Vol. (11), No. (2); 2025
ISSN : 2355-2069 (Print)
ISSN : 2656-5765 (Online)
Published by UIN Fatmawati Sukarno Bengkulu

EFL LECTURER'S AND STUDENTS' ACADEMIC WRITING EXPERIENCE AND CHALLENGES IN USING AI WRITING TOOLS: A QUALITATIVE STUDY

MELI FAUZIAH[1], SARWO EDY[2], ABDUL KARIM AMRULLAH[3], JESI NURAINI[4], EKA APRIAINI[5]
[1,2,3,4,5]*Institut Agama Islam Negeri Curup*
melifauziah@iaincurup.ac.id

DOI : http://dx.doi.org/10.29300/ling.v11i2.9666

Received: September 1st 2025 Accepted: December 13th 2025 Published: December 31st 2025

Abstract

This study investigates the experiences and challenges of lecturers and students in the English Tadris Study Program of IAIN Curup in using AI writing tools for academic work. Using a qualitative approach with purposive sampling, data were collected from one lecturer and ten students through interviews, supported by a preliminary pilot study confirming the integration of AI in academic writing practices. The findings reveal that AI enhances idea development, organization, syntactic accuracy, vocabulary refinement, and writing confidence, functioning as a cognitive accelerator that streamlines the writing process. However, significant challenges emerge, including shallow idea generation, rigid structures, machine-like language, inaccurate citations, limited access to premium AI features, and insufficient prompt literacy. The discussion highlights deeper pedagogical implications, particularly the shifting paradigm from "writing as creation" to "writing as collaboration," emphasizing the lecturer's role as mediator of ethical AI use. Psychological transformations also appear, where efficiency leads to dependency, forming a "comfort paradox" that threatens independent thinking and authorial identity. The study concludes with recommendations for institutional AI guidelines, AI literacy integration, equitable access, and pedagogical redesign to balance automation with originality.

Keywords: AI writing tools, academic writing, AI literacy, pedagogical implications

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a highly influential communicative practice that shapes individual expression and contributes to broader social development. It enables the structured articulation of emotions, ideas, and knowledge, and supports comprehension, documentation, and meaningful learning (Utami et al., 2023). Effective writing, however, requires more than technical ability; it demands adherence to compositional norms, critical thinking, and effective rhetorical strategies. With the growing integration of artificial intelligence (AI), tools such as machine learning and natural language processing are increasingly used to enhance writing fluency, efficiency, and instructional practices (Altmäe et al., 2023; Nazari et al., 2021). AI-based applications—including chatbots, automated writing evaluators, and writing assistants—aim to support learning and improve students' writing development (Woo et al., 2024). Research demonstrates that AI tools in EFL contexts offer high efficiency, usability, and time savings for both teachers and learners (T. S. Chang et al., 2021; Gayed et al., 2022; Jeanjaroonsri, 2023; Zhao, 2023), particularly benefiting low-proficiency learners by providing timely feedback and writing support.

Initial observations at State Institute of Islamic Studies (IAIN) Curup, Bengkulu, Indonesia show that students and lecturers incorporate AI tools to facilitate academic writing activities, consistent with trends identified by (Ouyang et al., 2022), who found that AI integration enhances academic performance, especially writing skills. Students rely on AI to overcome

difficulties in generating ideas and producing well-structured essays, while lecturers adopt these tools to support instruction. AI writing tools assist users through suggestions and feedback on language, syntax, content, and organization (Hosseini et al., 2024; Strobl et al., 2019; Thorp, 2023). Educators also value AI-related professional development to strengthen teaching practices and address student concerns (Froemming, 2020).

However, concerns persist regarding misuse and academic integrity. Scholars warn that AI tools can facilitate new forms of plagiarism, encourage the uncritical acceptance of generated ideas, and obscure personal voice and identity in writing (Burkhard, 2022; Prentice & Kinden, 2018; Rogerson & McCarthy, 2017). From the perspective of technological determinism (McLuhan, 1964), AI reshapes writing habits by offering convenience but also fostering dependency. Students risk losing authenticity and rhetorical awareness, aligning with (Hyland, 2015) view of academic writing as a social, discipline-bound practice. Lecturers face difficulties evaluating originality because AI tends to generate generic, context-neutral texts (Liu et al., 2023). Ethical dilemmas—such as plagiarism, lack of attribution, and diminished writing competence—have also been identified (Dwivedi et al., 2023). Given that technology is not morally neutral (Burkhard, 2022), appropriate guidance is needed to ensure responsible use, prevent plagiarism, and support students' critical engagement with AI-generated feedback.

Existing studies on AI-based writing tools in EFL contexts mainly highlight their effectiveness, efficiency, and positive learning outcomes. However, they often overlook the experiential, teaching, and ethical challenges that come with using these tools. There is especially little research on how AI writing tools impact students' authorial voice, critical engagement, and adherence to academic writing standards. Additionally, there is little focus on how lecturers handle issues of originality, assessment, and academic integrity. Few studies also look at the views of both EFL students and lecturers in real classroom settings where AI use is informal and not tightly regulated. As a result, the ways AI writing tools are experienced, negotiated, and managed in higher education EFL contexts—particularly in developing institutional environments—remain insufficiently explored.

Preliminary observations and pre-interviews at IAIN Curup further indicate active use of AI tools such as Grammarly, Quillbot, and ChatGPT by both students and lecturers for grammar correction, paraphrasing, idea generation, feedback, and instructional support. Signs of AI-generated writing appear in student assignments, while lecturers employ AI to enhance teaching and assessment processes.

In response to this emerging phenomenon, the study aims to investigate the experiences and challenges faced by EFL students and lecturers in using AI writing tools.

Academic Writing

Academic writing serves as a structured medium through which scientific knowledge is communicated, evaluated, and advanced within a discipline. As (Altunkaya & Ayranci, 2020) notes, effective academic writing demands that authors address audiences who possess prior interest and foundational knowledge of the field, and that they present ideas through verifiable, unbiased, and well-organized arguments. This form of writing adheres to strict conventions, requiring clear thesis formulation, a deep understanding of the subject matter, and engagement with previous research through critical analysis and citation.

Scientific writing is distinguished from other writing genres by its emphasis on explaining scientific concepts, methods, and cognitive processes such as generating new knowledge, analyzing and verifying information, and constructing meaningful conceptual relationships (Grogan, 2021; Lindsay, 2020). Through these processes, students develop critical thinking, logical reasoning, and problem-solving abilities that contribute to scientific literacy. This aligns with constructivist learning principles, which emphasize active meaning-making, personal interpretation, and collaborative engagement (Supriyadi, n.d. 2021). Empirical findings across

STEM education contexts further underscore the value of scientific writing in enhancing students' conceptual understanding and argumentation skills (Belland et al., 2020; Belland & Kim, 2021; Kim et al., 2022). Thus, academic writing not only communicates knowledge but also develops the intellectual competencies essential for higher-order academic work.

AI Writing Tools

The growing interest in AI writing tools among EFL learners reflects the increasing accessibility and perceived utility of AI systems in supporting academic communication. These tools—ranging from automated essay scoring systems to grammar checkers, paraphrasers, and generative AI applications—provide assistance in producing text, generating ideas, and correcting linguistic errors (Chang et al., 2021; Gayed et al., 2022; Jeanjaroonsri, 2023; Zhao, 2023). Their immediate, personalized feedback is particularly valuable for EFL learners who struggle with linguistic proficiency and require guidance in structure, coherence, grammar, and content development.

AI systems evaluate writing by comparing learner-produced text against large corpora of high- and low-quality samples, allowing them to identify errors, suggest revisions, and enhance clarity (Hosseini et al., 2024; Strobl et al., 2019; Thorp, 2023). Research indicates that timely feedback from AI tools can improve students' understanding of writing principles and support their writing development (Akgun & Greenhow, 2022; Nazari et al., 2021; Rudolph, 2023). These benefits make AI writing tools increasingly attractive for both students and lecturers in EFL academic environments.

Lecturers' and Students' Experiences in Using AI Writing Tools

User experience plays a crucial role in determining the effectiveness and acceptance of educational technology. According to Marx in Sumakul et al. (Sumakul et al., 2022), learners' perceptions influence classroom practices, task design, and self-perceptions as capable learners. Similarly, in Biggs' 3P (Presage–Process–Product) model, student experiences are central to learning outcomes, and the components of the model interact in an interconnected manner (Lizzio, 2022). Students' intention to use AI tools is shaped by their perception of usefulness and ease of use, which in turn impacts actual usage patterns.

Studies show that EFL students appreciate AI tools such as chatbots, grammar checkers, and story bots because they are accessible, user-friendly, and helpful in improving writing quality, enhancing confidence, and supporting independent learning (Bailey, 2021; Haristiani, 2019). Many learners feel more comfortable interacting with AI than with human instructors, leading to greater willingness to engage in writing tasks.

Lecturers, meanwhile, view AI as valuable for reducing administrative workloads, facilitating feedback, and supporting teaching in large classes (Holmes, 2019; Jia et al., 2020; Qin et al., 2020). However, their attitudes are influenced by pedagogical beliefs, teaching experience, familiarity with educational technologies, and perceptions of AI's educational value (Luckin, 2016; So et al., 2019). Some lecturers remain cautious due to limited exposure, concerns about professional displacement, or uncertainty about how to integrate AI effectively. Thus, experiences vary, but both groups recognize AI's potential when used critically and ethically. A summary of these experiences was provided in the preceding table.

Lecturers' and Students' Challenges in Using AI Writing Tools

Despite the potential benefits, both students and lecturers face notable challenges in using AI writing tools. AI offers features such as intelligent tutoring, automated assessments, and individualized learning, yet it cannot replicate the emotional connection, contextual sensitivity, and nuanced judgment provided by human teachers (Shidiq, 2023). Overreliance on AI may inhibit students' creativity, originality, social interaction, and critical thinking. AI systems lack the capacity to fully understand learners' diverse preferences and needs, which can lead to superficial engagement with writing tasks.

In developing countries, structural constraints pose additional barriers. Limited access to up-to-date devices, high costs of ICT infrastructure, insufficient bandwidth, and institutional budget limitations hinder sustainable AI adoption (Talebian et al., 2014). These challenges are compounded by lecturers' limited AI literacy, low confidence, and feelings of overwhelm when required to learn new digital systems (Su et al., 2023). Without adequate training and support, lecturers may resist adopting AI tools or struggle to implement them effectively.

As summarize, the challenges faced by students and lecturers highlight the need for balanced technology integration, capacity building, and improved infrastructural support to ensure meaningful and ethical use of AI writing tools in higher education.

Overview of Prior Studies

Several previous studies inform the present research. Utami et al., (2023) found that AI tools assist Indonesian students during the planning and drafting stages of academic writing, although they do not address all writing needs. Nazari et al., (2021)demonstrated that AI-assisted feedback enhances behavioral engagement and improves academic writing skills among non-native English postgraduate learners. (Burkhard, 2022) reported diverse attitudes toward AI tools, noting risks of plagiarism due to inattentive use and the need for tailored instructional strategies. Akbarani (2023) emphasized that while AI supports academic writing instruction, improper use may produce negative impacts. (Gayed et al., 2022) showed that AI-based tools like AI KAKU can help EFL learners navigate cognitive difficulties in writing, particularly those needing structured support.

Compared to these studies, the present research differs in its dual focus on both experiences and challenges, and in its inclusion of both lecturers and students as participants within a higher education context. By employing interviews as the primary data collection method, this study provides a more comprehensive and contextually grounded understanding of AI writing tool use in academic writing practices at the university level.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative research design to explore EFL lecturers' and students' experiences and challenges in using AI writing tools in academic writing contexts. Participants consisted of one English lecturer and ten EFL students from the English Tadris Study Program at IAIN Curup, selected through purposive sampling based on their regular use of AI writing applications such as Grammarly, Quillbot, and ChatGPT for academic writing tasks. Preliminary observations and informal discussions confirmed participants' active engagement with AI-assisted writing. According to Sugiyono in Putri (2023), purposeful sampling is a technique used to consciously select a certain sample while accounting for predetermined characteristics. The sample size was deemed sufficient as data saturation was reached when additional interviews produced no new themes or insights.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews using protocols validated by English language experts from three universities. Interviews progressed from general to focused questions to elicit in-depth accounts of participants' experiences and challenges. Prior to data collection, ethical approval was obtained from the relevant institutional authority, and informed consent was secured from all participants. Confidentiality and anonymity were ensured throughout the research process.

Data analysis followed Creswell's (2014) qualitative procedures, including data organization, iterative reading, coding, theme development, and interpretation. Interview transcripts were grouped by participant type (lecturer and students) and thematically categorized into experiences and challenges using a thematic analysis approach informed by Saldaña's coding framework (Wicks, 2017) and Denzin and Lincoln's analytic principles in his Handbook of Qualitative Study (Genot, 2018). Afterwards, trustworthiness was established

through credibility and dependability strategies, including expert validation of interview instruments, sustained engagement with the data, iterative coding, and the maintenance of a transparent audit trail documenting analytical decisions.

FINDINGS

This section presents the findings of the study, focusing on lecturer's and students' experiences and challenges in using AI writing tools for academic writing. Preliminary observations conducted prior to the study confirmed that AI tools were actively integrated into writing practices by both lecturer and students in the English Tadris Study Program at IAIN Curup. Building on these observations, in-depth interviews were conducted with one lecturer and ten students selected through purposive sampling based on their regular use of AI writing tools.

Data analysis revealed two overarching categories: Experiences (A) and Challenges (B). To enhance clarity, coded abbreviations were used to represent each participant and theme, as summarized in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Abbreviations for the coded themes on Experiences (A)

No	Abbreviation	Experiences
1	A1	Idea Development: AI as a Cognitive Accelerator
2	A2	Writing Organization: Formation of Cohesion and Logical Structure
3	A3	Academic Language Structure: Improvement in Syntactic Accuracy
4	A4	Formal/Informal Vocabulary: Accuracy of Language Register
5	A5	Academic Writing Mechanics: Basic Precision versus Advanced Format Deficiencies
6	A6	Creativity and Idea Evolution: Source of Inspiration, Not Substitution for Originality
7	A7	Confidence in Understanding: Increased Sense of Security in Writing
8	A8	Comfort and Efficiency of Use: Acceleration and Convenience

Table 2. Abbreviations for the coded themes on Challenges (B)

No	Abbreviation	Challenges
1	B1	Idea Development Challenges: Generality and Lack of Depth
2	B2	Organization Challenges: Rigidity of Rhetorical Structure
3	B3	Language Structure Challenges: Machine-Like Output Issue
4	B4	Formal/Informal Vocabulary Challenges: Contextual Inappropriateness
5	B5	Writing Mechanics Challenges: Citation Failure and Advanced Academic Format
6	B6	Funding and Access Challenges: Digital Resource Gap
7	B7	Skill and Dependency Challenges: Need for Prompt Literacy

Lecturer's and Students' Experiences in Using AI Writing Tools

The findings addressing the first research question indicate that both lecturer and students generally perceive AI writing tools as supportive across multiple stages of academic writing. Lecturer "E" viewed AI primarily as a cognitive accelerator that enhances idea development, writing organization, and efficiency, while emphasizing the need for critical revision to preserve originality. She noted that AI tools help improve coherence, cohesion, grammatical accuracy, and formal vocabulary use, although the outputs are often general, mechanical, and limited in handling advanced academic formatting such as citation styles. AI was also seen as a source of inspiration that supports creativity without replacing students' intellectual contribution, increases confidence, and accelerates the writing process, provided that overreliance is avoided.

Students' experiences largely aligned with the lecturer's perspective. Most students reported that AI tools assisted them in brainstorming ideas, structuring essays, improving grammar, refining vocabulary, and correcting basic writing mechanics. AI was particularly valued for overcoming writer's block, enhancing confidence, and reducing stress during drafting and revision. However, students consistently acknowledged that AI-generated outputs often required substantial refinement to achieve academic depth, contextual appropriateness,

and personal voice. While AI supported creativity and efficiency, students emphasized that it functioned best as a supportive tool rather than a substitute for critical thinking and originality.

Lecturer's and Students' Challenges in Using AI Writing Tools

The findings addressing the third and fourth research question reveal several interconnected challenges experienced by both lecturer and students. The lecturer "E" identified a series of interconnected pedagogical, linguistic, and technical challenges arising from students' reliance on AI writing tools, beginning with difficulties in idea development, as many students depended too heavily on AI-generated content, which she perceived as overly general and lacking depth, making it harder for them to cultivate originality and critical thinking. She also struggled with issues of organization, noting that students often copied AI's rigid and formulaic structures without adapting them to academic logic or revising them in their own words. In terms of language structure, "E" observed that students tended to accept AI's grammatical outputs uncritically, resulting in writing that was correct but mechanical and lacking natural human tone. Similar problems occurred in vocabulary use, where students frequently selected AI-suggested words without evaluating contextual suitability, leading to inconsistent or inappropriate lexical choices that did not align with academic conventions.

Challenges also emerged in writing mechanics, particularly in advanced academic requirements such as citation formats and referencing, where students tended to follow AI outputs blindly, despite AI's frequent inaccuracies in paraphrasing and citation style. Beyond linguistic concerns, "E" highlighted access limitations, explaining that inadequate device support and the premium nature of many AI tools created inequities in students' ability to benefit from AI-assisted learning. Finally, she emphasized that students' insufficient prompt literacy and growing dependency on AI further complicated the learning process, as unclear instructions often produced inaccurate outputs and overreliance threatened the development of independent writing, analytical skills, and academic autonomy.

Similarly, students reported challenges across idea development, organization, language structure, and mechanics. Many found AI-generated ideas repetitive and lacking depth, while AI-produced structures were often rigid and misaligned with their intended arguments. Although grammatically correct, AI outputs frequently sounded unnatural or overly formal, requiring careful editing. Students also struggled with citation accuracy and advanced formatting, noting that AI often failed to comply with academic standards. Students noted that AI often failed to produce accurate citations or adhere to standards such as APA or MLA, forcing them to manually correct references, punctuation, and stylistic inconsistencies. Beyond linguistic concerns, nearly all students faced financial and access-related constraints, since many AI platforms offered only limited free features and required paid subscriptions for advanced tools, while device limitations further restricted their ability to utilize AI effectively. Finally, a major challenge involved prompt literacy and dependency, as students struggled to formulate precise instructions, leading to irrelevant outputs, while others expressed growing reliance on AI that weakened their confidence and independence in academic writing, highlighting the need for balanced use that supports rather than replaces human creativity and critical thinking.

DISCUSSION

With all of the coding theme had been explained above, and by joining and matching the criteria examined beforehand, the interpretation process of this study revealed several points that be in accordance to the previous study as well as revealing some of keypoints that answered the questions raised in preliminary section.

Overall, all of the research subjects discussed a contrastive yet supporting topic about both experiences and challenges lecturer and students faced while using AI.

The most intriguing finding is the dualistic use of AI in writing academic work. Although, it has a non-questionable efficiency when it comes to writing efficiency, even removing technical barrier, yet it contains risks to academic authenticity. There were also a notably increase in efficiency and confidence while writing academic work as AI automate mechanics correction and also could generate initial ideas to make the writing process flows smoothly. However, reliance on this efficiency resulted in the decline of personal creativity and the threat of losing authorial autonomy. By framing AI use as a shift from *"writing as creation"* to *"writing as collaboration,"* this study extends prior findings (e.g. Chang et al., 2021; Gayed et al., 2022; Jeanjaroonsri, 2023; Zhao, 2023) by theorizing how AI reshapes the epistemological nature of writing itself, rather than merely improving writing performance. This finding was an intriguing topic to be researched, especially to predict how this shift could affect the academic world.

Next, challenges with the skill while communicating with AI, marked a significant gap in AI usage. One finding could be summarized as "the quality of AI output determined by its input." Not only data, but also prompt; which are needed both by lecturer and students at English Study Program of IAIN Curup. Several subjects had also encounter unclear result, too general ideas and even rigid structures, which support why skill and dependency challenges arise. Subject of the research also revealed that the vital skill that they need is the Contextual Prompting Skill to communicate with AI, and Critical Vetting Skill to identify output that unnatural or not comply with academic ethics. This finding refines existing models of AI-assisted learning by positioning prompt literacy and evaluative judgment as core mediating variables.

On the aspect of Funding and Access Challenges: Digital Resource Gap, the subject of the research raised an issue about AI use is deemed important, then access to premium features especially those related to integrity of the academic work should be treated as basic resources. For example, campus could adopt research integrity method of SCOPUS paper submission requirement to the academic work administration or management. In one of the challenges, subject of the research revealed that lecturers and assessments must be designed to be dynamically work with comply or critically focused on some indicators that couldn't be automated such as critical analysis of AI generated ideas, or testing their prompting skill. This approach will cultivate the ability of critical thinking of the students themselves. The comparison of user roles and pedagogical issues, summarizing the suggested directions for intervention are presented in the Table 3 below.

Tabel 3. The comparison of user roles and pedagogical issues

Aspect	Summary of Interview Results		Suggestion / Implication
	Lecturer	**Students**	
Focus on Idea Quality	Lecturers emphasize the importance of *originality* and *critical depth* in student writing. They see AI as a tool that can inspire ideas but must not replace authentic intellectual effort.	Students often use AI to *overcome writer's block* or *generate general ideas* but struggle to refine them into specific, critical arguments.	Integrate guided activities that teach *AI idea refinement*, emphasizing *critical engagement* rather than direct adoption of AI-generated ideas.
Focus on Revision	Lecturers highlight that AI outputs should be *revised for structure, coherence, and linguistic accuracy* while maintaining the author's personal style.	Students tend to depend on AI-generated language, which often results in *rigid, unnatural expressions* and *limited stylistic variation.*	Provide revision workshops focusing on *stylistic flexibility* and *natural language adjustment* to eliminate *machine-like tone* and foster authentic voice.
Primary Risk	The main risks identified are *loss of creativity*, *academic dishonesty*, and *over-reliance on AI.* Lecturers worry students may not develop their own writing identity	Students acknowledge risks such as *dependence on AI tools (B7)*, *limited access to premium features (B6)*, and *rigid sentence structures*	Implement *AI literacy programs* that teach responsible, transparent use, along with institutional *fair access policies* to prevent inequality.

		(B3).	
Critical Competency	Lecturers expect students to *critically evaluate and edit* AI outputs, integrating their own reasoning and supporting evidence.	Students admit they often accept AI results without *adequate verification or source evaluation.*	Encourage the role of *student-as-editor*: promote *critical editing skills* and *source verification* as part of academic writing assessment.
Ethical Awareness	Lecturers are concerned about *plagiarism* and *authorship ethics* when students use AI without acknowledgment.	Students have limited understanding of *ethical citation* or *transparency* when integrating AI-generated text.	Include modules on *ethical AI citation*, *authorship integrity*, and *responsible tool use* within writing courses.
Feedback and Guidance	Lecturers find that *AI-assisted drafts* allow more focus on content feedback rather than basic grammar correction.	Students appreciate AI feedback but often lack *lecturer guidance* on how to improve AI-generated texts effectively.	Strengthen *human-AI feedback integration* by combining lecturer mentoring with AI-generated suggestions.
Skill Development Impact	Lecturers note that excessive reliance on AI *limits linguistic and reasoning skill development.*	Students feel AI helps with efficiency but reduces *writing effort* and *critical learning experience.*	Balance AI use with *manual drafting stages* to ensure genuine skill acquisition and reflection.
Pedagogical Direction	Lecturers agree that *AI should be pedagogically framed* as a support tool, not a replacement for cognitive effort.	Students express the need for *clear guidance and institutional policy* on acceptable AI usage.	Establish *curriculum-level integration* of AI literacy, including *usage boundaries*, *critical reflection*, and *ethical standards.*

With all of the discussion above addressed each of the thematic category of analysis results, several findings of this study are not mentioned in the aforementioned research. For example, the work of Hosseini et al., (2024); Strobl et al., (2019); and Thorp, (2023) concluded that student seek feedback in the aspect of structure of their writing, however in this study, several subjects lack AI Literacy which discourage them to use AI to learn the structure of their work.

Some finding of this study also supports Luckin's (2016) work, in which they raised a fact of risk of AI to the Professional life, which in academic profession, in researcher opinion, could began with risk of AI on academic authenticity. Not only that, increase in efficiency are also influenced by various variables, which support Prentice & Kinden (2018) study. Moreover, researcher raised several gaps in the related findings section, span from essential requirement in using AI (Utami et al., 2023), its feedback (Nazari et al., 2021), and attitudes in using AI writing tools (Burkhard, 2022). All are mentioned and support by the finding of this study.

Furthermore, this study also highlighted an underexplored pedagogical implication regarding the role of lecturers as mediators between AI and academic writing ethics. The findings show that while lecturers act as facilitators who encourage students to critically use AI, they are also responsible for redesigning instructional strategies that balance automation and originality. This aligns with the concept of *AI-augmented pedagogy*, where human oversight becomes an ethical anchor that ensures AI functions as a scaffold rather than a substitute for intellectual engagement. The lecturer's challenge in maintaining students' originality underlines the necessity for explicit guidelines on ethical AI use, reflective writing exercises, and transparent acknowledgment of AI assistance within academic institutions. This dimension, which has not been thoroughly examined in previous studies, provides a concrete direction for the development of *AI-integrated writing pedagogy* that promotes critical awareness and accountability.

Another critical aspect uncovered by this study relates to the psychological and cognitive transformation in the writing process caused by AI use. Students' reliance on AI not only alters their writing behavior but also affects their self-perception as authors. The balance between confidence gains and dependency risk signifies the emergence of a "comfort paradox," where ease of use can simultaneously hinder independent thinking. This psychological dependency

intertwines with cognitive laziness, as noted by several participants who experienced difficulty writing without AI assistance. Such findings call for the incorporation of *metacognitive AI literacy* in writing curricula, aiming to train students not just in technical skills but in reflective self-monitoring when using AI tools. This framework ensures that while students benefit from AI's efficiency, they remain critically aware of their role as the principal creator of meaning in academic texts.

With all the supporting theory above, researcher may infer from this study that the role of AI in education possess the same value and risks to the results of academic work. While it could improve the quality of one's work, on the other hands, institutions required to keep the pace of management and authenticity administration, especially on students' works, to maintain academic ethics at any cost.

CONCLUSION

The rapid advancement of AI in academic writing has significantly reduced technical barriers and enhanced students' productivity, yet it also raises concerns about declining critical thinking skills and writing autonomy. Lecturer in the English Tadris Study Program views AI tools as supportive aids that improve efficiency, language accuracy, and idea generation, while stressing that AI must remain secondary to genuine intellectual effort. In addition, students perceive AI as helpful for overcoming writer's block, organizing ideas, and refining grammar and vocabulary, although many become overly dependent on it, leading to reduced creativity and a shift toward "writing with assistance" rather than independent creation. Besides, lecturer also struggles to preserve students' originality, ensure fair assessment, and manage ethical risks such as plagiarism and overreliance, problems exacerbated by the absence of institutional AI literacy guidelines. Meanwhile, the last finding reveals that students face shallow idea development, rigid structure, vocabulary inconsistency, citation inaccuracies, limited access to premium AI features, and weak prompting skills, resulting in generic or ethically problematic outputs. Overall, this study confirms existing findings while highlighting crucial gaps for future research, including the need for stronger academic integrity safeguards and deeper investigation into the paradigm shift from human-centered writing to AI-assisted composition.

Based on the study's findings, several recommendations are proposed to support responsible AI integration in academic writing. Institutions should develop clear ethical guidelines, embed AI literacy into curricula, ensure fair access, and reinforce academic integrity systems. Lecturers need training in AI-informed pedagogy and should design assessments that promote critical thinking, effective prompting, and reflective engagement. Students are encouraged to sharpen their prompting and evaluation skills, using AI as support rather than a substitute for creativity and independent thought. Future research should explore institutional safeguards for academic integrity and examine the shift from "writing to create" toward "writing with assistance." Overall, AI should function as a pedagogical scaffold that enhances human intellect and ethical awareness while maintaining authentic academic writing.

REFERENCES

Akbarani, R. , & P. F. D. (2023). The Challenges of Using Artificial Intelligence in Academic Writing. *In Proceeding of Annual International Conference on Islamic Education (AICIED)*, *1*, 63–71.

Akgun, S., & Greenhow, C. (2022). Artificial intelligence in education: Addressing ethical challenges in K-12 settings. *AI and Ethics*, *2*(3), 431–440. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00096-7

Altmäe, S., Sola-Leyva, A., & Salumets, A. (2023). Artificial intelligence in scientific writing: a friend or a foe? In *Reproductive BioMedicine Online* (Vol. 47, Issue 1, pp. 3–9). Elsevier Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rbmo.2023.04.009

Altunkaya, H., & Ayranci, B. (2020). The use of Edmodo in academic writing education. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *16*(1), 89–103. https://doi.org/10.17263/JLLS.712659

Bailey, D. , S. A. , & C. J. (2021). Digital storytelling with chatbots: Mapping L2 participation and perception patterns. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*.

Belland, B. R., & Kim, N. J. (2021). Predicting high school students' argumentation skill using information literacy and trace data. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *114*(3), 211–221. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2021.1897967

Belland, B. R., Weiss, D. M., & Kim, N. J. (2020). High school students' agentic responses to modeling during problem-based learning. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *113*(5), 374–383. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2020.1838407

Burkhard, M. (2022). *STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF AI-POWERED WRITING TOOLS: TOWARDS INDIVIDUALIZED TEACHING STRATEGIES*. https://www.grammarly.com/plagiarism-checker

Chang, T.-S., Li, Y., Huang, H.-W., & Whitfield, B. (2021). Exploring EFL Students' Writing Performance and Their Acceptance of AI-based Automated Writing Feedback. *2021 2nd International Conference on Education Development and Studies*, 31–35. https://doi.org/10.1145/3459043.3459065

Creswell, J. (2014). *Educational Research, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative*. Pearson Education, Inc.

Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., Baabdullah, A. M., Koohang, A., Raghavan, V., Ahuja, M., Albanna, H., Albashrawi, M. A., Al-Busaidi, A. S., Balakrishnan, J., Barlette, Y., Basu, S., Bose, I., Brooks, L., Buhalis, D., … Wright, R. (2023). "So what if ChatGPT wrote it?" Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, *71*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642

Froemming, C. & C. L. (2020). Professional Development for Technology Integration in the Early Elementary Grades. *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference*, 444–450.

Gayed, J. M., Carlon, M. K. J., Oriola, A. M., & Cross, J. S. (2022). Exploring an AI-based writing Assistant's impact on English language learners. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *3*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100055

Genot, E. J. (2018). Strategies of inquiry. *Synthese*, *195*(5), 2065–2088. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-017-1319-x

Grogan, K. E. (2021). Writing Science: What Makes Scientific Writing Hard and How to Make It Easier. *The Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America*, *102*(1). https://doi.org/10.1002/bes2.1800

Haristiani, N. (2019). Artificial Intelligence (AI) chatbot as language learning medium: An inquiry. Journal of Physics: Conference Series. *IOP Publishing*, *1387*(1).

Holmes, W. (2019). Artificial Intelligence in Education. In *Encyclopedia of Education and Information Technologies* (pp. 1–16). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60013-0_107-1

Hosseini, M., Rasmussen, L. M., & Resnik, D. B. (2024). Using AI to write scholarly publications. In *Accountability in Research* (Vol. 31, Issue 7, pp. 715–723). Taylor and Francis Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2023.2168535

Hyland, K. (2015). *Teaching and Researching Writing*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315717203

Jeanjaroonsri, R. (2023). Thai EFL Learners' Use and Perceptions of Mobile Technologies for Writing. In *Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network* (Vol. 16, Issue 1). https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/index

Jia, J., He, Y., & Le, H. (2020). *A Multimodal Human-Computer Interaction System and Its Application in Smart Learning Environments* (pp. 3–14). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-51968-1_1

Kim, N. J., Vicentini, C. R., & Belland, B. R. (2022). Influence of Scaffolding on Information Literacy and Argumentation Skills in Virtual Field Trips and Problem-Based Learning for Scientific Problem Solving. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, *20*(2), 215–236. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-020-10145-y

Lindsay, D. (2020). *Scientific Writing = Thinking in Words*. CSIRO Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1071/9781486311484

Liu, Y., Han, T., Ma, S., Zhang, J., Yang, Y., Tian, J., He, H., Li, A., He, M., Liu, Z., Wu, Z., Zhao, L., Zhu, D., Li, X., Qiang, N., Shen, D., Liu, T., & Ge, B. (2023). *Summary of ChatGPT-Related Research and Perspective Towards the Future of Large Language Models*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.metrad.2023.100017

Lizzio, A. , W. K. , & S. R. (2022). University students' perceptions of the learning environment and academic outcomes: implications for theory and practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, *27*(1), 27–52.

Luckin, R. , H. W. , G. M. , and F. L. B. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*. Pearson Education.

Nazari, N., Shabbir, M. S., & Setiawan, R. (2021). Application of Artificial Intelligence powered digital writing assistant in higher education: randomized controlled trial. *Heliyon*, *7*(5). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07014

Ouyang, F., Zheng, L., & Jiao, P. (2022). Artificial intelligence in online higher education: A systematic review of empirical research from 2011 to 2020. *Education and Information Technologies*, *27*(6), 7893–7925. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-10925-9

Prentice, F. M., & Kinden, C. E. (2018). Paraphrasing tools, language translation tools and plagiarism: An exploratory study. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *14*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-018-0036-7

Putri, D. , & V. U. Y. (2023). *The Effects of Using Cake Application To Improve Listening Ability of the Tenth Grade Students of State Senior High School 2 of Tungkal Jaya*.

Qin, F., Li, K., & Yan, J. (2020). Understanding user trust in artificial intelligence-based educational systems: Evidence from China. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *51*(5), 1693–1710. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12994

Rogerson, A. M., & McCarthy, G. (2017). Using Internet based paraphrasing tools: Original work, patchwriting or facilitated plagiarism? *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *13*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-016-0013-y

Rudolph, J. T. (2023). ChatGPT: Bullshit spewer or the end of traditional assessments in higher education? *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.9

Shidiq, M. (2023). *The Use Of Artificial Intelligence-Based Chat- Gpt And Its Challenges For The World Of Education; From The Viewpoint Of The Development Of Creative Writing Skills*. *01*(01), 353–357.

So, W.-C., Wong, M. K.-Y., Lam, W.-Y., Cheng, C.-H., Ku, S.-Y., Lam, K.-Y., Huang, Y., & Wong, W.-L. (2019). Who is a better teacher for children with autism? Comparison of learning outcomes between robot-based and human-based interventions in gestural

production and recognition. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, *86*, 62–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2019.01.002

Strobl, C., Ailhaud, E., Benetos, K., Devitt, A., Kruse, O., Proske, A., & Rapp, C. (2019). Digital support for academic writing: A review of technologies and pedagogies. *Computers & Education*, *131*, 33–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.12.005

Su, J., Ng, D. T. K., & Chu, S. K. W. (2023). Artificial Intelligence (AI) Literacy in Early Childhood Education: The Challenges and Opportunities. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *4*, 100124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100124

Sumakul, D. T. Y. G., Hamied, F. A., & Sukyadi, D. (2022). *Students' Perceptions of the Use of AI in a Writing Class*. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220201.009

Supriyadi, S. (n.d.). A new decade for social changes Evaluation Instrument Development for Scientific Writing Instruction with A Constructivism Approach. *Www.Techniumscience.Com*, *21*, 2021. www.techniumscience.com

Talebian, S., Mohammadi, H. M., & Rezvanfar, A. (2014). Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in Higher Education: Advantages, Disadvantages, Conveniences and Limitations of Applying E-learning to Agricultural Students in Iran. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *152*, 300–305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.199

Thorp, H. H. (2023). ChatGPT is fun, but not an author. In *Science* (Vol. 379, Issue 6630, p. 313). American Association for the Advancement of Science. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adg7879

Utami, S. P. T., Andayani, Winarni, R., & Sumarwati. (2023). Utilization of artificial intelligence technology in an academic writing class: How do Indonesian students perceive? *Contemporary Educational Technology*, *15*(4). https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13419

Wicks, D. (2017). The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers (3rd edition). *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, *12*(2), 169–170. https://doi.org/10.1108/QROM-08-2016-1408

Woo, D. J., Blood, P., School, S., Kong, H., Susanto, H., Yeung, C. H., Guo, K., Ka, A., Fung, Y., & Ping, H. (2024). Exploring AI-Generated text in student writing: How does AI help? In *Language Learning & Technology* (Vol. 28, Issue 2). https://hdl.handle.net/10125/73577

Zhao, X. (2023). Leveraging Artificial Intelligence (AI) Technology for English Writing: Introducing Wordtune as a Digital Writing Assistant for EFL Writers. In *RELC Journal* (Vol. 54, Issue 3, pp. 890–894). SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221094089