quality is measured not only by formal correctness but by the indelible mark of original and critical thought transcending generative textuality.

Ultimately, AI's emergence in universities constitutes a call to revalue writing as a central epistemic practice. Far from making it obsolete, technology underscores its irreplaceable role in knowledge construction. The path forward is not choosing between pen and algorithm, but forging a synergy where human analysis, creativity, and ethical judgment lead intelligent collaboration with digital tools.

REFERENCES

Al-Zahrani, A. M. (2023). The impact of artificial intelligence on academic writing and integrity in higher education. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 21(4), 621–638. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-023-09485-6>

Alcántara, A. (2023). Evaluación auténtica y escritura académica en la universidad digital. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación Superior*, 14(41), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.22201/iisue.20072872e.2023.41.1721>

Alonso, L. (2024). Plagio algorítmico y autoría académica en tiempos de inteligencia artificial. *Comunicar*, 32(74), 9–18. <https://doi.org/10.3916/C74-2024-01>

Anaya, M., Flores, P., & Rojas, L. (2023). Dificultades en la escritura académica universitaria: Un estudio diagnóstico. *Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Educativos*, 53(2), 87–105. <https://doi.org/10.48102/rlee.2023.53.2.211>

Baldrich, J., Morales, C., & Paredes, S. (2024). Inteligencia artificial generativa y escritura académica: Usos emergentes en educación superior. *Educación y Tecnología*, 18(1), 33–52. <https://doi.org/10.22201/edutech.2024.18.1.1467>

Belinche, J., Cárdenas, M., & Silva, R. (2023). Prácticas de escritura académica y desempeño universitario. *Revista Educación y Humanismo*, 25(44), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.17081/eduhum.25.44.2023>

Díaz, R., & Rodríguez, E. (2024). ChatGPT y escritura universitaria: Percepciones estudiantiles y desafíos docentes. *Pixel-Bit. Revista de Medios y Educación*, 69, 137–156. <https://doi.org/10.12795/pixelbit.2024.i69.07>

García, L., Muñoz, P., & Herrera, D. (2022). Alfabetización académica en la educación superior: Retos y propuestas. *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, 83, 211–232. <https://doi.org/10.17227/rce.num83-13256>

González, A. (2024). Escritura académica y aprendizaje universitario en la era de la inteligencia artificial. *Revista de Educación Superior*, 53(210), 25–44. <https://doi.org/10.36857/resu.2024.210.1023>

González, A. (2025). Coautoría reflexiva y escritura aumentada con inteligencia artificial. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, 87(1), 99–117. <https://doi.org/10.35362/rie8715564>

Hernández, F., & Marín, J. (2018). Evaluación formativa y escritura académica en la universidad. *Educación XXI*, 21(2), 185–206. <https://doi.org/10.5944/educxx1.19407>

Juca, M. (2023). Políticas institucionales frente al uso de inteligencia artificial en la educación superior. *Revista Gestión Universitaria*, 9(2), 55–72.

Loayza, C. (2024). Inteligencia artificial como apoyo al aprendizaje universitario: Un estudio exploratorio. *Revista Educación*, 48(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.15517/revedu.v48i1.56621>

López, M., Sánchez, R., & Torres, V. (2025). Escritura académica y herramientas de IA generativa: Riesgos y oportunidades. *Comunicar*, 33(76), 21–30. <https://doi.org/10.3916/C76-2025-02>

Magne, A., & Uño, P. (2024). Escritura académica como práctica transversal en la universidad. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 42(1), 79–96. <https://doi.org/10.6018/rie.42.1.543221>

Martínez, S., & González, D. (2024). Voz autoral y originalidad en textos generados con inteligencia artificial. *Estudios sobre Educación*, 46, 143–160.

https://doi.org/10.15581/004.46.143-160

Mendoza, J., Patiño, L., & Ríos, E. (2025). Formación docente para el uso pedagógico de la inteligencia artificial. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación Educativa*, 27, e489. <https://doi.org/10.24320/redie.2025.27.e489>

Murrieta, P. (2024). Escritura académica y currículo universitario: Una relación pendiente. *Perfiles Educativos*, 46(184), 120–137. <https://doi.org/10.22201/iisue.24486167e.2024.184.60234>

Ossa, J., & Willatt, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in academic writing: Support or substitution? *Computers & Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 4, 100118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeari.2023.100118>

Rodríguez, E. (2007). Alfabetización académica y prácticas discursivas universitarias. *Revista Signos*, 40(64), 13–30. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-09342007000200002>

Rodríguez, E. (2024). Escritura académica en contextos latinoamericanos: Desafíos estructurales. *Revista Latinoamericana de Educación Comparada*, 15(1), 59–76.

Santana, L., Pérez, J., & Núñez, C. (2023). Inteligencia artificial y corrección lingüística en la educación superior. *Lenguaje y Textos*, 58, 41–55. <https://doi.org/10.4995/lyt.2023.18945>

Santiago, R. (2025). El paradigma ciborg en la escritura académica universitaria. *Revista de Innovación Educativa*, 27(2), 1–15.

VanderLinde, R., & Mera, J. (2023). Academic integrity in the age of AI-generated texts. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 48(8), 1187–1201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2023.2189456>

Vicente, J., Ramos, M., & Calderón, S. (2023). Dependencia tecnológica y aprendizaje universitario: El caso de ChatGPT. *Revista Educación y Sociedad*, 24(3), 201–219. <https://doi.org/10.15517/edu.v24i3.54210>

Villacreses, M., Torres, H., & Ponce, G. (2025). Aprendizaje significativo y escritura académica mediada por inteligencia artificial. *Revista de Educación a Distancia*, 25(78), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.6018/red.78.578341>

Vimos, K., Andrade, P., & León, F. (2024). Inteligencia artificial y ética educativa en la universidad. *Revista Andina de Educación*, 7(2), 89–104.

Zárate, J. (2017). Dificultades en la escritura académica de estudiantes universitarios bolivianos. *Revista Boliviana de Educación*, 3(5), 45–60.