Scholar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences
Vol. 01, Issue. 01, pp. 26 - 34, Jan – Mar 2026

S I P
Scholar India Publishers

AI AND THE FUTURE OF SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING IN ENGLISH STUDIES

Devi K*[1], Ariharan S [2], Dr. P. Rajini [3]

1. B.Ed. Student, First Year, Avinashilingam Institute for Home Science & Higher Education for Women, Coimbatore, India
2. Ph.D. Research Scholar, School of Liberal Arts and Humanities, Woxsen University, Hyderabad, India
3. Assistant Professor of English, Government Arts and Science College, Idappadi, India.

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) technologies are rapidly transforming scholarly publishing, with far-reaching implications for English Studies. AI tools now assist at every stage of research-from literature discovery and writing to citation analysis and editorial selection. For example, AI-powered assistants like Elicit and Scholarcy streamline literature reviews by summarizing large volumes of texts, while grammar and editing tools (e.g. Grammarly, Wordvice AI) help non-native English researchers refine their writing. Publishers and platforms similarly harness AI: Elsevier's Journal Finder matches manuscripts to "over 2,500 peer-reviewed" journals, and bibliometric tools like scite.ai classify citation contexts automatically. Large-scale text-mining methods (topic modeling, stylometry, distant reading) enable English scholars to analyze entire literary corpora and even predict emerging trends in fields such as eco-criticism or digital humanities. (Deka & Sarmah, 2020) At the same time, AI raises serious ethical questions. Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) guidelines emphasize that AI cannot be listed as an author, since AI "has no legal standing" to take responsibility, and authors must disclose AI use and remain accountable for all content. Critics also warn that AI tends to produce homogeneous output. Studies find that ChatGPT-driven writing converges on consensus ideas and clichés, leaving "no divergent opinions" and biasing global users toward Western norms (Wang, 2024). Conversely, AI offers opportunities: neural translation and editing tools promise a future where "everyone can use their own language to write, assess and read science". (Stein et al., 2024) Publishers are beginning AI-translating academic works (e.g. Taylor & Francis translating books into English) to broaden readership, potentially easing the burden on non-Anglophone authors. In sum, English Studies stands at a crossroads. If adopted judiciously, AI can democratize research and enable novel digital humanities methods, but unchecked reliance risks eroding creativity, interpretative plurality, and scholarly integrity. This paper surveys existing literature and emerging practice to chart AI's benefits and pitfalls for the future of publishing in English Studies.

Keywords

Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, English Studies, Scholarly Publishing, Digital Humanities, Research Ethics

1. Introduction

English Studies has long been rooted in close reading, critical theory, and humanistic interpretation of literature. Scholars in this field are traditionally guided by reflective analysis and creativity rather than quantitative methods. Yet the rise of AI and ML in the academy is making it "impossible for the various fields of English studies to ignore [its] presence and impact". Even as AI tools originate in computer science and data-driven

*Corresponding author: ariharansaravanan219@gmail.com

fields, humanities researchers are beginning to integrate them into every step of their workflow. (Xu et al., 2024)

New AI technologies can quickly sift through vast digital archives, suggest research directions, and even draft prose, challenging conventional notions of scholarship. At the same time, English Studies must grapple with how these technologies intersect with core humanistic values.

In the age of AI, familiar questions about authorship, originality, and interpretation acquire new complexity. This paper examines both the practical opportunities of AI in English scholarship (tools for research, writing, metrics, and multilingual access) and the ethical and epistemological challenges it raises. We argue that the field must carefully balance innovation with its humanistic traditions, adopting AI tools where they add value but guarding against overreliance and loss of critical plurality.

2. AI in Research and Writing for English Studies

AI-driven tools are already reshaping how literature scholars conduct research and draft manuscripts. In the realm of literature review and information gathering, AI assistants can dramatically reduce the time required to find relevant sources. For example, tools like Elicit use advanced language models to "transform the literature review process" by analyzing queries and summarizing key findings across many articles. Similarly, Scholarcy and connected platforms automatically summarize papers and extract important details. (Tovar, 2023)

Scholarcy, in particular, "simplifies understanding complex academic papers by summarizing them into accessible formats", helping a busy researcher quickly grasp the main arguments of a dense article. Established reference managers like Zotero and Mendeley have also incorporated AI features (metadata extraction, citation prediction) to streamline research. Zotero is described as a "powerful research management tool" that enables "the collection, organization, citation, and sharing of research materials with ease". (Cyrus, 2015)

Together, these tools allow English scholars to compile bibliographies, tag themes, and even visualize citation networks with minimal manual effort. In sum, literature review tasks that once took weeks (finding articles, reading abstracts, taking notes) can now be partly automated or AI-assisted, letting researchers focus more on interpretation.

For writing and editing, AI similarly offers support. Grammar and style checkers such as Wordvice AI or Grammarly use ML to catch errors and suggest improvements in syntax and clarity. These are especially valued by non-native English scholars. By flagging grammar issues and proposing idiomatic phrasing, such tools can help ensure that argumentation is communicated clearly, mitigating barriers for those writing in English as a second language.

Automated paraphrasing and vocabulary suggestions help refine expression without requiring a human editor at every step. Machine translation is also advancing: neural translation engines (DeepL, Google Translate) have grown sufficiently accurate that scholars may draft or translate sections of text (or analyze literature in other languages) with them. (Zou et al., 2022) In practice, a graduate student might use ChatGPT or another LLM to get a first draft outline of an essay on feminist theory, then iteratively revise it, using the AI primarily as brainstorming aid.

Research in education shows AI writing assistants can enhance writing skills: for instance, one study of Chinese English majors found AI-driven feedback improved organization and coherence in student essays. In the context of English Studies, this means AI could help a native Arabic literature researcher polish an article for an English journal, or aid an undergraduate in

translating Foucault's concepts for a seminar paper.

AI also excels at summarization. Large language models can condense long passages of theory or complex criticism into brief overviews. For example, an AI might summarize a chapter of Derrida or Spivak in a few paragraphs, enabling a student to grasp the gist before reading in detail. Such automated summarization can make canonical texts more accessible to newcomers or provide quick refreshers for established scholars. (LeClair et al., 2020) While summary accuracy is not perfect (hallucination and oversimplification remain risks), the potential to quickly capture main ideas of "dense material" is a boon. In practical terms, a researcher might upload a hefty literary critique into an AI tool to get an outline, then verify and expand on it manually.(Granjeiro et al., 2025) Of course, these writing aids are meant to augment rather than replace human creativity.

As Cheng et al. (2025) caution, AI support in writing involves trade-offs: while it can assist with tasks like organization and editing, "it also introduces issues with plagiarism [and] AI hallucinations" that must be managed. Researchers are encouraged to use AI as a collaborator for drafting and feedback but to maintain oversight to ensure originality and nuance. In short, AI tools are transforming English research and writing workflows by automating routine tasks and suggesting content, but true scholarship still depends on the human scholar's critical input.(Granjeiro et al., 2025)

3. AI in Scholarly Publishing Practices

Beyond individual research, AI is reshaping the infrastructure of academic publishing itself. One clear use is in journal selection. Traditionally, authors have relied on their mentors or indexing catalogs to find suitable journals. Now AI-driven "journal finder" tools handle this match-making. Major publishers offer services that analyze a paper's abstract and keywords to recommend journals. (Haddaway et al., 2015)

For example, Elsevier's Journal Finder is a free tool that "identif[ies] the right journal for your research, matching your manuscript with over 2,500 peer-reviewed academic journals". (Publishers like Taylor & Francis and Springer have similar suggestors.) Such tools use ML to compare your manuscript's content with published articles to gauge fit. In English Studies, an author might input an article on postcolonial narrative theory and quickly be pointed to a shortlist of interdisciplinary journals with relevant scopes, saving hours of manual searching.(Soffer & Geifman, 2020)

AI is also entering the peer review and editorial process via recommendation algorithms. Automated recommender systems can suggest potential peer reviewers or even assess an article's fit with a journal's impact profile. One example is Cabells' Predatory Reports (powered by AI classifiers) that help editors flag suspect journals. On a research level, authors can use AI for citation management: services like scite.ai analyze citation contexts and classify them (supporting or contrasting) using deep learning. This "smart citation" approach transforms bibliometric analysis by giving a richer picture than simple counts. For instance, a scholar studying feminist criticism could use scite to see which works are widely cited positively versus critically. These insights can inform literature reviews and tenure dossiers alike.(González-Torres et al., 2020)

AI can even reveal shifting scholarly trends through large-scale text analysis. Digital humanities scholars long use methods like topic modeling and stylometry to map thematic evolutions in literature. Li et al. (2024) review how topic modeling "offers novel ways to analyze and interpret vast corpora of textual data". In practice, an English professor might use topic modeling across hundreds of novels or articles to identify rising themes (e.g. environmental concerns, identity politics) and forecast where scholarship is headed. (Kherwa & Bansal, 2018) By quantifying

keyword frequencies or sentiment, AI can predict fields that are about to explode, such as a surge in cli-fi research.

Moretti's idea of "distant reading" (2013) anticipated this shift: instead of close analysis of one text, scholars use algorithms to read many texts at once. As Li et al. note, topic modeling provides a "macroscopic lens through which researchers can examine cultural and literary trends"(Qu, 2024). AI-enhanced publishing tools - from journal finders to citation analytics to trend forecasting - are streamlining the business of scholarship and data-driven exploration of the research landscape. (DesRoches, 2022)

4. Ethical Implications for English Studies

The integration of AI into publishing raises deep ethical issues that English scholars must confront. The most discussed questions involve originality and authorship. With AI capable of generating text, what counts as plagiarism? Current guidelines from publishing ethics bodies emphasize transparency. COPE and leading publishers have stated unequivocally: AI tools themselves "cannot be listed as an author" because they have no legal standing to take responsibility. In other words, if a literary critic uses ChatGPT to draft a paragraph, the credit must remain with the human author. (DeVilbiss & Roberts, 2025)

Users must disclose any substantial AI involvement in methods sections or acknowledgements. Crucially, even when AI is used, human authors are held fully responsible for content. As one editorial policy notes, authors "are fully responsible for the content of their manuscript, even those parts produced by an AI tool, and are thus liable for any breach of publication ethics". In practice, this means an English scholar cannot hide behind AI: if a quoted excerpt or argument turns out to be false or plagiarised (an AI "hallucination"), the author takes the blame. (Digital Divide, Artificial Intelligence, and Women's Labour Inequality in India: Evidence from PLFS Data, n.d.) Relatedly, scholarship must grapple with the difference between aided creation and plagiarism. Cheng et al. (2025) warn that generative AI often "hallucinates" details or fabricates citations.

Another concern is the potential loss of diversity in interpretation. Literary criticism thrives on debate and multiple perspectives. If everyone uses the same AI as co-writer, there is a danger of homogenized analysis. Empirical studies highlight this risk. In one experiment, students given writing prompts and access to ChatGPT produced essays that were strikingly similar in content: the LLM "tended toward consensus," so that respondents "had no divergent opinions being generated". (Jelson et al., 2025)

The researchers observed that AI-generated answers converged on common themes (e.g. career success, philanthropy) at the expense of novel viewpoints. Chayka (2025) summarizes: "A.I. is a technology of averages… the answers they produce tend toward consensus, both in the quality of the writing… and in the calibre of the ideas". For English Studies, this is unsettling. If literary scholars rely on AI's pattern-finding, they may lose the creative leaps and contradictions that enrich criticism. Indeed, a separate study found that AI writing suggestions pushed users toward Western frames of reference, diminishing cultural specificity. AI thereby risks flattening interpretive plurality, especially across cultures. As Bowyer (2025) notes, AI tools "homogenize writing toward Western norms, diminishing nuances that differentiate cultural expression". English critics must ask: will our scholarship become more uniform and cliché if it is filtered through AI?(Agarwal et al., 2025)

Finally, there are the broader ethical issues of equity and exploitation. AI systems are trained on massive datasets (often including copyrighted literary works), raising questions about consent and credit.

5. Opportunities for English Studies Scholars

Despite the challenges, AI opens valuable opportunities for English Studies, especially in broadening participation and innovation. One of the most cited potentials is democratization of access. English scholarship is dominated by English-language publications, which can marginalize non-Anglophone voices. AI translation and multilingual editing tools promise to lower that barrier. As Amano et al. (2025) envision for science, "everyone can use their own language to write, assess and read" scholarly work as AI editing and translation improve. (Hamamah et al., 2023)

In practical terms, this could allow a scholar from Brazil or Kenya to write an article in Portuguese or Swahili, have it translated and polished by AI, and reach a global readership. Bowker (2025) highlights this social justice angle: she notes that the publishing world's reliance on English forces non-native speakers to expend extra effort, so AI translation could "ease the burden of non-Anglophone scholars" and support a "more multilingual scholarly publishing ecosystem". The Global South, in particular, could benefit from such tools, ensuring their research on colonialism or postcolonial literatures is shared widely. Similarly, AI-driven copyediting can assist scholars who are fluent in theory but less confident in English prose, helping them publish without gatekeeping linguistic barriers.(Hamamah et al., 2023)

In the field of digital humanities, AI enables new research methods that were previously impossible. Building on ideas like Moretti's distant reading (2013), English scholars now use machine learning to analyze huge textual corpora. Topic modeling, for example, allows one to process hundreds of novels or poetry collections to detect thematic shifts. Li et al. (2024) emphasize that topic modeling can unveil patterns hidden to close readers: it "allows for the handling of large datasets – entire libraries of texts can be processed, revealing patterns that are not discernible through conventional reading methods".

This means scholars can identify how certain motifs rise and fall over centuries, or how language style changes across eras. AI can also power network analysis of literary influence, stylometric authorship attribution, and even computational adaptation of readings (e.g. sentiment analysis of tragedy vs. comedy). Such tools expand the toolkit of English Studies: one might use image-recognition AI to analyze themes in book cover art, or machine learning to trace intertextual allusions across corpora. These digital avenues can enrich traditional close reading by providing additional evidence and generating new hypotheses. For graduate students and scholars, mastering these AI methods could become a valuable skill in the digital humanities.(Tian et al., 2024)

Another opportunity lies in increasing the international impact and readership of English scholarship. Beyond translating writing, publishers are experimenting with AI to make existing works more accessible. Taylor & Francis recently announced plans to AI-translate academic books into English that otherwise would never be published internationally. The goal, as T&F put it, is to "promote better understanding between cultures and accelerate awareness of the knowledge required to meet today's challenges, regardless of where it is first published". (Chew et al., 2023)

If executed ethically, this approach could bring high-quality research from non-Western contexts to global attention. English Studies, in particular, could benefit from such initiatives: for example, a seminal literary analysis published in Japanese or Turkish could be translated by AI and then refined by human editors, allowing worldwide scholars to engage with it. Moreover, AI-based recommender systems can help readers discover foreign-language scholarship: if an English researcher reads an article on African diaspora poetry, an AI might suggest related works originally written in Spanish or Hindi, promoting cross-pollination of ideas.(Wang et al.,

2023)

6. Challenges & Risks

A primary concern is overreliance on automation, which may weaken scholars' skills. As one experimental study found, college students who used ChatGPT to write essays showed significantly less brain activity in creative regions, and many "felt no ownership whatsoever" of the resulting text. In other words, outsourcing thinking to AI can come at a cognitive cost. (Malik et al., 2024) For English scholars, this raises alarms: if one relies on AI to generate literary analysis, one may lose practice in critical thinking and original interpretation. There is a danger of treating AI as an answer machine rather than a tool. Over time, scholars might cease to struggle with ambiguity or develop novel arguments, defaulting instead to the AI's "safe" consensus answers.

A related risk is homogenization of scholarship. AI language models are trained to reproduce dominant language patterns, which can lead to bland or formulaic writing. Critics note that AI's outputs often "tend toward consensus" and are filled with "clichés and banalities". If many scholars incorporate AI-written text into their work, the field's literature could become less diverse in voice and insight. This effect is exacerbated for non-Western scholars: AI systems trained primarily on English-language content will naturally reflect Western academic norms. (Park, 2024)

The Cornell study mentioned above found that Indian and American subjects given AI writing suggestions produced essays that became more similar to each other, largely following Westernized norms. Culturally specific knowledge and stylistic nuance were suppressed. For English Studies, whose methods celebrate difference and cultural context, this is a profound threat. If an AI "rewrite" of Chinua Achebe's novel tended to Americanise its idioms, the literary richness is lost. Scholars must therefore guard against letting AI dictate the terms of their arguments. When using AI output, extensive human editing is needed to re-infuse it with critical originality and cultural sensitivity.(Salamone, 2006)

Another serious challenge is predatory and fraudulent publishing. In an unregulated environment, unscrupulous actors can misuse AI to flood the literature with bogus work. Spinellis (2025) documents an alarming case: a predatory journal published a completely AI-generated article attributed to his name, complete with valid DOI and fabricated content. His analysis found dozens of similar papers in that journal, implying that the publisher was using AI to churn out low-quality "articles" and even misattribute them to inflate its prestige. Spinellis warns that such unchecked proliferation of AI-generated content "threaten[s] the credibility of academic publishing" and could "severely undermine trust in scholarly communication". (Ugwu et al., 2024)

English Studies is not immune to this trend. Predatory journals might begin to publish AI-written literary articles (e.g. pseudo-analyses of classics) because AI can produce plausible-looking text quickly. This could mislead casual readers or even uninformed faculty into citing junk. The field must therefore strengthen vetting procedures: editors and reviewers need to be vigilant for signs of AI "hallucination" (incoherent arguments, missing data) even in humanities papers. Tools like Turnitin's AI detector can help, but human judgment remains essential. Academics should support reputable publishing outlets and shun "write-only" publications that exist only to collect fees.(Perkins et al., 2023)

Finally, there is the risk of homogenization and loss of creativity in pedagogy and scholarship. If educators begin to accept AI-generated essays or exam responses, students may stop learning to write critically. If tenure committees rely on citation metrics augmented by AI, scholars might chase metrics rather than originality. And if conference proposals become AI-suggested, intellectual conversation could stagnate. (Liang, 2023)

English Studies has always valued the unpredictable – metaphorical leaps, novel interpretations, passionate disagreements. AI tends to smooth out the rough edges. To counter this, the community should emphasize AI literacy: teaching students both how to use AI responsibly and how to recognize when to rely on human judgment. For instance, classes on digital humanities could include exercises where students critique AI summaries of a poem versus their own readings. By consciously engaging with the technology, scholars can avoid passive dependence.(Jung, 2025)

In sum, while AI promises efficiency, it also endangers the very qualities that make literary scholarship vital. Over-dependence on AI can blunt critical faculties, produce bland or biased scholarship, and facilitate dishonest publication practices. Recognizing these dangers is the first step; the next is to develop safeguards (ethical guidelines, AI detection, continued peer review rigor) to ensure that English scholarship remains rich, diverse, and trustworthy.(Elali & Rachid, 2023)

7. Conclusion

English Studies is navigating uncharted terrain as AI reshapes scholarly publishing. On one hand, these technologies offer powerful tools: they can accelerate literature reviews, support multilingual communication, and unlock new digital humanities methods, making scholarship more accessible and data-driven. On the other hand, they pose unique challenges to a discipline rooted in humanistic inquiry. The potential for AI to dilute creativity, marginalize non-Western perspectives, or facilitate academic fraud is real.

This dual nature means that English scholars must negotiate carefully between tradition and innovation. We should embrace AI where it clearly augments human insight (for example, using translation to uplift Global South voices or topic modeling to reveal overlooked themes). Simultaneously, we must uphold core values of the humanities: the primacy of human interpretation, the richness of diverse perspectives, and the integrity of authorship.(Koon, 2025)

Practically, this implies developing AI literacy and ethical awareness. Departments might offer workshops on how to use writing assistants responsibly, or include discussions of AI ethics in research methods courses. Journals and associations (like MLA or ADE) should issue clear guidelines about AI use, building on COPE's standards. Reviewers in English Studies might learn to spot AI-generation clues, and editors could require disclosure of AI assistance.

As Onic et al. (2025) observe, the study of literature is at a tipping point where "the effects of AI and ML on all aspects of the fields" are now impossible to ignore. The coming years will show how well the discipline can adapt. By balancing the efficiency gains of AI with vigilant ethical standards and a commitment to interpretive plurality, English Studies can ensure that its scholarly publishing evolves without sacrificing the human element at its heart.

References

[1] Agarwal, D. P., Naaman, M., & Vashistha, A. (2025). AI Suggestions Homogenize Writing Toward Western Styles and Diminish Cultural Nuances. 1. https://doi.org/10.1145/3706598.3713564

[2] Ariharan, Mr S. "The Death of the Author Revisited: Authorship in Hypertext and E-Literature."

[3] Chew, E. W., Weisman, W. D., Huang, J., & Frey, S. (2023). Machine Translation for Accessible Multi-Language Text Analysis. arXiv (Cornell University). https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2301.08416

[4] Cyrus, J. (2015). Research Guides: Rapid Review Protocol: Steps: Rapid Review. https://guides.library.vcu.edu/rapidreview

[5] Deka, P., & Sarmah, M. (2020).

Co-Occurrence of Keywords in Ecocriticism Research Publications: An Analytical Approach.

[6] DesRoches, A. (2022). Harnessing the Power of Artificial Intelligence in Scholarly Publishing. Editorial Office News, 15(9). https://doi.org/10.18243/eon/2022.15.9.3

[7] DeVilbiss, M. B., & Roberts, L. W. (2025). Artificial Intelligence Tools in Scholarly Publishing. ``

[8] Digital Divide, Artificial Intelligence, and Women's Labour Inequality in India: Evidence from PLFS Data.

[9] Elali, F., & Rachid, L. N. (2023). AI-generated research paper fabrication and plagiarism in the scientific community. Patterns, 4(3), 100706. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2023.100706

[10] González-Torres, T., Rodríguez-Sánchez, J.-L., Montero, A., & Losada, R. G. (2020). Visualizing Research on Industrial Clusters and Global Value Chains: A Bibliometric Analysis. Frontiers in Psychology, 11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01754

[11] Granjeiro, J. M., Cury, A. A. D. B., Cury, J. A., Bueno, M. R., Sousa-Neto, M. D., & Estrela, C. (2025). The Future of Scientific Writing: AI Tools, Benefits, and Ethical Implications [Review of The Future of Scientific Writing: AI Tools, Benefits, and Ethical Implications]. Brazilian Dental Journal, 36. Fundação Odontológica de Ribeirão Preto. https://doi.org/10.1590/0103-644020256471

[12] Haddaway, N., Collins, A., Coughlin, D., & Kirk, S. A. (2015). The Role of Google Scholar in Evidence Reviews and Its Applicability to Grey Literature Searching. PLoS ONE, 10(9). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0138237

[13] Hamamah, H., Emaliana, I., Hapsari, Y., Degeng, P. D. D., & Fadillah, A. C. (2023). Using Nominal Group Technique to Explore Publication Challenges and the Usefulness of AI-Based Writing Technologies: Insights From Indonesian Scholars. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 13(8), 2038. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1308.20

[14] Jelson, A., Manesh, D., Jang, A., Dunlap, D., Kim, Y.-H., & Lee, S. W. (2025). An Empirical Study to Understand How Students Use ChatGPT for Writing Essays. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2501.10551

[15] Jung, M. (2025). Responsible Computational Text Generation: AI Content Classification and Policy Framework. https://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/158904

[16] Kherwa, P., & Bansal, P. (2018). Topic Modeling: A Comprehensive Review [Review of Topic Modeling: A Comprehensive Review]. ICST Transactions on Scalable Information Systems, 159623. European Alliance for Innovation. https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.13-7-2018.159623

[17] Koon, S. (2025). Creating "Full-Stack" Hybrid Reasoning Systems that Prioritize and Enhance Human Intelligence. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2504.13477

[18] LeClair, A., Haque, S., Wu, L., & McMillan, C. (2020). Improved Code Summarization via a Graph Neural Network. 184. https://doi.org/10.1145/3387904.3389268

[19] Liang, W., Zhang, Y., Codreanu, M., Wang, J., Cao, H., & Zou, J. (2025). The Widespread Adoption of Large Language Model-Assisted Writing Across Society. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2502.09747

[20] Liang, Y. (2023). Balancing: The Effects

of AI Tools in Educational Context. Frontiers in Humanities and Social Sciences, 3(8), 7. https://doi.org/10.54691/fhss.v3i8.5531

[21] Malik, M. A., Amjad, A. I., Aslam, S., & Fakhrou, A. (2024). Global insights: ChatGPT's influence on academic and research writing, creativity, and plagiarism policies. Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics, 9. https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2024.1486832

[22] Park, S. (2024). AI Chatbots and Linguistic Injustice. Journal of Universal Language, 25(1), 99. https://doi.org/10.22425/jul.2024.25.1.99

[23] Perkins, M., Roe, J., Postma, D., McGaughran, J., & Hickerson, D. (2023). Game of Tones: Faculty detection of GPT-4 generated content in university assessments. arXiv (Cornell University). https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2305.18081

[24] Qu, S. (2024). A Thematic Analysis of English and American Literature Works Based on Text Mining and Sentiment Analysis. Deleted Journal, 20, 1575. https://doi.org/10.52783/jes.3076

[25] Salamone, F. A. (2006). The Depiction of Masculinity in Classic Nigerian Literature. Journal of the African Literature Association, 1(1), 202. https://doi.org/10.1080/21674736.2006.11690036

[26] Soffer, O., & Geifman, D. (2020). Comparing research topics in European and International Communication Association journals: Computational analysis. International Communication Gazette, 83(8), 753. https://doi.org/10.1177/1748048520928334

[27] Stein, J., Messingschlager, T., Gnambs, T., Hutmacher, F., & Appel, M. (2024). Attitudes towards AI: measurement and associations with personality. Scientific Reports, 14(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-53335-2

[28] Tian, Z., Sun, M., Liu, A., Sarkar, S., & Liu, J. (2024). Enhancing Instructional Quality: Leveraging Computer-Assisted Textual Analysis to Generate In-Depth Insights from Educational Artifacts. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2403.03920

[29] Tovar, D. A. (2023). AI Literature Review Suite. arXiv (Cornell University). https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.02443

[30] Wang, C. (2024). Exploring Students' Generative AI-Assisted Writing Processes: Perceptions and Experiences from Native and Nonnative English Speakers. Technology Knowledge and Learning. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-024-09744-3

[31] Wang, T., Lund, B., Marengo, A., Pagano, A., Mannuru, N. R., Teel, Z. A., & Pange, J. (2023). Exploring the Potential Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on International Students in Higher Education: Generative AI, Chatbots, Analytics, and International Student Success. Applied Sciences, 13(11), 6716. https://doi.org/10.3390/app13116716

[32] Xu, H., Gan, W., Qi, Z., Wu, J., & Yu, P. S. (2024). Large Language Models for Education: A Survey. arXiv (Cornell University). https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2405.13001

[33] Zou, R., Chang, W., Gao, S., & Qin, S. (2022). Strategies for improving the quality of computer-assisted translation based on internet. International Journal of Advanced Academic Studies, 4(4), 156. https://doi.org/10.33545/27068919.2022.v4.i4c.890