

## Dr Matty Wood, [ChatGPT Doing Students' Work like Writing Essays](#), 10 January 2023

In this video, Dr Wood uses ChatGPT to carry out various writing tasks which students often have to do at university. After explaining what ChatGPT is, and its ethical implications, Wood tests the platform for the following tasks:

### Time 02:41 **Basic essay** (Underlined words are defined at the end of the text. [My comments in square brackets.])

He asks ChatGPT to “write me an essay entitled: ‘Biological interventions have had a significant impact on the treatment of mental health’. [As a lecturer in Social Psychology, he should know something about.] He notes that the essay is “pretty well-written, on a lot of levels”. It introduces the topic well, “signposts the contents”, “steps through the key ideas in a coherent way, and concludes at the end”. It would not pass, because there are no references, but these can be asked for, and the result is then passable.

ChatGPT seems “over-reliant” on a few references [and may “hallucinate”]. The essay is “broadly accurate”, which is not always the case, but does not make “a new and novel argument”, which good essays do. It is “broadly descriptive”.

More search queries will make the answer better.

### Time 05:03 **Literature review and methods**

In answer to the prompt: “write me a literature review about explainable AI and the implications to psychology”. The answer is short, but again can be expanded. This would provide something that is “quite good” – not “amazing”. The answer does not build towards the study of the discipline. The review is average, but the writing somewhat better.

Starting a new Chat produces different answers.

### Time 07:29 **Executive summary of Macbeth**

ChatGPT is really good at summarising texts. Wood asks it to summarise Macbeth. It does generate something different each time the prompt is used. As a non-literature scholar he believes the summary to be quite good.

### Time 08:06 **Short answer question**

ChatGPT excels at short answer questions, which are to the point and concise. Wood uses a question given to students: “How is a critical approach to gender different to a sex differences approach to gender?”

The answer is very accurate.

### Time 09:20 **Generating recommendations**

According to Wood, ChatGPT is remarkable at generating recommendations

### Time 09:53 **A case study**

For this, ChatGPT is good at “structuring writing”, which students struggle with.

### Time 10:36 **Reflective writing**

ChatGPT is also good at this. Wood uses the prompt: “write a reflection of a nurse about a challenging day on a ward”. The result sounds “pretty convincing” to Wood as a “non-nurse practitioner”. Incorporating academic references and gives a good result, though a little formulaic.

### Time 11:48 **Implications**

ChatGPT can mark work, for example, Wood asks for ChatGPT to “write 2 paragraphs of feedback on the reflection, to say it was a little formulaic and could have some more specific examples”.

ChatGPT could give teachers and students to spend more time on teaching and learning... It would be a waste of time to ban ChatGPT... More effort could go into encouraging authentic writing styles... The more generic, description, glib arguments, which don't require any original thought [...] will be more difficult to reward... ChatGPT makes us think about programmatic assessment, with broader assessment models, thinking more broadly about students' learning.

To signpost = to indicate with a marker; to be over-reliant = to be too dependent on; accurate = precise, exact; to excel at = to be very good at; to the point = relevant; formulaic = involving established forms of words or symbols, conventional; glib = quick, superficial, insincere; programmatic assessment = assessment integrated into the entire educational programme.