EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
Vol. 6, No. 4, September-November 2026
e-ISSN : 2774-6283 | p-ISSN : 2775-0019
Online Journal System : https://jurnalp4i.com/index.php/edutech

ENGLISH TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF GENERATIVE AI USE IN TEACHING WRITING

Alvira Putri Sepriani[1], Asep Suparman[2], Anne Ratna Suminar[3]
Institut Pendidikan Indonesia Garut[1,2,3]
e-mail: alvrptrs@gmail.com

Diterima: *13/10/2026*; Direvisi: *20/10/2026*; Diterbitkan: *3/11/2026*

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengeksplorasi persepsi guru bahasa Inggris terhadap pemanfaatan *Generative Artificial Intelligence* (GenAI) dalam pembelajaran menulis pada jenjang sekolah menengah atas. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dengan desain studi kasus deskriptif pada sebuah SMA negeri di Garut, Jawa Barat. Partisipan terdiri atas dua orang guru bahasa Inggris berpengalaman yang dipilih secara purposif berdasarkan kriteria masa kerja dan kebiasaan memanfaatkan teknologi digital. Data dikumpulkan melalui wawancara semi-terstruktur, analisis artefak pembelajaran, dan catatan lapangan, kemudian dianalisis menggunakan analisis tematik model enam tahap Braun dan Clarke. Hasil analisis menghasilkan enam tema utama: GenAI sebagai pendukung tulisan siswa, GenAI sebagai pendukung pengajaran, GenAI sebagai risiko terhadap pembelajaran mandiri siswa, GenAI sebagai risiko terhadap keaslian tulisan, GenAI sebagai alat yang memerlukan penggunaan bertanggung jawab, dan GenAI sebagai tantangan bagi asesmen menulis. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa persepsi guru bersifat kondisional dan terikat pada konteks pedagogis di ruang kelas. Guru memandang GenAI bermanfaat untuk stimulasi kosakata dan ide awal, namun penggunaannya harus dibatasi agar tidak mengikis kemandirian berpikir serta orisinalitas karya tulis siswa.
Kata Kunci: *Generative AI*, pembelajaran menulis, persepsi guru.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore English teachers' perceptions regarding the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in teaching writing at the senior high school level. A qualitative descriptive case study design was employed at a public senior high school in Garut, West Java. The participants were two experienced English teachers purposively selected based on their teaching tenure and digital tool integration. Data were gathered through semi-structured interviews, pedagogical document analysis, and observational field notes, then examined using Braun and Clarke's six-phase thematic analysis. The analysis yielded six core themes: GenAI as a support for student writing, GenAI as a support for teaching, GenAI as a risk to independent learning, GenAI as a risk to textual authenticity, GenAI as a tool demanding responsible use, and GenAI as a challenge for writing assessment. The findings demonstrate that teachers maintain a conditional and context-dependent perception of AI integration. While teachers recognize its utility for lexical scaffolding and conceptual brainstorming, they emphasize rigorous boundary setting to prevent the erosion of learner autonomy and textual originality.
Keywords: *Generative AI, teachers' perceptions, teaching writing.*

INTRODUCTION

Writing instruction within the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) represents a demanding instructional endeavor for secondary school educators. Students must

Copyright (c) 2026 EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
https://doi.org/10.51878/edutech.v6i4.16409

EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
Vol. 6, No. 4, September-November 2026
e-ISSN : 2774-6283 | p-ISSN : 2775-0019
Online Journal System : https://jurnalp4i.com/index.php/edutech

not only generate novel ideas but also orchestrate syntactic structures, academic vocabulary, coherence, and cyclical revision strategies. In high school settings, language practitioners are tasked with providing systematic scaffolding, tailored formative feedback, and authentic evaluations to foster gradual compositional competence (Graham & Alves, 2021; Hyland, 2019). This pedagogical challenge has expanded rapidly alongside the democratization of artificial intelligence across educational landscapes. The advent of advanced linguistic platforms introduces unprecedented dynamics into how students conceptualize, compose, and refine written discourse.

Generative AI (GenAI) offers the distinct capability to synthesize, restructure, and critique textual artifacts through conversational natural language prompts. Within communicative language learning environments, this emerging technology facilitates preliminary brainstorming, thematic outlining, contextual grammar troubleshooting, and immediate stylistic revision (Barrett & Pack, 2023; Evmenova et al., 2024; Kasneci et al., 2023). A recent systematic review highlights that automated compositional assistance currently stands out as one of the most transformative applications of artificial intelligence in language instruction (Daud et al., 2025). When applied prudently, GenAI operates as cognitive scaffolding that augments instructional capacity for both educators and developing writers. These platforms promise efficiency by demystifying complex syntactic conventions and facilitating self-directed language exploration.

Nonetheless, these empirical affordances are accompanied by profound pedagogical vulnerabilities when left unguided. Unregulated reliance on conversational algorithms risks shifting the software's role from instructional scaffolding to cognitive substitution. Such tendencies trigger acute concerns regarding intellectual dependency, passivity throughout the drafting process, and compromised academic integrity (Cotton et al., 2024; Fan et al., 2024). In formative composition classes, this substitution is detrimental because finalized digital drafts obscure the student's actual linguistic repertoire and mental reasoning. Consequently, the pervasive availability of synthetic text obliges classroom practitioners to fundamentally reassess conventional writing pedagogy and appraisal mechanisms.

Secondary school teachers occupy a decisive position in mediating this technological influx within everyday classroom routines. Borg (2003) asserts that instructional enactment is intimately governed by teacher cognition, representing the complex psychological construct of what teachers believe, comprehend, and value. Concurrently, the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) posits that structural integration is mediated by perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use (Davis, 1989). In the context of GenAI, teachers' subjective appraisals dictate not merely the technical adoption of digital utilities, but also the pedagogical boundaries, ethical sanctions, and methodological safeguards instituted in the classroom. Recent investigations demonstrate that language teachers frequently exhibit ambivalent orientations toward artificial intelligence, simultaneously applauding its linguistic utility while expressing reservations regarding cognitive deskilling and operational opacity (Benek, 2025; Mardhiyya et al., 2025; Mulkiyah, 2024).

Although scholarship surrounding educational artificial intelligence has proliferated globally, empirical inquiries examining Indonesian high school English teachers' perceptions of GenAI in writing instruction remain limited. Existing literature often prioritizes tertiary learning environments, learner-centric adoption scales, or quantitative metrics of technological readiness, frequently overlooking the nuanced realities of secondary classrooms. Investigating how practicing educators in regional Indonesian high schools navigate these computational disruptions is critical for designing realistic pedagogical guidelines. Therefore, this study aims

Copyright (c) 2026 EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
https://doi.org/10.51878/edutech.v6i4.16409

EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
Vol. 6, No. 4, September-November 2026
e-ISSN : 2774-6283 | p-ISSN : 2775-0019
Online Journal System : https://jurnalp4i.com/index.php/edutech

to explore English teachers' nuanced perceptions of GenAI integration in secondary writing instruction. The inquiry focuses on perceived instructional benefits, developmental risks, ethical boundaries, pedagogical adjustments, and emerging requirements in authentic writing assessment.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a qualitative descriptive case study design to examine educational phenomena within real-world classroom settings. A qualitative approach was deemed essential because the research aimed to illuminate the subjective meanings, professional beliefs, and pedagogical rationales of practicing teachers rather than testing statistical hypotheses. The descriptive case study framework permitted an in-depth exploration of situated teacher cognition, taking into account institutional constraints, curriculum demands, and daily instructional practices. By maintaining a naturalistic orientation, the study investigated how technological innovations interact with classroom realities.

The investigation was situated at a public senior high school (*Sekolah Menengah Atas Negeri*) in Garut Regency, West Java, Indonesia. The study purposively selected two certified English language teachers, coded as TR-01 and TR-02 to preserve professional confidentiality. Crucially, the participants offered rich and complementary professional profiles that directly informed their pedagogical cognition. Participant TR-01 was a female educator with seven years of high school teaching experience who regularly incorporated educational applications into her communicative language classes. Conversely, TR-02 was a senior male teacher with over nineteen years of instructional service who occupied leadership responsibilities in local subject teacher working groups (*Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran* / MGMP). Both educators possessed active experience utilizing generative software platforms such as ChatGPT for educational purposes.

Data collection relied primarily on semi-structured in-depth interviews developed in alignment with Teacher Cognition Theory (Borg, 2003) and the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989). The interview protocol explored theoretical beliefs regarding writing pedagogy, observed learner interactions with AI tools, perceived operational challenges, and tactical assessment adaptations. Each teacher completed two separate sixty-minute audio-recorded interview sessions conducted in a blend of English and Indonesian to capture their professional views. To establish rigorous data trustworthiness, the researchers implemented methodological and source triangulation by supplementing interview transcripts with classroom observational field notes and instructional artifacts, including teacher lesson plans, writing assignment prompts, and marked student papers. Furthermore, member checking was performed by presenting transcribed dialogues and draft interpretations back to TR-01 and TR-02 to verify interpretive accuracy.

The transcribed empirical data were evaluated following Braun and Clarke's (2021) six-phase thematic analysis framework. The researchers first established deep data familiarization through iterative readings of the verbatim transcripts alongside contextual observational memos. Preliminary codes were systematically applied to meaningful semantic units addressing technological affordances, perceived cognitive risks, instructional modifications, and evaluative strategies. In subsequent stages, these initial codes were collated into overarching conceptual candidates, iteratively reviewed against the empirical corpus, and refined into distinct thematic categories. This analytical procedure generated six structural themes that holistically portray the teachers' professional perceptions of GenAI in second language composition.

Copyright (c) 2026 EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
https://doi.org/10.51878/edutech.v6i4.16409

EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
Vol. 6, No. 4, September-November 2026
e-ISSN : 2774-6283 | p-ISSN : 2775-0019
Online Journal System : https://jurnalp4i.com/index.php/edutech

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Result

The thematic analysis revealed that the high school English teachers shared an evaluative, multidimensional perception of GenAI in writing instruction. Neither participant characterized conversational algorithms as purely advantageous innovations or detrimental disruptions. Instead, their pedagogical stance was conditional: GenAI was embraced when functioning as cognitive scaffolding that deepened learner engagement, yet resisted whenever it displaced authentic student reasoning. The synthesized thematic structure derived from the empirical data is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Themes Regarding Teachers' Perceptions of GenAI in Writing Instruction

No.	Thematic Category	Empirical Focus and Meaning
1.	GenAI as a Support for Students' Writing	Scaffolding for vocabulary acquisition, grammatical editing, and pre-writing ideation.
2.	GenAI as a Support for Teaching	Increasing instructional efficiency in text material curation, differentiated prompts, and lesson planning.
3.	GenAI as a Risk to Independent Learning	The threat of cognitive atrophy, uncritical task completion, and passivity in composing drafts.
4.	GenAI as a Risk to Original Writing	Erosion of voice, textual homogenization, and unearned authorship of written tasks.
5.	GenAI as a Tool Requiring Responsible Use	The necessity of transparent usage boundaries, ethical classroom codes, and teacher monitoring.
6.	GenAI as a Challenge for Writing Assessment	A shift from product-focused scoring toward process-tracing, classroom drafting, and oral defense.

Source: Qualitative Thematic Data Analysis (2026)

The structured themes outlined in Table 1 illustrate the dual perspective of secondary English educators. While technical affordances in drafting and lesson preparation were readily identified, they were consistently counterbalanced by deep concerns regarding learner autonomy and the validity of student artifacts. This cognitive tension indicates that integration decisions in secondary writing classes are fundamentally mediated by the teacher's commitment to authentic language acquisition. The specific manifestations of each empirical theme are examined sequentially below.

1. GenAI as a Support for Students' Writing

Both participants recognized GenAI as an accessible linguistic scaffold for secondary students confronting composition blocks. TR-01 stated that conversational models provided immediate lexical options and clarified complex grammatical structures during independent drafting phases. She noted that lower-proficiency students frequently utilized prompts to translate idiomatic expressions and verify verb tenses before writing sentences. Similarly, TR-02 emphasized that AI platforms served as dynamic brainstorming partners that helped students conceptualize structural outlines for analytical exposition texts. Consequently, both educators valued the utility of GenAI when students leveraged digital suggestions to revise and refine their self-authored drafts.

2. GenAI as a Support for Teaching

The interview findings highlighted that the utility of GenAI extended directly to teachers' professional planning routines. TR-01 shared that she frequently utilized language models to generate differentiated reading passages and contextual grammar exercises tailored

Copyright (c) 2026 EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
https://doi.org/10.51878/edutech.v6i4.16409

EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
Vol. 6, No. 4, September-November 2026
e-ISSN : 2774-6283 | p-ISSN : 2775-0019
Online Journal System : https://jurnalp4i.com/index.php/edutech

to mixed-ability classes. In parallel, TR-02 described how AI assistance substantially reduced the administrative time required to formulate diverse essay prompts and rubrics. Both participants maintained that algorithmically produced instructional media served as flexible supplementary materials rather than definitive pedagogical directives. Hence, the teachers positioned GenAI as a productive resource that augmented their instructional design without displacing professional autonomy.

3. GenAI as a Risk to Students' Independent Learning

Despite acknowledging its supportive capacity, both educators articulated serious reservations regarding cognitive overreliance. TR-01 observed that struggling writers frequently engaged in unreflective copying, pasting entire paragraphs generated by algorithms directly into assignments without processing sentence meanings. TR-02 expressed concern regarding the atrophy of fundamental cognitive struggles that normally characterize original writing, warning against a habit of automated convenience. The participants argued that delegating rhetorical drafting to digital systems strips learners of vital opportunities to develop syntactic problem-solving and critical reasoning. In their view, rapid assignment completion achieved through automated prompts undermines the development of genuine language proficiency.

4. GenAI as a Risk to Students' Original Writing

The participants expressed concern over the loss of authentic student voice and textual originality in homework assignments. TR-01 noted an influx of compositions featuring advanced vocabulary, flawless syntax, and generic rhetorical patterns that clearly diverged from the students' typical communicative abilities. TR-02 concurred, observing that synthetic drafts lacked the personal perspectives and stylistic imperfections that usually characterize adolescent EFL writing. Both teachers viewed textual homogenization as an academic integrity challenge that distorts the teacher's understanding of true student proficiency. For these educators, textual authenticity requires personal ownership over syntactic structures, rhetorical choices, and conceptual development.

5. GenAI as a Tool Requiring Responsible Use

Neither educator supported an outright ban on artificial intelligence within the secondary school environment. TR-01 argued that institutional prohibition was unrealistic given ubiquitous smartphone access, advocating instead for clear collaborative classroom agreements that regulate tool usage. TR-02 similarly asserted that educators must guide adolescents toward responsible technological literacy, establishing boundaries regarding permissible drafting phases and unauthorized copy-pasting. Both participants emphasized that the school administration must provide structured digital citizenship workshops and pedagogical training for teachers to support ethical AI implementation. Responsible utilization was conceptualized as a transparent, supervised partnership that safeguards cognitive engagement.

6. GenAI as a Challenge for Writing Assessment

The presence of synthetic text generators has challenged the validity of evaluating finalized written products alone. TR-01 stated that she could no longer rely on take-home essays to gauge compositional skill, prompting her to institute mandatory oral retelling sessions where students verbally defend their lexical choices. In a similar vein, TR-02 modified his pedagogical routine by relocating high-stakes drafting activities entirely into supervised, offline classroom sessions. Both educators emphasized process-tracing methods, including handwritten outlines, stage-by-stage peer reviews, and reflective conferences. This shift marks a transition from

Copyright (c) 2026 EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
https://doi.org/10.51878/edutech.v6i4.16409

EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
Vol. 6, No. 4, September-November 2026
e-ISSN : 2774-6283 | p-ISSN : 2775-0019
Online Journal System : https://jurnalp4i.com/index.php/edutech

evaluating static textual submissions toward dynamically assessing the cognitive journey and verbal comprehension of the writer.

Discussion

The empirical findings of this study demonstrate that high school English teachers conceptualize GenAI as a pedagogically conditional instrument. The positive recognition of its utility for lexical acquisition and thematic brainstorming aligns with the perceived usefulness construct within the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989). Teachers welcome conversational platforms when these tools lower affective barriers and assist novice writers in navigating initial compositional hurdles. These findings mirror the conclusions of Mahapatra (2024), who documented that automated language models provide valuable formative feedback when integrated into directed revision stages. Similarly, Barrett and Pack (2023) highlighted the capacity of GenAI to demystify complex discourse conventions across diverse drafting phases. In this study, perceived usefulness was realized only when technological affordances operated within a structured learning environment.

However, the teachers' concerns regarding cognitive passivity and unreflective copying underscore the risks associated with premature technological adoption. The apprehension that automated text generation induces intellectual inertia aligns with recent scholarship on cognitive offloading (Fan et al., 2024). When students outsource syntactic formulation and rhetorical organization to algorithmic systems, they bypass the productive cognitive effort that drives second language acquisition. This observed tension validates Borg's (2003) teacher cognition framework, which asserts that teachers' curricular choices are anchored in their beliefs about how learning occurs. Because TR-01 and TR-02 believe that writing proficiency develops through iterative cognitive struggle, they view automated text generation as a risk to genuine language internalisation. Consequently, the teachers' resistance reflects a broader epistemological concern that the immediacy of AI-generated output may erode learners' capacity to judge the feasibility and quality of their own writing, a phenomenon some researchers describe as the confusion between speed and strength in judgment (Ma, 2026a, 2026b; Papakonstantinidis et al., 2024).

The complications surrounding authorship, stylistic homogenization, and academic integrity identified by the participants reflect broader international debates on digital scholarship. Cotton et al. (2024) observed that the syntactic fluency of large language models blurs the boundary between assisted drafting and academic misconduct. Within the studied Indonesian secondary context, the teachers addressed this issue by focusing on linguistic authenticity rather than using automated plagiarism software. Recognizing that digital detectors frequently yield unverified outcomes, both educators relied on their personal knowledge of individual student progress to assess authorship. This human-centered pedagogical intuition reinforces the principle that evaluating authentic writing requires close dialogic interaction between teacher and student (Hyland, 2019). Such interaction also offers a safeguard against the homogenization of voice that the participants feared, since sustained conversation about a student's drafting choices makes it easier to distinguish genuine authorial decisions from text produced by an AI system that "sounds better" but no longer sounds like the learner (Wang, 2024).

The pedagogical adaptations documented in this study—including in-class drafting, handwritten portfolios, and verbal defenses—reflect a deliberate shift toward process-oriented assessment. The teachers recognized that when static written products can be generated in seconds, the text itself can no longer serve as sole evidence of competence. This instructional evolution aligns with the writing pedagogy espoused by Graham and Alves (2021), which

Copyright (c) 2026 EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
https://doi.org/10.51878/edutech.v6i4.16409

EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
Vol. 6, No. 4, September-November 2026
e-ISSN : 2774-6283 | p-ISSN : 2775-0019
Online Journal System : https://jurnalp4i.com/index.php/edutech

highlights the value of tracking cognitive problem-solving throughout drafting, revising, and editing. Rather than retreating into punitive monitoring, the participants balanced technological affordances with observational, process-tracing evaluations. This measured adaptation highlights that experienced educators can mediate technological disruption by reaffirming human-centered communicative values (Chaaban et al., 2021; Marzuki et al., 2026; O'Brien & Forde, 2023; Stenalt & Mathiasen, 2024).

Practical Recommendations and Policy Guidelines

Based on the empirical insights gathered from the participating educators, schools and language practitioners require actionable strategies to guide GenAI integration. These practical recommendations and policy frameworks are designed to support high school environments in balancing computational utility with pedagogical integrity.

Recommendations for Classroom English Teachers:

1) **Establish a Collaborative Classroom AI Honor Code:** Educators should formulate transparent usage agreements with students at the start of the academic term. This code should explicitly specify which writing stages allow generative exploration (e.g., brainstorming, topic outlining, vocabulary lookup) and which require independent drafting.
2) **Prioritize In-Class Process-Oriented Writing:** High-stakes summative composition should transition to monitored classroom environments. Incorporating handwritten preliminary drafts, in-class peer review circles, and reflective editing logs ensures that students remain the primary architects of their writing.
3) **Implement Oral Retelling and Task Defense:** Writing assessment should incorporate brief post-writing conferences where learners verbally explain their organizational logic, vocabulary choices, and thematic arguments. This practice verifies authentic student comprehension while reinforcing spoken language skills.
4) **Design Critical Human-in-the-Loop Prompts:** Teachers should structure assignments where students actively critique, fact-check, and edit purposefully flawed AI outputs. This shifts the learner's stance from a passive consumer to an analytical editor.

Policy Guidelines for Secondary Schools and Institutional Leaders:

1) **Adopt Guided-Use Rather Than Prohibitionist Policies:** School leadership should avoid unenforceable institutional bans on artificial intelligence. Administrative policies should focus on digital citizenship, technological literacy, and clear guidelines for academic attribution.
2) **Provide Continuous Professional Development on AI Pedagogy:** Educational authorities and local teacher working groups (*MGMP*) should organize hands-on training that familiarizes teachers with the capabilities, limitations, and prompt engineering strategies relevant to language pedagogy.
3) **Modernize School-Wide Assessment Rubrics:** School districts should revise secondary writing rubrics to evaluate the complete composing process rather than solely grading final products. Allocating marks for iterative drafts, revision notes, and personal voice helps safeguard against automated plagiarism.

CONCLUSION

This study reveals that secondary English teachers perceive Generative AI as a valuable yet conditional pedagogical resource in writing instruction. The participating educators acknowledged that computational tools offer useful support for vocabulary discovery,

Copyright (c) 2026 EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
https://doi.org/10.51878/edutech.v6i4.16409

grammatical editing, initial brainstorming, and teacher lesson preparation. Nevertheless, these technical affordances are tempered by concerns regarding cognitive overreliance, passive copy-pasting, and the erosion of authentic student voice. Rather than advocating for an outright ban on digital models, the teachers favored balanced, guided, and supervised implementation grounded in clear ethical boundaries and transparent expectations.

The presence of generative software has reshaped the demands of secondary writing assessment, prompting a shift away from static product appraisal toward process-focused methodologies. The participating teachers adapted their evaluative practices by incorporating in-class drafting sessions, process portfolios, and oral comprehension defenses to ensure that submissions reflect actual student capability. For sustainable integration, high schools should support process-oriented writing assessments and provide ongoing professional development focused on pedagogical AI literacy. Future research should build on these findings by conducting longitudinal classroom observations across diverse institutional settings and examining the measurable impacts of guided GenAI integration on students' compositional outcomes.

REFERENCES

Barrett, A., & Pack, A. (2023). Not quite eye to A.I.: Student and teacher perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence in the writing process. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1), Article 59. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00427-0

Benek, K. (2025). EFL learners' and teachers' perceptions of AI-powered language learning technologies: Benefits and challenges. *International Journal of Instruction*, *18*(2), 103–120. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2025.1827a

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, *36*(2), 81–109. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). To TA or not to TA? Comparing reflexive thematic analysis and other pattern-based qualitative analytic approaches. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, *21*(1), 37–47. https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12360

Celik, I., Dindar, M., Muukkonen, H., & Järvelä, S. (2022). The promises and challenges of artificial intelligence for teachers: A systematic review of research. *TechTrends*, *66*(4), 616–630. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-022-00715-y

Chaaban, Y., Al-Thani, H., & Du, X. (2021). A narrative inquiry of teacher educators' professional agency, identity renegotiations, and emotional responses amid educational disruption. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *108*, Article 103522. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103522

Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *61*(2), 228–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148

Daud, A., Aulia, A. F., Muryanti, Harfal, Z., Nabilla, O., & Ali, H. S. (2025). Integrating artificial intelligence into English language teaching: A systematic review. *European Journal of Educational Research*, *14*(2), 677–691. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.14.2.677

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, *13*(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Copyright (c) 2026 EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
https://doi.org/10.51878/edutech.v6i4.16409

Evmenova, A. S., Regan, K., Mergen, R., & Hrisseh, R. (2024). Improving writing feedback for struggling writers: Generative AI to the rescue? *TechTrends*, *68*(4), 790–802. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-024-00965-y

Fan, Y., Tang, L., Le, H., Shen, K., Tan, S., Zhao, Y., Shen, Y., Li, X., & Gašević, D. (2024). Beware of metacognitive laziness: Effects of generative artificial intelligence on learning motivation, process, and performance. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *55*(5), 1874–1896. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13478

Graham, S., & Alves, R. A. (2021). Research and teaching writing. *Reading and Writing*, *34*(7), 1613–1621. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-021-10188-9

Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., … Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *103*, Article 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Ma, S. A. (2026a). *Speed is not strength: Judgment surrender and cognitive illusion in AI-mediated education*. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18182401

Ma, S. A. (2026b). *Speed is not strength: Judgment surrender and cognitive illusion in AI-mediated education*. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18182400

Mahapatra, S. (2024). Impact of ChatGPT on ESL students' academic writing skills: A mixed methods intervention study. *Smart Learning Environments*, *11*(1), Article 20. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00295-9

Mardhiyya, Q. A., Saptaningtyas, A. R., Syifa, K. M., & Lestari, V. L. (2025). The perception of teachers on the integration of AI in English language teaching. *IDEAS: Journal on Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, *13*(2), 8169–8185. https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v13i2.8860

Marzuki, A. G., Aisiyiah, V. M. N., Erizar, E., Amalia, I., Huriyah, H., Triassanti, R., & Kencanawati, D. (2026). Investigating teachers' pedagogical adaptations for effective technology integration in EFL classrooms. *Al-Lisan: Jurnal Bahasa (dan Pengajarannya)*, *11*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.30603/al.v11i1.6828

Mulkiyah, U. (2024). Integrating artificial intelligence in EFL classrooms: Opportunities and challenges for Indonesian teachers. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, *4*(1), 765–773. https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v4i1.507

O'Brien, A., & Forde, C. (2023). Health science staff and student experiences of teaching and assessing clinical skills using digital tools: A qualitative study. *Annals of Medicine*, *55*(2), Article 2256656. https://doi.org/10.1080/07853890.2023.2256656

Papakonstantinidis, S., Kwiatek, P., & Spathopoulou, F. (2024). Embrace or resist? Drivers of artificial intelligence writing software adoption in academic and non-academic contexts. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, *16*(2), Article ep501. https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/14250

Stenalt, M. H., & Mathiasen, H. (2024). Towards teaching-sensitive technology: A hermeneutic analysis of higher education teaching. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *21*(1), Article 24. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00449-2

Copyright (c) 2026 EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
https://doi.org/10.51878/edutech.v6i4.16409

EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
Vol. 6, No. 4, September-November 2026
e-ISSN : 2774-6283 | p-ISSN : 2775-0019
Online Journal System : https://jurnalp4i.com/index.php/edutech

Wang, C. (2024). Exploring students' generative AI-assisted writing processes: Perceptions and experiences from native and nonnative English speakers. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, *30*(3), 1825–1846. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-024-09744-3

Copyright (c) 2026 EDUTECH : Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Berbantuan Teknologi
https://doi.org/10.51878/edutech.v6i4.16409