Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics

Vol. 11(1), May 2026
www.ijeltal.org
e-ISSN: 2527-8746; p-ISSN: 2527-6492

Indonesian EFL Students' Thesis Writing in the Age of AI: Practices and Ethical Perspectives

Yustinus Calvin Gai Mali

Master's Program in English Language Education, Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana
yustinus.mali@uksw.edu

Received 7 January 2025 | Received in revised form 3 February 2026 | Accepted 27 March 2026

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
artificial intelligence, EFL lecturers, students, thesis, writing

DOI:
http://dx.doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v11i1.2439

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore how Indonesian EFL university students use Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools to support their undergraduate thesis writing, why they use those tools, and the AI-use policies they expect to have in their thesis writing process. To achieve these goals, the researcher conducted a qualitative case study involving five female EFL undergraduate students who were in the process of completing their theses at an English Education Program at a private university in Indonesia. Research data were collected through an in-depth semi-structured interview, supported by the students' thesis draft to help them recall their thesis writing experiences. The researcher considered four rigor standards for qualitative studies: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability to ensure the quality of the research findings. The inductive data analysis results revealed that students used four AI tools; ChatGPT, DeepL, Grammarly, and Quillbot in their thesis writing process to help them paraphrase, generate writing ideas, translate words and sentences, and select appropriate vocabulary. These tools were used because the students believed they might help enhance the quality of their writing, write faster, and increase their confidence in writing their thesis. At the same time, the students were also aware of the risks of being too dependent on AI tools and the inaccuracy of AI-generated texts and suggestions, which encouraged them to verify the AI outputs before incorporating them into their thesis. Practical implications for EFL lecturers who are supervising thesis students and directions for future research were presented.

How to cite:
Mali, Y. C. G. (2026). Indonesian EFL Students' Thesis Writing in the Age of AI: Practices and Ethical Perspectives. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, *11*(1), 27-46.

1. Introduction

As technology advances, new tools are emerging rapidly, almost daily. One of these emerging modern technologies is Artificial Intelligence (AI). Recently, AI has attracted considerable interest among educators in English language education (Crompton et al., 2024; Dmitrenko & Akhmadullin, 2023; Sumakul et al., 2022), particularly in academic writing

(Cheng et al., 2025; Guleria et al., 2023; Kritandani et al., 2024). In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings, mastering academic writing skills poses formidable challenges for EFL students, given their limited vocabulary and experiences in conducting research, difficulties in writing academically following its conventions and rules (Esfandiari et al., 2022), limited peer review support, and time constraint (Tseng & Lin, 2024).

In such challenging situations, AI emerges as a valuable tool to make the academic writing process less daunting for EFL students. Why? AI writing tools can act as students' virtual tutors, providing instant feedback on various aspects of their writing, including coherence, vocabulary, syntax, content, and sentence structure, thereby facilitating more effective, faster improvements in writing performance (Alkamel & Alwagieh, 2024; Özçelik & Ekşi, 2024). Moreover, AI tools can help students identify and correct grammatical and lexical errors in their writing, while also suggesting alternative sentence structures to revise and enhance overall writing quality, structure, and the flow of ideas (Song & Song, 2023). Some researchers also found that AI capabilities can translate text into English. *Google Translate*, for example, appears to have become a ubiquitous aid for students writing in a language that is not their native tongue (Nguyen et al., 2024). However, there are instances where students copy and paste from *Google Translate* to complete their writing assignments (Godwin-Jones, 2022).

Despite the positive aspects of AI tools, concerns have been raised about the potential for unethical use of AI in academic writing. One of the most concerning issues is plagiarism, where students try to pass off AI-generated text as their own work (Peachey & Crichton, 2024). Plagiarism is becoming increasingly difficult to detect as AI-generated text becomes increasingly indistinguishable from human-written text (Krajka & Olszak, 2024). Another concern is the over-dependence on AI tools, which might inhibit students' critical thinking (Jackaria et al., 2024), creativity (Cong-Lem et al., 2024), and ability to create original content (Gustilo et al., 2024). Over-reliance on AI tools would undermine the processes of learning, growth, and development in writing (Marzuki et al., 2023). If that dependency on AI tools continues, the researcher has no doubt why some authors (cited in Črček & Patekar, 2023) pessimistically predicted the death of college essays due to students' use of AI to write them.

Being fully aware of the ongoing discussions on AI, the researcher had the opportunity to supervise several undergraduate EFL students in their thesis writing during the Fall semester (August-December 2025). The thesis writing is a form of academic writing commonly undertaken by university students in Indonesia as a requirement for completing their undergraduate studies. Undeniably, writing a thesis is a challenging task for students, as it requires strong academic writing skills, thorough research, analysis, and clear outcomes (Rababah et al., 2024). It is no surprise, therefore, that during his supervisory time in this AI era, some students admitted to using AI tools to help them write their thesis. Given this background, the researcher is interested in *DeepL*y exploring students' practices and experiences with AI tools to help them write their thesis. That exploration is crucial to gain a better understanding of how far and ethically they used AI in their thesis writing process. The specific research questions that guided the present study are as follows: *How do EFL university students use AI tools to help them write their thesis? Why do the students use AI tools in their thesis writing process? What kinds of AI policies are expected by the students?*

Answers to those research questions will primarily benefit EFL lecturers teaching academic writing classes or supervising undergraduate theses. They will see clear illustrations of how the students involved in this research used AI to write their thesis. With those illustrations, lecturers can consider setting policies to regulate the ethical use of AI for their students who are currently working on their undergraduate thesis or other related academic writing projects. That policy is needed to minimize students' over-reliance on AI tools, which might hinder the development of their writing skills. Moreover, the lecturers will also learn the potential of some AI tools that might support or hinder their students' thesis writing progress. This study also hopes to contribute to the literature, specifically regarding current Indonesian EFL university practices in using AI to write undergraduate theses. This issue has not been sufficiently addressed in the literature. This study should also address Esfandiari et al.'s (2022) concern that "EFL students' actual writing experiences appear to have been neglected in writing research" (p. 2), especially in the age of AI.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Definitions of AI

The concept of AI pertains to the creation of machines capable of executing tasks that typically necessitate human intelligence (Ngo, 2023). AI is also a multifaceted technology used by students to learn, given its ability to mine large amounts of data, operate using natural language (including speech, listening, and writing), and follow the rules and patterns of language (Crompton et al., 2024). In language education, AI refers to the models of human thinking and action that can behave as a language teacher (Sumakul et al., 2022).

2.2 AI for Writing

Various AI tools are increasingly used for writing. *ChatGPT* is well known for its ability to paraphrase sentences (Črček & Patekar, 2023), generate ideas (Meniado et al., 2024), correct grammatical errors (Özçelik & Ekşi, 2024), and provide explanations of those detected grammar errors (Baskara, 2023). Besides *ChatGPT*, one popular AI grammar checkers, *Grammarly,* is reported to give a lot of helpful grammar feedback (O'Neill & Russell, 2019) and help students improve their grammar (Gozali et al., 2024), given its capability to correct students' writing errors (Bibi & Atta, 2024; Crawford et al., 2023), edit and revise students' written texts (Song & Song, 2023). Founded in 2009 by Alex Shevchenko, Max Lytvyn, and Dmytro Lider (Giray, 2024), *Grammarly* is also capable of giving suggestions for improving writing punctuation, clarity, engagement (Marzuki et al., 2023), structures, choice of vocabulary, and coherence of a writing text (Imran & Almusharraf, 2023). However, *Grammarly* sometimes failed to provide sufficient error corrections and was unable to recognize non-English words (i.e., flagging them as errors) (Gozali et al., 2024). There are also complaints that *Grammarly*'s feedback is often too repetitive and possibly oversimplified, as it tends to avoid overly technical explanations for its users (Godwin-Jones, 2022). Therefore, when using *Grammarly,* students should always verify the corrections it suggests before incorporating them into their writing. Leveraging *Grammarly* judiciously allows writers to enhance quality while retaining their unique expression (Giray, 2024). *Quillbot* is also well-known for its capacity to paraphrase sentences and provide grammatical feedback on writing assignments (Cheong & Hong, 2023; Marzuki et al., 2023; Ngo, 2023). With its recent development, *Quillbot* has an additional feature to detect AI-generated text in students' work and summarize the contents of a text.

Another popular AI technology to support students' writing is machine translation (MT). It involves the automatic translation of text from one language to another (Gao et al., 2024) and is considered a critical component of modern AI technology (Liang, 2025). *Google Translate* helps students translate words, phrases, or sentences to find the proper words in their writing, ensuring that their readers understand what they are trying to convey (Chandra & Yuyun, 2018). Many students like using the tool because it is free, available across multiple devices, and can translate quickly (Godwin-Jones, 2022). Nevertheless, the tool does not always produce accurate results when translating sentences, especially longer ones, and often fails to translate idioms or figurative language (Chandra & Yuyun, 2018). The translation results it provides are sometimes confusing (Akmal & Mulia, 2020). It is also concerning that some students copy and paste from *Google Translate* to complete their writing assignments, thereby failing to engage with the target language (Godwin-Jones, 2022).

Similar to *Google Translate, DeepL,* launched in 2017, has gained popularity among EFL students. It is well known for its high translation accuracy, user-friendly features, free access, and its ability to maintain grammatical accuracy, thereby contributing to a more coherent and engaging writing style (Gao et al., 2024; Liang, 2025). After using *DeepL* to help translate Chinese stories into English, some Chinese EFL students in Liang's (2025) study reported that the tool sometimes produced grammatically inaccurate translations, misinterpreted cultural events, and misinterpreted idiomatic expressions in their stories. They are also concerned about overreliance on the tool, cautioning that it might impede the improvement of their English writing skills. Besides, overreliance on the MT might reduce language-learning motivation and limit understanding of cultural nuances (Klimova, 2025). It is essential, therefore, to encourage students to use AI tools in a balanced manner, supplementing their writing efforts without replacing their active learning and writing practices (Liang, 2025). The AI tools reviewed above are the ones used by the research participants in this study; the review provides the researcher with a better understanding of the tools used by the participants. Also, the literature reviewed in this section will be used to discuss the findings of the current study.

2.3 Ethics of Using AI in Writing Practices

Educational institutions need a specific policy to regulate the ethical and responsible use of AI technology, particularly for writing purposes. Regarding the use of online grammar checkers and MT, previous studies have suggested the following practical guidelines. Very recently, Cheng et al. (2025) listed some ethically acceptable uses of AI, such as checking grammar, spelling, and readability, as well as language translation. In that practice, students must always double-check the edits and translations made by AI to ensure they accurately reflect their own voice and critical thinking. Cheng et al. (2025) further highlighted the need to disclose exactly how they used AI tools to produce their writing and which parts of their writing involved the use of AI.

Regarding MT, the literature suggested several practical policies. For example, using MT might constitute academic dishonesty when students translate stretches of text rather than words (Vinall et al., 2024; Wise et al., 2024). Involving 200 EFL undergraduate university students, Murtisari et al. (2019) reported that most of the students believed that using MT might be considered a form of cheating when it is used without further/proper editing (42%), applied in tests or graded assignments (40.6%), and employed above word level (24.5%).

These reports resonate with Klimova's (2025) view that it is appropriate to use MT to translate individual words or phrases, but not to translate large sections of text for assignments directly. From a different perspective, Vinall et al. (2024) argued that classroom policies regarding MT should be designed through open dialogue between students and their lecturer, as these policies may vary by task type and learning goals, and thus do not need to be fixed and permanent.

In 2024, Indonesia released a guideline for AI use in education (Direktorat Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan, Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi, Riset dan Teknologi, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset dan Teknologi, 2024). The guideline explicitly stated that students may use AI tools to find literature for their writing, develop writing ideas, and review their writing. Nevertheless, the guideline emphasizes that students are fully responsible for their writing and must verify any AI-generated suggestions regarding the content of their work. Understanding the ethics of AI use helps researchers see and discuss the ethical implications of AI tools for research participants in this study.

3. Research Methodology

This study is framed as a qualitative case study (Yin, 2018), selected for its focus on investigating a real-world case through in-depth and detailed data collection and analysis. The case examined in this study was related to individuals and bounded by place and time (Gozali et al., 2024), specifically five EFL university students in Indonesia who used AI tools to help them write their thesis at an English Language Education Program at a private university in Central Java, Indonesia (henceforth called ED), in the Fall semester of the 2025/2026 academic year. The case study method was also selected because it allowed the researcher to obtain rich descriptions of individuals' experiences and lived realities (Newcomer, 2017; Ong et al., 2021), informed by participants' perspectives (Newcomer, 2017). In line with the research objective, the design can also be categorized as an intrinsic case study (by Ary et al., 2019), owing to the intent of understanding a unique phenomenon, namely, the use of AI done by a group of EFL university students at ED: how and why the students used AI in their thesis writing process and AI policies they expected in their thesis writing journey. With this design, the case explored in this study did not aim to represent other cases or a broader trait for investigation. Yet, the researcher hopes that the exploration might offer insights to readers dealing with a phenomenon similar to that presented in this study.

3.1 Research Setting

The research was conducted within the *Talenta Project* course held in ED. More specifically, the course was held in the Fall semester, August to December 2025, and situated in EFL contexts, where students learn English in a formal classroom with limited opportunities to use the language outside the classroom for daily communication. In the course, the students wrote their thesis as one of the requirements for obtaining their Bachelor of Education (B.Ed) Degree in English education. At ED, the thesis was presented as a publishable journal article, ranging in length from 5000 to 6000 words. The students in the course were encouraged to submit their articles to a national-level Indonesian journal for publication.

3.2 Research Participants

The participants in this research are five female EFL university students at ED, hereafter referred to as participants 1 (P1), 2 (P2), 3 (P3), 4 (P4), and 5 (P5). At the time this study was conducted, all participants were aged between 21 and 22 years old and in their fourth year of undergraduate study. Before taking the *Talenta Project* course, they had successfully passed academic writing and proposal writing courses. They were purposively included in this study because they admitted to using AI tools to assist with writing their thesis. Moreover, they were selected because they had completed the first draft of their thesis, were committed to participating in an in-depth interview with the researcher, and were considered able to clearly articulate how and why they used AI tools in writing their thesis.

Given the small number of participants in this study, Yin (2018) stated clearly that case study researchers should not treat their case as a sampling unit to represent a larger population or to make statistical generalizations. Instead, they should consider their case an opportunity to provide rich descriptions and insights that people can learn from, which this study aimed to do. Previous case studies (e.g., Ardi et al., 2023; Farrell & Stanclik, 2023; Luo et al., 2024; Nguyen et al., 2023) similarly involved a small number of research participants, yet successfully provided insights for their readers on cases they examined.

3.3 Data Collection

The data were collected mainly through semi-structured in-depth interviews. The researcher started by piloting the interview questions with a student in the course to ensure that the questions were clear. Necessary revisions (e.g., making some questions more concise and rearranging the order of the questions) were made after reviewing the student's answers. The researcher then moved to the next step.

A week before the interview session, the researcher briefed all participants on the study's purpose, obtained their consent to conduct the interview, and ensured that their answers would not affect their grade in the *Talenta Project* course. The researcher also informed the participants that they would receive a monetary incentive upon completing the interview session. That said, the researcher was fully aware that the incentive might affect the way the participants responded to the interview questions.

After obtaining their consent, the researcher emailed the list of interview questions (see Table 1) to the participants, allowing them to prepare their answers. They were allowed to contact the researcher to clarify any interview questions they found unclear. The researcher also collected the participants' thesis writing drafts to help them recall their memories when using AI tools and locate exactly which parts of the thesis they wrote with the help of AI.

In October 2025, the interview was conducted face-to-face in the researcher's office and lasted approximately 40 minutes per participant. The interview was conducted in English, but the participants might also use their first language (*Bahasa Indonesia*) to clarify their answers. All the answers in the participants' first language were translated using *DeepL* translation and double-checked by the researcher for accuracy.

Table 1: The list of interview questions

No	Questions
1	Which AI tools did you use to help you write your thesis?
2	How did you use the AI tools? Give examples. Which specific parts of the thesis did you use AI for?
3	Why did you use the tools?
4	In what ways did AI tools help or hinder your writing?
5	Did you verify or revise the content generated by the AI tools? If yes, how did you do it? If not, why?
6	If you had not used AI, how would your writing process or the result have been different?
7	Did using AI help you learn more about writing in English? Why or why not?
8	Did you inform your teacher about your use of AI tools? Why or why not? How did your teacher respond (if notified)?
9	Do you think it is ethical to use AI for academic writing in the class? Why or why not?
10	What kinds of policies did you expect to have in the future *Talenta Project* class?
11	How do you see the role of AI in the future *Talenta Project* class?

During the interview session, the researcher positioned himself more as a friend than a researcher to encourage participants to articulate their answers as comfortably as possible in an open and trusting environment. This interview was recorded, transcribed, and analyzed qualitatively as detailed in the next section. During the interview session, the researcher was aware of his positionality as the participants' thesis supervisor, which might affect how the participants responded to the interview questions. That said, the researcher assured them that any responses they provided would not impact the grades of their thesis.

3.4 Data Analysis Procedures

The transcribed interview data were analyzed using a data analysis spiral strategy (Creswell & Poth, 2018), which enables researchers to enter with data from text and exit with in-depth descriptions. The analysis consisted of the following phases. First, *managing and organizing data,* the researcher compiled all the interview transcripts into a single *Google Docs* file. Second, *reading and memoing emerging ideas,* the researcher closely read all the interview transcripts closely several times to become more familiar with the participants' experiences when using AI tools to write their thesis. The researcher then added *a comment* button to the file to note any important ideas or insights he found in the research data. Third, *describing and classifying codes into themes,* the researcher highlighted all relevant information related to the research questions and coded the information in the form of words or phrases. The researcher then carefully reviewed the codes to identify commonalities that could be developed into themes. Fourth, *developing and assessing interpretations,* the researcher reread all the emergent themes and checked with the notes he had written to confirm the accuracy of the analysis results. Fifth, *representing and visualizing the data,* the researcher organized the codes and themes resulting from his data analysis into tables as answers to the research questions of this study. Lastly, *presenting accounts of findings,* the researcher presented the research findings to answer the research questions. All of the data analysis phases outlined above have been successfully used by some researchers (e.g., Kusuma, 2022; Mali, 2024) to analyze their research data similar to this study.

3.5 Rigor of the Study

The researcher considered four rigor standards for qualitative studies outlined by Ary et al. (2019), namely credibility (i.e., the truthfulness of the findings), transferability (i.e., the

degree to which degree to which the findings of this study can be applied to other contexts), dependability (i.e., the extent to which the same general results in different settings), and confirmability (i.e., the extent to which the research is free of bias in the procedures and the interpretation of results). The researcher addressed the credibility of the findings by asking the research participants to review and, if necessary, edit the interview transcripts to confirm that the transcripts accurately reflected what they wanted to say. This member-checking strategy was also done by Farrell and Stanclik (2023) and Ong et al. (2021). The researcher also addressed credibility by inviting his colleague with a Master's Degree in English Language Education to review the raw data (i.e., the interview transcripts and the students' thesis work) and the researcher's interpretation of the data. The results of the peer debriefing were positive, as the colleague reported the same interpretations after the researcher clarified the colleague's comments. The researcher then addressed transferability by providing detailed descriptions of the research context and participants (see the previous sections) to assist readers of this paper in understanding how the study was conducted.

Meanwhile, to address the study's dependability and confirmability, the researcher did the following things. Concerning the dependability, the researcher involved the same colleague who assisted with the peer debriefing. He helped to code the interview transcripts of P1 and P2, or "25% of the data" (Esfandiari et al., 2022, p.11), and compared the codes with those made by the researcher. The discrepancies were discussed and resolved until agreement on the coding was reached. This interrater agreement was also done by Esfandiari et al. (2022) to enhance the dependability of their research. Then, regarding confirmability, the researcher involved the same colleague who had helped with addressing credibility and dependability to check the interpretations made by the researcher. However, the researcher is aware that there must always be the issue of subjectivity in qualitative studies, specifically acknowledging his positionality as the participants' thesis supervisor, which might influence the way the researcher interprets his data analysis.

4. Results

This section presents the findings in order of the research questions: how EFL university students use AI tools to help them write their thesis, why the students use AI tools in their thesis writing process, and the kinds of AI policies expected by the students.

4.1. How EFL University Students Use AI Tools to Help Them Write Their Thesis

The data analysis results presented in Table 2 indicate that students utilized four AI tools to assist them in writing their thesis: *ChatGPT, DeepL, Grammarly*, and *Quillbot*. The students used these tools for various purposes. First, *ChatGPT* was used to paraphrase sentences and expand their writing ideas, particularly when writing the introduction and findings sections of their thesis. When using *ChatGPT*, students demonstrated critical control over the ideas suggested by the AI to ensure that it did not alter their original writing ideas. Nevertheless, the feelings of guilt and ethical hesitation were also evident when using *ChatGPT*.

Table 2: The students' use of AI tools

AI Tools	Themes	Codes	Sample Excerpts
ChatGPT	The students used *ChatGPT* to	Paraphrasing sentences	"[…] I often used paraphrasing in the findings section because I wrote that part based on codes and journal data, so paraphrasing helped

AI Tools	Themes	Codes	Sample Excerpts
	paraphrase sentences.		me avoid copying directly from the journals" (P5)
	The students used *ChatGPT* to expand their writing ideas.	Expanding ideas	"[…] when I got stuck while writing the introduction, I would share the journal article I planned to use and ask *ChatGPT* whether my writing was connected to the journal or not. Then, *ChatGPT* would give suggestions, and I would revise and link the ideas back to my own thoughts […]" (P4)
	The students checked the ideas suggested by *ChatGPT*.	Reviewing ideas suggested by *ChatGPT*	"Yes, I always checked and revised the content from AI tools. Usually, after receiving suggestions or sentences from ChatGPT, I reread them carefully to ensure they accurately reflect my ideas and the context of my thesis. I didn't just follow everything. I decided based on my own knowledge or feeling whether something really needed to be changed or not." (P2)
	The students acknowledged the use of *ChatGPT* in their thesis writing process.	Acknowledging the use of AI	"I told my teacher that I used *ChatGPT*, but my teacher reminded me not to rely on it too much, just use it when I really need help or get stuck." (P2)
DeepL	The students used *DeepL* to improve the quality of their writing.	Selecting appropriate vocabulary	"[…] I will see the words that are not suitable in the sentences, then I will search for the other words from the options given by *DeepL*. This makes my work easier." (P1)
		Improving sentence structure	"Sometimes, I also didn't know the sentence structure for writing, so I used *DeepL* as the foundation on which I started to write." (P1)
	The students used *DeepL* to translate their writing ideas in L1 to English.	Translating L1 to English	"For *DeepL*, I sometimes use it to translate a word or sentence that I need to put in my writing. For example, when providing a sentence citation to support a point, I know the sentence in Indonesian, but I don't know how to write it in English. Then I use *DeepL* to help me translate what's on my mind." (P4)
		Translating unfamiliar words	"I use *DeepL* to translate words or sentences that I do not understand clearly." (P1)
	The students used *DeepL* to paraphrase supporting ideas for their thesis.	Paraphrasing supporting ideas	"I also use *DeepL* to paraphrase the supporting sources I use in my thesis." (P2)
	The students acknowledged the use of *DeepL* in their thesis writing process.	Acknowledging the use of AI	"I wrote in my thesis that I used *DeepL* […] I also told my lecturer because I want to be honest about what I did […]" (P1)

AI Tools	Themes	Codes	Sample Excerpts
Grammarly	The students used *Grammarly* to improve the quality of their writing.	Checking grammar	"I used *Grammarly* to check the grammar for all of my work [...]" (P1)
			"I used it mostly just for punctuation, spacing, or small grammatical errors (like missing -s or -es)." (P5)
		Checking punctuation	*Grammarly* also helps me check the details of punctuation." (P1)
		Improving sentence structures	"I also used *Grammarly* to improve the writing structure in my paragraphs." (P2)
		Improving vocabulary choice	"I also used it to revise some words that are not too academic." (P1)
	The students used *Grammarly* to detect any plagiarized text in their work.	Detecting plagiarism	"I used Grammarly to check grammar and plagiarism in all parts of my thesis ." (P3)
			"What I relied on most was Grammarly's *AI detection* feature. It highlights which parts appear to be AI-generated, so I would revise those sentences. My process was to translate the sentence back into Indonesian, rephrase it, and translate it again into English until the AI percentage decreased." (P5)
	The students experienced negative consequences from using *Grammarly.*	Being over-reliant on the tool	"*Grammarly* can make me dependent on it when writing because AI really helps me." (P1)
	The students verified the AI-generated text suggestions.	Verifying the information	"After I got the answers to what I wanted. Yes, I rechecked it. After using *DeepL*, I usually check the grammar on *Grammarly*. After that, I will check it by reading it until I feel satisfied with the answer." (P1)
Quillbot	The students used *Quillbot* to improve the quality of their writing.	Improving sentence structure	"It also has features to change the sentence style (academic, simple, etc.)." (P5)
		Improving vocabulary choice	"It replaced words that didn't sound natural or seemed "too AI" with words I actually understood. That made me more confident and helped me truly understand what I was writing." (P5)

The second AI tool the students used was *DeepL.* They used it to paraphrase supporting ideas, select appropriate vocabulary, and translate ideas they thought in L1 into English; all of these helped the students produce more fluent and academically appropriate sentences in their thesis. The other AI tools were *Grammarly* and *Quillbot.* The students extensively used *Grammarly* to check their grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure in their thesis, as

well as for plagiarism detection. As the data show, the students demonstrated awareness of the need to verify the suggestions/ corrections made by *Grammarly* to be suitable for the particular meanings or contexts of their writing. However, a student was concerned that *Grammarly* made them dependent on the AI tool. Meanwhile, *Quillbot* was primarily used to enhance sentence structures and vocabulary choices for the students' thesis. *Quillbot* also allowed a student to revise AI-sounding words into ones they could understand better and confidently use in their thesis.

4.2. Why the EFL University Students Use AI

As shown in Table 3, there are four reasons why the students used AI to help them write their thesis. Speed and efficiency emerged as the most frequently cited factors. The AI tools helped them write sentences more quickly, especially when they experienced writer's block or struggled to find appropriate academic vocabulary and to develop their ideas. Alongside the writing speed and efficiency, the students also considered AI tools as a learning medium to enhance their English proficiency. For example, the repeated corrections and suggestions on grammar usage, academic vocabulary, and sentence structure that the students received from the AI tools helped them learn and become more aware of grammatical and linguistic accuracy in their thesis. The other reason for using the AI tools was to compensate for the students' lack of confidence in their English writing skills, feeling uncertain about their grammar, ideas, and sentence organization, as well as their ability to communicate complex ideas clearly in English. The data also indicated that the AI tools could provide students with psychological safety, as they knew the AI tools could minimize grammatical errors and enhance the readability of their thesis.

Table 3: Why the students use the AI tools

Themes	Codes	Sample Excerpts
The students used the AI tools because they could write faster.	Writing Faster	"If I had not used any AI during the writing process, it might have taken longer to write. Especially when my mind is stuck and I don't know what ideas to use or what to write in my thesis, it will definitely take longer." (P3)
		"I use those tools to save time when writing because when I write, I often feel stuck or run out of ideas to continue my sentences." (P4)
		"If I hadn't used AI, I think I would have written much less, and the process would have taken a lot longer. Even with AI, it already took me a long time, so without it, it would've been even slower." (P5)
The students used the AI tools because the tools help improve their understanding of English.	Improving understanding of English	"Using AI really helped me learn more about writing in English. Every time I got feedback or suggestions, I could see how sentences were structured more naturally or academically. It helped me identify which words are more suitable for formal writing and how to connect ideas more effectively. I also learned new vocabulary and expressions that I hadn't used before. So even though I used AI for help, I still learned a lot from the corrections and suggestions it gave me." (P2)

Themes	Codes	Sample Excerpts
The students used the AI tools because they lacked confidence in their writing skills.	Not feeling confident in their writing skills	"Without AI, I might still finish my thesis, but it probably wouldn't sound as organized or natural as it does now, and maybe my supervisor would have to work harder to correct my writing." (P2)
		"I used these tools because I'm not very confident in my writing. I can understand journals quite well, but when I try to turn what I read into sentences, my writing ends up short, less detailed, and not well-structured." (P5)
The students used the AI tools because the tools could give them writing ideas.	Generating writing ideas	"They (*Grammarly*, *ChatGPT*, and *DeepL*) also helped me get some ideas before writing and when I felt stuck when writing my thesis. (P3)

Finally, the students used the AI tools because they could help generate writing ideas, especially when they felt stuck.

4.3. The AI Policies Expected by the Students

The findings indicated that three major principles should be integrated into AI policies, as proposed by the students. First, the students agreed that copying and pasting AI-generated sentences into their thesis without adaptations, modifications, careful review, and personal contributions could constitute academic misconduct. The students believed that their thesis should remain their intellectual product, where AI is limited as a supporting tool rather than positioning it as the primary thesis writer. Second, the students proposed the idea of using AI detection tools as a part of the AI policy, viewing that students might receive score deductions if AI-generated content found in the student's thesis exceeds acceptable limits of 15-20%. However, the students were concerned that the AI detection tool might not always work accurately, flagging students' genuine human writing as AI-generated texts.

Table 4: The AI policies expected by the students

Themes	Codes	Sample Excerpts
The students should not copy and paste the AI-generated text.	Not copying the AI-generated text	"Yes, as long as we don't use it to fully generate and copy-paste everything. I think, if we only use it to help sometimes when we are feeling stuck when writing the thesis, it's still ethical." (P3)
		"I think it's okay to use AI for academic writing as long as we're still responsible and the work is mostly our own. It becomes a problem only if we let AI do everything for us. For me, it's more like using it as a helper. I still think, write, and decide which suggestions to use, not just accept everything blindly." (P5)
The students' work should be checked using an AI detection tool.	Using an AI detection tool	"The kind of policy that I expect is that we can still use AI, but when it turns out to be more than 15 to 20 percent of plagiarism, the score will be deducted or maybe not accepted." (P1)
		"Sometimes the AI detection isn't really accurate. Some normal sentences can get detected as AI-generated, even though we actually write them." (P2)

Themes	Codes	Sample Excerpts
The students may use AI to translate, check grammar, or paraphrase.	Using AI for translating, grammar checking, and paraphrasing	"When it comes to translating, checking the grammar, or paraphrasing, I think it's still fine." (P2) "I used them to help me paraphrase and find new words, not for generating sentences to fill up my writings, so I think it's still okay to get help from AI." (P4)

Third, the students believed that it is permissible to use AI more as supporting tools that help students check their grammar, paraphrase ideas, and translate.

5. Discussion

As the answers to the first research question, how EFL university students use AI tools to help them write their thesis, the data analysis results indicated that the students used four AI tools in their writing process. The practices of using those tools confirmed findings of the previous studies about the positive use of AI tools, such as *ChatGPT* to paraphrase sentences (Črček & Patekar, 2023) and generate ideas (Meniado et al., 2024), *Grammarly* to improve grammatical aspects of students' writing (Bibi & Atta, 2024; Crawford et al., 2023; Gozali et al., 2024; Marzuki et al., 2023), *DeepL* to translate ideas and contribute to a more coherent and engaging writing styles for students' writing (Gao et al., 2024; Liang, 2025), and *Quillbot* to improve sentence structure and vocabulary choice (Gozali et al., 2024). Positively speaking, none of the respondents used AI tools to generate original content and use it directly in their thesis, which indicates their growing awareness of using AI more as a supporting tool rather than a replacement for their writing efforts.

The practices of using AI tools might also indicate that AI is already present in the classroom and becomes "a useful tutor in writing classes" (Hang, 2023, p.35) for students. That said, writing teachers who are technology literate or those who lack technological skills, whether they like it or not, should be prepared to teach students who potentially use AI to write their thesis. At that point, the researcher supported Tseng and Warschauer's (2023) proposal against banning AI-based tools in the classroom; otherwise, students would lose essential opportunities to learn how to use those tools effectively in their future workflows. As Tseng and Warschauer (2023) also highlighted, in this AI world era that increasingly values the use of AI in the workplace, students who have limited experience "to manipulate AI tools to increase their productivity and efficiency will fall behind those who do have the experience and skills to make use of those tools effectively" (p. 259).

However, the researcher had conflicting feelings about the students' use of *DeepL* in the thesis writing process. For instance, although P1 acknowledged using the tool in her thesis and informed her supervisor of its use, she did not provide detailed information on the number of words or sentences she translated for her thesis. In fact, some students (P1, P2) also used *DeepL* for the sentence-level translation, especially for paraphrasing purposes. As previous researchers (Klimova, 2025; Vinall et al., 2024; Wise et al., 2024) have reminded us, using MT to translate stretches of texts above the word level might be considered academic dishonesty, especially when the students do not verify the translation results by the AI tool (Murtisari et al., 2019). Yet, how if the students in this study verified, double-checked, and

still edited all the (sentence-level) translation results by *DeepL*? Was it considered cheating? Who could ensure that the students complete all of this verification and editing tasks?

That said, the researcher supports Vinall et al.'s (2024) argument that classroom policies regarding MT should be designed through an open and constructive dialogue between students and their lecturer, as these policies may vary by task type and learning goals. Inviting students to engage in this conversation regarding ethics will also be essential for shaping their better understanding of how to engage with AI-based tools and inform teachers about best practices for using AI ethically (Tseng & Warschauer, 2023). With that student's understanding, lecturers can now focus more on supervising students to enhance their theses substantially, rather than acting as "police" and being busy in investigating whether their students use AI to write their theses.

With regards to the second research question, why the students used the AI tools, the findings confirmed perspectives by the previous researchers (e.g., Klimova et al., 2024; Steele, 2023) that AI, besides improving the quality of writing, also has the capacity to complete a writing task faster and make the writing process more efficiently, as experienced by the research participants of this study. However, these advantages should be interpreted with caution, as writing efficiency does not necessarily equate to deeper learning on students' research topics or the development of students' writing skills. Besides, the AI's capacity to enhance students' writing might increase their sense of dependence on AI tools, leading to a loss of confidence when writing without them. Klimova (2025) and Liang (2025) warned that dependency on AI might reduce students' language-learning motivation and hinder their improvement of English language skills. The heavy reliance on the AI tools might also shift students' focus from composing quality and meaningful thesis to polishing surface grammatical features of their thesis. At that point, the researcher strongly believes that establishing transparent AI policies might ensure that AI tools are not used as a shortcut that might impede students' writing skill development, particularly in EFL settings, which require students' active writing practices.

Related to the third research question, the AI policies expected by the students, the researcher observed that the students demonstrated a sense of AI ethical literacy in the thesis writing process. They rejected the direct copy-paste practices of AI-generated content and suggestions for their thesis. According to the recent AI national policy in Indonesia, it can be a real illustration of the essence of maintaining human agency in a writing work without depending entirely on sentences generated by AI. Importantly, as suggested by UNESCO (see Miao et al., 2021), this AI ethical literacy should be part of regular discussions and debates in classrooms to ensure that students can use various AI tools ethically.

The data also informs the calls for using the AI detection tools. Yet, the researcher could see the rising concerns about the accuracy of the tools. While the tools can reinforce accountability in students' writing, they have been reported to flag students' original writing as AI-generated text (Cong-Lem et al., 2024). In line with this point, the researcher appreciated the student's proposal of the acceptable limits of the AI-generated content (i.e., 15-20%) detected by the tools in the thesis. However, given the trust issues with AI detection tools, who can ensure that students have written their thesis responsibly, even if the AI-detected text falls within the acceptable limit of 15-20% or even less? Thus, to address this complexity, lecturers supervising their thesis students should consider moving beyond the

AI-detection based approaches to promoting the critical AI-literacy that encourages students to engage with various AI tools reflectively (i.e., being aware that the AI-generated content is not always right; thus, it needs adaptions and careful reviews), responsibly (i.e., not directly copying and pasting the AI generated text), and transparently (i.e., acknowledging openly how and for what purposes the AI tools were used to write a thesis) within their thesis writing process.

With these discussions in mind, the researcher can draw some pedagogical implications for EFL lecturers supervising their undergraduate students. First, they must be AI-literate. Why? They should have the capacity to formulate clear AI policies in the students' thesis writing process and communicate them to their students at the beginning of the thesis supervision process. This policy should be discussed constructively to achieve agreed-upon policies and a shared understanding of what students may/may not do with the AI when writing their thesis, especially regarding the understanding that students should be the primary writers and be prepared to take responsibility for their thesis. To support the discussions, the lecturers can explore best practices in AI policies from universities worldwide (e.g., read Moorhouse et al., 2023). The policies should then be stated explicitly in the classroom syllabus and reinforced in daily conversations among students and their supervisor throughout the thesis writing journey. Without formal guidance, students cannot be expected to independently navigate the ethical boundaries of AI-assisted writing (Črček & Patekar, 2023).

Second, in addition to the policy, lecturers should also discuss the drawbacks of being overly dependent on AI tools, with the hope that students will become more aware of these drawbacks and strike a balance between technological assistance from AI and their own writing efforts. Conversations about the drawbacks should start to be normalized in the classroom.

Third, lecturers should equip their students with strong critical thinking and evaluation skills. The students must fact-check, review grammatical suggestions, writing ideas, and translated words or phrases generated by the AI tools before incorporating them into their thesis. While the text AI generates is consistently coherent and natural, it is often not reliable and accurate (Tseng & Warschauer, 2023).

Lastly, the lecturers should consider revisiting the rubric to assess their students' thesis. In this AI era, the rubric should not only cover the grammatical aspects of the thesis, which AI tools can easily polish, but also pay more attention to the thesis's content, such as the depth and critical analysis of the research findings. Additionally, students should have various opportunities to disseminate their thesis, where they can discuss their work not only with their thesis supervisors but also with people outside their campus. The scoring can then be focused on how well the students can respond to questions addressed by the audience of their presentations. Failing to answer the questions might be an indicator that the AI tools wrote the thesis, and the authors did not fully understand what they wrote. One of the most common forms is through a thesis defense presentation that may be open to the public. Another approach is to ask students to present their thesis at a national or international conference. Through these activities, lecturers can convey a clear message to their students that they should be morally and ethically responsible for what they write, present, and discuss with others.

6. Conclusion

The researcher could draw the following conclusions. First, the students were AI literate as they used four AI tools, *ChatGPT, DeepL, Grammarly,* and *Quillbot,* considering these tools as their digital writing assistants to enhance the grammatical accuracy, clarity, idea development, and quality of their thesis. Second, the students demonstrated ethical AI literacy, as they consistently reviewed all AI-generated suggestions and ideas carefully before incorporating them into their thesis. Third, the students had both instrumental and affective reasons for using the AI tools in their thesis writing process. Instrumentally speaking, the students used the tools to write more efficiently, enhance the linguistic accuracy of their thesis, and gain a better understanding of academic vocabulary and grammar. Affectively speaking, the students used the tools to boost their writing confidence and overcome writing anxiety in writing their thesis. Fourth, in terms of policy expectations, the students proposed practical and balanced AI policies, allowing the use of AI tools for grammar checking, paraphrasing, and translation, while prohibiting the direct copying of AI-generated content without critical review and necessary modifications.

This study has some limitations that the researcher would like to acknowledge. This study involved only five research participants, all of whom were female EFL undergraduate university students. Involving more participants with mixed genders (i.e., male and female) might yield further insights into the use of AI in undergraduate thesis writing. Additionally, future researchers can explore AI practices employed by students at the master's and doctoral levels and compare these practices with those presented in this study. Commonalities in practices across educational levels might illustrate best practices for using AI ethically in writing a thesis. Additionally, future researchers can supplement the interview data with students' self-reflections on their practices of using AI in their thesis writing process, as well as forum group discussion sessions with technology experts to comment on the ideas from the interviews and reflections.

In closing, the researcher would like to propose guiding questions for future research explorations to follow up on the current study: Other than *Grammarly, ChatGPT, DeepL,* and *Quillbot,* what other AI tools have the capacity to support students in their thesis writing process? How can lecturers regulate the more ethical and responsible ways of using AI tools in the thesis writing process? How can lecturers enhance students' self-confidence when writing their thesis with/without the support of AI tools? What should students do to address the over-reliance on the use of AI tools in their thesis writing process? In closing, the researcher hopes that this study will encourage readers of this paper to reflect on their students' AI practices in their writing classrooms and find ways to support their students' writing process with the best, most ethical, and responsible uses of AI.

References

Akmal, S., & Mulia, I. D. (2020). Investigating students' interest on reading journal articles: Materials, reasons and strategies. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *7*(1), 194–208. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v7i1.15358

Alkamel, M. A. A., & Alwagieh, N. A. S. (2024). Utilizing an adaptable artificial intelligence writing tool (ChatGPT) to enhance academic writing skills among Yemeni university EFL students. *Social Sciences and Humanities Open*, *10*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101095

Ardi, P., Widyaningsih, T. L., & Widiati, U. (2023). Appreciative Collaborative Reflection to catalyze Indonesian EFL teachers' identity configuration in a teacher professional education program. *Education and Self Development*, *18*(2), 10–26. https://doi.org/10.26907/esd.18.2.02

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Irvine, C. K. S., & Walker, D. A. (2019). *Introduction to research in education (10th ed.).* Cengage.

Baskara, F. R. (2023). Integrating ChatGPT into EFL writing instruction: Benefits and challenges. *International Journal of Education and Learning*, *5*(1), 44–55. https://doi.org/10.31763/ijele.v5i1.858

Bibi, Z., & Atta, A. (2024). The role of ChatGPT as AI English writing assistant: A study of student's perceptions, experiences, and satisfaction. *Annals of Human and Social Sciences*, *5*(I), 433–443. https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2024(5-i)39

Chandra, S. O., & Yuyun, I. (2018). The use of google translate in EFL essay writing. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, *21*(2), 228–238. https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.2018.210212

Cheng, A., Calhoun, A., & Reedy, G. (2025). Artificial intelligence-assisted academic writing: Recommendations for ethical use. *Advances in Simulation*, *10*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41077-025-00350-6

Cheong, W., & Hong, H. (2023). The impact of ChatGPT on foreign language teaching and learning: Opportunities in education and research. *Journal of Educational Technology and Innovation*, *5*(1), 37–45. https://jeti.thewsu.org/index.php/cieti/article/view/103

Cong-Lem, N., Tran, T. N., & Nguyen, T. T. (2024). Academic integrity in the age of generative AI: Perceptions and response of Vietnamese EFL teachers. *Teaching English with Technology*, *24*(1), 28–47. https://doi.org/10.56297/FSYB3031/MXNB7567

Crawford, J., Cowling, M., & Allen, K. A. (2023). Leadership is needed for ethical ChatGPT: Character, assessment, and learning using artificial intelligence (AI). *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, *20*(3), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.3.02

Črček, N., & Patekar, J. (2023). Writing with AI: University students' use of ChatGPT. *Journal of Language and Education*, *9*(4), 128–138. https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2023.17379

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.).* Sage Publications, Inc.

Crompton, H., Edmett, A., Ichaporia, N., & Burke, D. (2024). AI and English language teaching: Affordances and challenges. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *55*, 2503–2529. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13460

Direktorat Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan, Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi, Riset dan Teknologi, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset dan Teknologi (2024). *Panduan penggunaan Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) pada pembelajaran di perguruan tinggi* [Guide to using Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in higher education]. Direktorat Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan, Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi, Riset, dan Teknologi, Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi.

Dmitrenko, T. A., & Akhmadullin, A. A. (2023). Current trends in teaching a foreign language in the digital era. *Training, Language and Culture*, *7*(4), 16–23. https://doi.org/10.22363/2521-442X-2023-7-4-16-23

Esfandiari, R., Meihami, H., & Jahani, F. (2022). Exploring Iranian postgraduate EFL

students' academic writing experiences and expectations: A dynamic narrative approach. *TESL-EJ*, *25*(4), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.25100a4

Farrell, T. S. C., & Stanclik, C. (2023). "COVID-19 is an opportunity to rediscover ourselves": Reflections of a novice EFL teacher in Central America. *RELC Journal*, *54*(1), 71–83. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220981778

Gao, R., Lin, Y., Zhao, N., & Cai, Z. G. (2024). Machine translation of Chinese classical poetry: A comparison among ChatGPT, Google Translate, and DeepL Translator. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *11*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03363-0

Giray, L. (2024). "Don't let Grammarly overwrite your style and voice:" Writers' advice on using Grammarly in writing. *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, *28*(3), 293–303. https://doi.org/10.1080/10875301.2024.2344762

Godwin-Jones, R. (2022). Partnering with AI: Intelligent writing assistance and instructed language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, *26*(2), 5–24. http://doi.org/10125/73474

Gozali, I., Ryan, A., & Wijaya, T. (2024). ChatGPT as an automated writing evaluation (AWE) tool: Feedback literacy development and AWE tools' integration framework. *The JALT CALL Journal*, *20*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v20n1.1200

Guleria, A., Krishan, K., Sharma, V., & Kanchan, T. (2023). ChatGPT: ethical concerns and challenges in academics and research. *The Journal of Infection in Developing Countries*, *17*(9), 1292–1299. https://doi.org/10.3855/jidc.18738

Gustilo, L., Ong, E., & Lapinid, M. R. (2024). Algorithmically-driven writing and academic integrity: Exploring educators' practices, perceptions, and policies in AI era. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *20*(3), 1–44. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-024-00153-8

Hang, N. T. T. (2023). EFL techers' perspectives toward the use of ChatGPT in writing classes: A case study at Van Lang University. *International Journal of Language Instruction*, *2*(3), 1–47. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.54855/ijli.23231

Imran, M., & Almusharraf, N. (2023). Analyzing the role of ChatGPT as a writing assistant at higher education level: A systematic review of the literature. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, *15*(4), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13605

Jackaria, P. M., Hajan, B. H., & Mastul, A. R. H. (2024). A comparative analysis of the rating of college students' essays by ChatGPT versus human raters. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, *23*(2), 478–492. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.2.23

Klimova, B. (2025). Use of machine translation in foreign language education. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, *12*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2025.2491183

Klimova, B., Pikhart, M., & Al-Obaydi, L. H. (2024). Exploring the potential of ChatGPT for foreign language education at the university level. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *15*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1269319

Krajka, J., & Olszak, I. (2024). "AI, will you help?" How learners use artificial intelligence when writing. *XLinguae*, *17*(1), 34–48. https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2024.17.01.03

Kritandani, W., Putra, A. W., Mali, Y. C. G., & Isharyanti, N. (2024). SciSpace for finding relevant literature in English language education contexts: A technology review. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Studies*, *10*(2), 108–117. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24071/ijels.v10i2.9146

Kusuma, I. P. I. (2022). How does a TPACK-related program support EFL pre-service teachers' flipped classrooms? *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, *15*(2), 300–325. https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/259931/176125

Liang, L. (2025). The impact of using DeepL translator on Chinese EFL students' story writing. In *Journal of China Computer-Assisted Language Learning* (Vol. 5, Issue 1). https://doi.org/10.1515/jccall-2024-0009

Luo, W. A., Murtisari, E. T., & Isharyanti, N. (2024). Lower-proficiency EFL students' use of Grammarly in writing: Behavior, cognition, and affect. *JALT CALL Journal*, *20*(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v20n1.1089

Mali, Y. C. G. (2024). EFL graduate students' voices on their technology-integrated classroom language tasks. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Learning*, *27*(1), 116–135. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v27i1.7375

Marzuki, Widiati, U., Rusdin, D., Darwin, & Indrawati, I. (2023). The impact of AI writing tools on the content and organization of students' writing: EFL teachers' perspective. *Cogent Education*, *10*(2), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2236469

Meniado, J. C., Huyen, D. T. T., Panyadilokpong, N., & Lertkomolwit, P. (2024). Using ChatGPT for second language writing: Experiences and perceptions of EFL learners in Thailand and Vietnam. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *7*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100313

Miao, F., Holmes, W., Huang, R., & Zhang, H. (2021). *AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers*. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://doi.org/10.54675/pcsp7350

Moorhouse, B. L., Yeo, M. A., & Wan, Y. (2023). Generative AI tools and assessment: Guidelines of the world's top-ranking universities. *Computers and Education Open*, *5*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2023.100151

Murtisari, E. T., Widiningrum, R., Branata, J., & Susanto, R. D. (2019). Google translate in language learning: Indonesian EFL students' attitudes. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, *16*(3), 978–986. https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2019.16.3.14.978

Newcomer, S. N. (2017). Investigating the power of authentically caring student-teacher relationships for Latinx students. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *17*(2), 179–193. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2017.1310104

Ngo, T. T. A. (2023). The perception by university students of the use of ChatGPT in education. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (IJET)*, *18*(17), 4–19. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v18i17.39019

Nguyen, H. H. B., Ngoc, H. H. B., & Dan, T. C. (2024). EFL students' perceptions and practices of using ChatGPT for developing English argumentative essay writing skills. *European Journal of Alternative Education Studies*, *9*(1), 168–216. https://doi.org/10.46827/ejae.v9i1.5341

Nguyen, V. T., Nguyen, T. C., & Ho, B. N. (2023). Using lesson study for teacher development: A case study of Vietnamese EFL teachers' reflections. *CTU Journal of Innovation and Sustainable Development*, *15*(3), 72–80. https://doi.org/10.22144/ctujoisd.2023.052

O'Neill, R., & Russell, A. M. T. (2019). Stop! Grammar time: University students' perceptions of the automated feedback program Grammarly. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *35*(1), 42–56. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.3795

Ong, W. A., Swanto, S., Alsaqqaf, A., & Ong, J. W. (2021). Promoting reflective practice via the use of 5-step copora reflective model: A case study of east Malaysian ESL pre-service teachers. *TEFLIN Journal*, *32*(1), 72–96. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v32i1/72-96

Özçelik, N. P., & Ekşi, G. Y. (2024). Cultivating writing skills: The role of ChatGPT as a learning assistant—a case study. *Smart Learning Environments*, *11*(10), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00296-8

Peachey, N., & Crichton, R. (2024). *AI activities and resources for English language teachers*. British Council. https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/2024-11/Peachey_2024_ AI_activities_resources_English_language_teachers.pdf

Rababah, L. M., Rababah, M. A., & Al-Khawaldeh, N. N. (2024). *Graduate students' ChatGPT experience and perspectives during thesis writing*. *14*(3), 22–35. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v14i3.48395

Song, C., & Song, Y. (2023). Enhancing academic writing skills and motivation: Assessing the efficacy of ChatGPT in AI-assisted language learning for EFL students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1260843

Steele, J. L. (2023). To GPT or not GPT? Empowering our students to learn with AI. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *5*, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100160

Sumakul, D. T. Y. G., Hamied, F. A., & Sukyadi, D. (2022). Artificial intelligence in EFL classrooms: Friend or foe? *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, *15*(1), 232–256. https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/256723

Tseng, W., & Warschauer, M. (2023). AI-writing tools in education: If you can't beat them, join them. *Journal of China Computer-Assisted Language Learning*, *3*(2), 258–262. https://doi.org/10.1515/jccall-2023-0008

Tseng, Y. C., & Lin, Y. H. (2024). Enhancing English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners' writing with ChatGPT: A university-level course design. *Electronic Journal of E-Learning*, *22*(2), 78–97. https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.21.5.3329

Vinall, K., Wen, W., & Hellmich, E. A. (2024). Investigating L2 writers' uses of machine translation and other online tools. *Foreign Language Annals*, *57*(2), 499–526. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12733

Wise, B., Emerson, L., Van Luyn, A., Dyson, B., Bjork, C., & Thomas, S. E. (2024). A scholarly dialogue: Writing scholarship, authorship, academic integrity and the challenges of AI. *Higher Education Research and Development*, *43*(3), 578–590. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2023.2280195

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications (6th ed.)*. Sage Publications, Inc.