ELT Echo: The Journal of English Language Teaching in Foreign Language Contexts (2026), Vol 11(2)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.24235/eltecho.v11i2.25078
Published by English Language Teaching Department, UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon, Indonesia. p-ISSN: 2579-8170, e-ISSN: 2549-5089

ELT Echo: The Journal of English Language Teaching in Foreign Language Contexts
journal homepage: https://journal1.uinssc.ac.id/index.php/eltecho

Critical and Responsible Use of ChatGPT, Grammarly, and QuillBot in EFL Postgraduate Academic Writing

Nadhrah Al Na'im[1]*, Pupung Purnawarman[1]

[1] Faculty of Language and Literature Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

Corresponding author's Email: nadranaim11@upi.edu

Article Information

Received: 20-10-2026
Revised: 17-11-2026
Accepted: 23-11-2026
Available Online: 01-12-2026

ABSTRACT

Research on the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in academic writing in Indonesia has generally focused on measuring perceptions and frequency of use, with many studies examining only a single tool. Consequently, limited information exists regarding students' practices when employing multiple AI tools simultaneously. This descriptive qualitative study examines how postgraduate students of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in Indonesia use ChatGPT, Grammarly, and QuillBot critically and responsibly. Data were obtained through semi-structured interviews with five first-semester master's students in an English Language Education program and analyzed using thematic analysis. Participants reported a clear division of functions for each tool: ChatGPT for brainstorming ideas and structuring outlines, Grammarly for checking grammar, and QuillBot for paraphrasing. They also reported practices such as verifying information, maintaining ownership of their ideas, and disclosing their use of AI. Identified challenges included over-reliance on AI, production of generic outputs, and insufficient institutional guidelines, whereas the opportunities included increased efficiency and improved language proficiency. These findings suggest that writing instruction should be adapted to the function of each tool, emphasizing verification and disclosure for ChatGPT, understanding corrections for Grammarly, and ensuring fidelity to sources when using QuillBot.

Keywords: academic writing; ChatGPT; critical AI literacy; Grammarly; QuillBot

1. INTRODUCTION

Academic writing poses a significant challenge for students learning English as a foreign language (EFL) in Indonesia. A meta-analysis of 21 studies demonstrates that these students encounter difficulties

related to language proficiency, structural organization, and content development (Hamdani & Abid, 2025). In response to these challenges, students increasingly use artificial intelligence (AI) tools throughout all stages of the writing process, including brainstorming, drafting, revising and editing (Putri et al., 2025). Consequently, writing has shifted from being solely an individual activity to a collaborative process involving both humans and machines (Cui et al., 2025). Furthermore, a systematic review of 70 empirical studies indicates that most research on ChatGPT in English language learning focuses specifically on writing skills (Lo et al., 2024).

However, the AI tools utilized by students function in different ways. ChatGPT functions as a generative tool, as it can produce text that resembles human writing based on user prompts (Barrot, 2023), including helping create outlines (Su et al., 2023) and generating ideas (Werdiningsih, Marzuki, Indrawati, et al., 2024). Grammarly functions as a corrective tool, providing automated feedback by identifying errors in written text and suggesting improvements (Koltovskaia, 2020). A systematic review further suggests that such tools should be used to supplement, rather than replace, feedback from lecturers (Dizon & Gayed, 2024). QuillBot acts as a paraphrasing tool, capable of restructuring existing sentences; it can enhance EFL students' paraphrasing skills (Mohammad et al., 2023). These functional differences also introduce distinct risks. Generative tools may produce inaccurate information and create opportunities for academic dishonesty (Lo et al., 2024). Corrective tools may lead students to accept corrections uncritically; for example, in a case study involving two ESL students, those who relied too heavily on Grammarly's feedback accepted the suggested corrections without evaluating them (Koltovskaia, 2020). Meanwhile, paraphrasing tools may modify words, sentences, or even entire paragraphs with minimal effort, which may obscure the boundary between legitimate paraphrasing and plagiarism (Roe & Perkins, 2022). Those studies generally focus on only one type of tool, leaving it largely unknown how students combine and manage all three.

To understand these differences, this study employs sociocultural theory. This theory emphasizes mediation, defined as the use of cultural tools to facilitate interactions between individuals and their environment, and the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which refers to the gap between what a learner can accomplish with assistance and what they can achieve independently (Vygotsky, 1978). Mediation is only effective when accompanied by internalization, a process in which external support is gradually reduced as the learner's proficiency increases (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). From this perspective, the three AI tools mediate different aspects of the writing process: ChatGPT mediates idea development, Grammarly mediates linguistic form, and QuillBot mediates sentence structure. Generative tools may risk replacing cognitive processes that should be internalized, since they can provide immediate answers. High school students who transform ideas generated by ChatGPT into their own arguments often develop a stronger sense of their unique writing voice (Levine et al., 2025). In contrast, university students must balance refining their writing with AI assistance and maintaining their original authorial voice (Wang, 2025). Because AI cannot determine when its assistance should be reduced, students must manage this process independently. This ability is associated with AI literacy, defined as the competence to critically evaluate AI, collaborate with it, and utilize it as a tool (Long & Magerko, 2020), which also includes an understanding of ethical issues (Ng et al., 2021).

In Indonesia, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology issued guidelines on the use of generative AI in higher education in October 2024 (Direktorat Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan, 2024). Nevertheless, a lack of regulation remains a significant barrier to the effective integration of AI in education (Haetami, 2025). Globally, students generally prefer clear regulatory frameworks rather than outright bans (Farinosi & Melchior, 2025), yet many existing policies are too broad to provide definitive ethical guidance (Luo, 2024). Research on Indonesian students generally suggests that, although AI is perceived as beneficial, it also raises concerns. Master's students, for

instance, use ChatGPT to enhance vocabulary, correct grammar, generate ideas, and structure essays, while also critically evaluating the outputs (Werdiningsih, Marzuki, Indrawati, et al., 2024). Students in both Indonesian and Taiwan recognized the advantages of AI for grammar checking and paraphrasing, yet they also expressed concerns regarding over-reliance and potential plagiarism (Rafida et al., 2024). Studies involving 373 Indonesian students (Martha et al., 2025) and 77 undergrduate students of English Language Education (Febriyanti et al., 2026) have also highlighted fears that AI use may diminish critical thinking skills. However, some of these studies have concentrated on undergraduate students, relied primarily on questionnaire-based perceptions, or focused exclusively on ChatGPT. While these studies document the frequency and purposes of AI use, as well as student concerns, there is limited exploration of the specific strategies employ to verify AI-generated content, maintain ownership of their ideas, and disclose AI usage. Meanwhile, postgraduate students face increasingly ambiguous boundaries between legitimate assistance and academic dishonesty (Hanh & Duyen, 2025), and over-reliance on AI may diminish critical and analytical thinking skills (Zhai et al., 2024).

To address this gap, this study aims to examine how EFL postgraduate students in Indonesia use ChatGPT, Grammarly, and QuillBot critically and responsibly in academic writing. Specifically, the study investigates three research questions: (1) how EFL postgraduate students in Indonesia employ AI tools in their English writing practices; (2) how they demonstrate critical awareness and responsibility when using AI for writing; (3) what challenges and opportunities they encounter in developing critical and responsible AI literacy for writing.

2. METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive qualitative design to provide a comprehensive overview of how EFL students in Indonesia use AI tools in their writing. This design enables the researcher to examine participants' experiences without manipulating variables and to remain close to the data, thereby ensuring the findings accurately reflect participants' experiences in their own language (Sandelowski, 2000). Because the data are based on self-reports, the findings represent practices as reported by participants rather than those observed directly.

Research Site and Participants

This study was conducted within a Master's program in English Language Education at a public university in West Java Province, Indonesia. The participants consisted of five first-semester students, selected purposively according to the following criteria: (1) being enrolled as active students, (2) having experience using AI tools for academic writing, such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, or QuillBot, and (3) being willing to participate in an interview. First-semester students were selected because they are in a transitional period and face higher academic writing demands at this level compared with previous educational stages. A sample size of five participants was considered sufficient because this study focuses on the depth of understanding rather than generalizability. The amount of data gathered from each participant influenced the required sample size; furthermore, sample adequacy was evaluated based on the research scope, topic, data quality, and research design (Morse, 2000). To ensure confidentiality, the institution's name is not disclosed, and the participants are identified as P1 through P5.

Data Collection and Instruments

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, which enable adherence to an interview protocol while permitting flexibility in exploring participants' responses (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015). The protocol consisted of nine primary questions and associated with follow-up questions, organized according to three research questions. The complete protocol has been included as a supplementary

document. Before conducting the interview, the protocol was validated by a lecturer specializing in information and communication technology (ICT)-based English language teaching. Several questions were revised based on the validator's feedback to improve clarity and ensure alignment with the research objectives. Interviews were conducted in either Indonesian or English, according to participants' preferences. All interviews were audio-recorded with participants' consent and subsequently transcribed verbatim. Each interview lasted approximately 8-15 minutes, a duration considered sufficient because the questions focused on the three research questions, and concluded once participants had addressed all questions and no additional information was forthcoming. Excerpts in Indonesian were translated into English while maintaining their original meaning, and the translations were subsequently reviewed by the participants for accuracy. To improve readability, filler words and repetitions within the excerpts were removed without changing the intended meaning, with omissions indicated by ellipses.

All interviews were conducted by the first author, a master's student in English Language Education with nearly three years of experience teaching English as both a private tutor and a tutor at a tutoring center, who also utilizes AI tools for academic writing. This background facilitated an understanding of the practices described by the participants, although it may have influenced the interpretation of their responses. Furthermore, the researcher was a classmate of the participants. While this familiarity encouraged greater openness, it may also have led participants to present themselves as responsible AI users. To mitigate these potential influences, the researcher emphasized that there were no right or wrong answers, employed non-directive, open-ended questions, and consistently sought participants' confirmation of the interpretations made. The second author is a lecturer with expertise in technology in English language learning.

This research was conducted as part of a course assignment and did not undergo review by an institutional ethics committee. However, ethical research principles were maintained throughout the study. Before the interviews, participants received an online consent form detailing the research objectives, procedures, data security protocols, and their right to withdraw at any time without consequence. Participation was entirely voluntary, and no incentives were provided. All transcripts and recordings were stored on password-protected devices accessible exclusively to the researcher. Audio recordings will be deleted following the completion of the study.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using a six-phase thematic analysis: familiarization with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the report (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The analysis was conducted manually by the first author, without the use of qualitative data analysis software, to facilitate closer engagement with the data. Coding followed a data-driven approach, allowing codes to emerge from participants' responses rather than being predetermined by a theoretical framework. For example, when participants described using ChatGPT to generate ideas, these responses were coded for that specific action. Similarly, statements regarding the verification of AI-generated content or concerns about over-reliance were coded accordingly. Codes related to the purposes of tool use, verification practices, ethical considerations, and perceived benefits and obstacles were grouped into themes aligned with each research question. Overlapping themes were combined, and themes lacking sufficient data support were either removed or incorporated into broader categories.

Coding was conducted by a single researcher, consistent with established practices in reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2023). Trustworthiness of the research was ensured through four criteria: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1986) Credibility was addressed through member checking; each participant received an interpretation form

via WhatsApp, which included the researcher's explanations organized into three sections aligned with the research questions. All participants confirmed the accuracy of these interpretations. Data source triangulation was carried out by comparing the responses of the five participants to identify both consistent patterns and divergent perspectives (Noble & Heale, 2019). Transferability was facilitated by providing a detailed description of the research context, while dependability and confirmability were maintained through consistent analytical procedures and thorough documentation of the coding process.

3. RESULTS

This section presents the interview results based on three research questions.

3.1 The Use of AI Tools in English Writing Practices

3.1.1 AI as a Writing Partner

All participants regarded AI as a partner rather than a replacement for their own writing skills. P1 described AI as "more like a writing partner than a writer." P5 perceived AI as a discussion partner, and P4 referred to it as a "co-author," emphasizing that the initial ideas consistently originate from her:

> In writing, the first idea always comes from me. I come with the outline and rough draft, then AI comes in to refine it so the coherence and cohesion are better. (P4)

3.1.2 Tools Functions and Stages of AI Use

Participants differentiated among the various AI tools they employ. For example, P3 stated, "I use ChatGPT for brainstorming, but for grammar I use the one that is specified to correct our grammar, which is Grammarly" (P3). However, P3 emphasized infrequent use of AI for idea generation, typically deriving ideas from references and subsequently utilizing AI to restructure content for greater cohesion and coherence. P5 reported using Grammarly for grammar checking and QuillBot for paraphrasing text and identifying advanced vocabulary. Table 1 illustrates the distribution of these functions.

Table 1. Functions of ChatGPT, Grammarly, and QuillBot as reported by participants

Tools	Types of functions	Reported uses	Example excerpt
ChatGPT	Generative	Brainstorming ideas	"I use ChatGPT for brainstorming" (P3)
Grammarly	Corrective	Checking grammar during the editing process	"AI is very helpful for me to check grammar. I use Grammarly." (P5)
QuillBot	Paraphrase	Paraphrasing sentences and seeking a more advanced vocabulary	"I also use QuillBot for paraphrasing sentences, finding more advanced vocabulary" (P5)

3.1.3 Article Sections Most Assisted by AI

Most participants reported that AI was most beneficial during writing the introduction and literature review sections. P1 utilized AI to develop the narrative for the background, research problem, research gap, objectives, and significance of the study. In contrast, P4 relied more extensively on AI for the literature review, as this required processing a significant number of references within a limited timeframe. However, P4 still personally selected the articles to be analyzed with AI assistance. In comparsion, AI was perceived as less valuable for the findings and discussion sections:

> It is not very helpful in findings and discussion because… when analyzing the data, I think it is risky to only rely on AI… we really need to add our own critical thinking (P3).

In contrast, P4 reported minimal use of AI in the introduction and discussion sections, aiming to maintain a more personal tone:

> The frequency of AI use is lowest in the introduction and discussion. Why introduction? Because for my preference, I want to make it more personal (P4).

3.2 Critical and Responsible Awareness in Using AI for Writing

Regarding the second research question, the participants' critical and responsible awareness in evident in three practices: verification, maintaining authorship, and transparency in the use of AI.

3.2.1 Verification Practices

All participants reported consistently verifying AI-generated content, primarily by comparing it with other sources. P1 cross-references claims made by the AI with personal records and sources, while P5 compared information provided by the AI against academic journals and other trusted sources. P3 emphasized the importance of consulting primary sources, having once encountered a fabricated reference from an AI:

> I usually need to look at the sources first, the main sources, whether it is actually accessible and credible… when I try to look at the documents, it is a non-existent thing (P3).

P4 explicitly instructed the AI at the outset not to fabricate information and continues to verify the results:

> I also prompt from the beginning: keep it real, it has to be legit, don't fabricate things. And I still cross-check at the end (P4).

3.2.2 Maintaining Authorship

The participants emphasized that core ideas should originate from individuals themselves. P1 drew a clear distinction between authorship and accountability:

> For me the line is pretty clear, authorship and accountability… If I am letting AI… produce original intellectual content that… I claim as my own, that's where it becomes a problem (P1).

P2 rephrased the AI output in her own words, whereas P3 utilized ideas and sources discovered independently. P4 defined authorship by how a writer processes AI-generated output:

> The idea comes from us, so we actually have authorship there… Whether the AI-generated results are customized, contextualized, and paraphrased by us, that determines plagiarism (P4).

3.2.3 Transparency in AI Use

Levels of transparency differ among participants. P1 consistently reported using AI in compliance with the study program's regulations:

> If my program requires the… disclosure, I disclose. Even when it doesn't, I still treat AI output as draft material that must be transformed and validated (P1).

In contrast, P5 utilized AI detection tools to verify the authenticity of her writing:

> To avoid plagiarism, since there are now AI checker tools, I use them to make sure my writing is authentic (P5).

3.3 Challenges and Opportunities in Developing AI Literacy

In relation to the third research question, participants reported three primary challenges: over-reliance on AI, the production of overly generic outputs, and the absence of clear institutional guidelines. Conversely, participants identified two main opportunities: increased efficiency and rapid feedback, as well as improved language skills.

3.3.1 Dependency on AI

Some participants recognized the potential risk of dependency. P2 explicitly acknowledged this risk, stating that AI facilitated her work. In contrast, P3 raised concerns regarding the possible loss of individual writing style due to AI usage. P4 also shared an experience of having developed such a dependency:

> There was a phase where everything made me feel unconfident because I kept using AI constantly. Yes, there was a phase of co-dependency. But eventually, we learn, gradually we figure out how to train AI and what should and shouldn't be done. (P4)

3.3.2 Generic AI Output

Participants frequently perceived AI-generated output as too general. P4 only obtained suitable results after providing clear context and direction. P1 observed that, although the output was technically accurate, it seemed generic:

> The output was technically fine… but it sounded too generic and kind of over-polished, like it could belong to any paper" (P1).

P3 similarly felt that AI-generated content often provides a global perspective, whereas her needs are specific to the Indonesian context:

> Sustainability is a very wide concept, and it will talk about what happened in global. But what I want to talk about is what is happening around me, which is in Indonesia (P3).

3.3.3 Lack of Clear Institutional Guidelines

Participants reported an absence of clear institutional guidelines regarding the use of AI in academic writing. P2 requested that the university explicitly defined the ethical use of AI, and P5 emphasized the necessity of establishing such guidelines at all institutional levels:

> There should be regulations about how to use AI, in which parts we are allowed to use AI, which parts are not allowed, how much we are allowed to use AI. Things like that should exist so that AI usage can have unified rules set by the campus community. From there, our accountability becomes clearer, because if there are no guidelines, then which rules do we follow? (P5).

3.3.4 Efficiency and Quick Feedback

The most frequently mentioned benefit is efficiency. According to P4, AI reduced the time required to create outlines, and P5 reported that manual grammar checking is no longer necessary. P1 also described a shift in their writing process:

> Before AI, my process was slower and more trial and error. I would write a paragraph, feel, um, maybe I feel unsure and rewrite it multiple times and sometimes get stuck just because I couldn't find the right wording. And with AI, the biggest difference is that I get faster feedback and more options (P1).

3.3.5 Language Improvement

Participants also reported improved language skills, particularly in academic vocabulary. As P5 explained:

> I don't think AI kills my creativity. It helps me understand more vocabulary when writing. Maybe AI can help me learn about many other types of sentences that can be used. (P5)

P1 felt that AI provided a wider range of word choices while also motivating them to maintain their individual voice:

> It gives me more angle, angles and wording options, but it also pushes, uh, me to, uh, protect my voice because AI tends to sound generic. So I feel more like an editor and decision maker (P1).

4. DISCUSSION

In general, this study identified three key findings. First, participants who explicitly named the tools they used were able to distinguish the specific functions of each tool. Second, they engaged in verification processes and sought to maintain ownership of their ideas, although the extent to which they disclosed their use of AI varied. Third, the challenges and opportunities they encountered were interconnected. Because these findings are based on self-reports, the following discussion interprets them as reflections of students' perceptions of their own practices, rather than as evidence of observable capabilities.

The findings related to the first research question demonstrated that students perceived AI as a strategically utilized partner. Metaphors such as "writing partner" or "co-author" reflected EFL learners' perception of ChatGPT as a companion rather than an adversary (Teng, 2024). This perspective aligns with the argument that AI cannot be credited as an author, since authorship requires accountability (Bozkurt, 2024). From a sociocultural perspective, the division of functions reported by participants can be interpreted as distinct forms of mediation. ChatGPT is primarily used for brainstorming during the planning stage, which is consistent with research indicating that master's students in Indonesia employed ChatGPT to generate ideas while critically evaluating its outputs (Werdiningsih, Marzuki, Indrawati, et al., 2024). Grammarly addressed aspects that related to language, supporting the idea that such tools can complement instructor feedback (Dizon & Gayed, 2024). QuillBot is used for paraphrasing, which, according to Mohammad et al. (2023), can improve EFL students' paraphrasing skills. In contrast to findings suggesting that students used AI throughout all stages of the writing process (Putri et al., 2025), some participants in this study limited their use of AI to sectipns requiring personal interpretation or voice. For example, P3 restricted AI use to the findings and discussion sections, while P4 limited it to the introduction and discussion sections. These patterns indicate that the decision to use AI is influenced not only by the tools' capabilities but also by the writer's identity. Students demonstrated agency in deciding when to utilize AI assistance and when to limit its use, a process that, according to sociocultural theory, is essential for internalization (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

The findings related to the second research question demonstrated that participants' verification practices, including cross-referencing sources and confriming the existence of citations, are consistent with the critical AI literacy model, which comprises awareness, positioning, strategy, and critical evaluation of AI (Wang & Wang, 2025). These findings compelement the research of Martha et al. (2025) and Febriyanti et al. (2026), whose studies primarily emphasized students' concerns. In contrast, participants in this study not only recognized potential risks but also reported concrete strategies for addressing them. However, the practice taken by P5, specifically the use of AI detection tools, should be approached with caution because such tools are not fully reliable (Weber-Wulff et al., 2023). Efforts to maintain ownership of ideas also emphasized the need to balance AI assistance with human judgment to ensure the authenticity of academic writing (Werdiningsih, Marzuki, & Rusdin, 2024). The perspective expressed by P1, which asserted that AI functions solely as a tool when the core ideas, evidence, and academic decisions are generated by the author, illustrates how participants set boundaries regarding authorship and accountability. Additionally, the diversity in disclosure practices highlights

the need for explicit guidelines on when to declare AI use, such as when AI is employed intentionally and to a significant extent (Resnik & Hosseini, 2025).

The findings related to the third research question demonstrated that the challenges and opportunities associated with AI use are closely interconnected. The dependency reported by participants is consistent with previous research suggesting that excessive reliance on AI may reduce critical and analythical thinking skills (Zhai et al., 2024). This phenomenon also exemplifies the "AI cognitive paradox," in which AI-generated information is accepted passively instead of being critically evaluated (Jose et al., 2025). However, P4 viewed this dependency as a temporary phase that can be addressed through reflective practices, rather than as a permanent condition. Therefore, educators may support students in navigating this transitional period, rather than solely cautioning them about potential risks. Additionally, AI-generated outputs are sometimes overly generic because large language models frequently reflect Western cultural values (Tao et al., 2024). Consequently, it is important for students to provide explicit local context, as demonstrated by P4. Meanwhile, concerns regarding unclear institutional guidelines also require attention, particularly since national-level guidance has been available since 2024 (Direktorat Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan, 2024). These findings also revelaed that, although students are generally aware of policies at the classroom level, institutional-level guidelines remain unclear (Jiang et al., 2025). This highlights a gap between national-level guidance and its implementation at the study program level.

In terms of opportunities, the provision of rapid feedback aligns with findings that ChatGPT can deliver personalized feedback without temporal or spatial constrainst (Mahapatra, 2024) and can improve students' self-confidence and writing quality in the Philippines and Indonesia (Herda et al., 2024). The improvements in language proficiency reported by participants also align with research indicating that feedback from ChatGPT helps refine the conciseness and grammar of EFL students' writing (Polakova & Ivenz, 2024). From a sociocultural perspective, this assistance may be conceptualized as scaffolding, provided that students maintain final decision-making authority, as exemplified by P1, who perceived herself as both editor and decision-maker. However, the increased self-confidence described by Herda et al. (2024) does not fully correspond with P4's experience; although AI reduced the time required to draft an outline, P4 reported decreased self-confidence due to over-reliance on the tool. Similarly, P2 associated the ease of use provided by AI with a potential risk of dependency. These experiences highlight the complex interplay between opportunities and challenges: the convenience that constitutes an advantage may foster dependency if not accompanied by critical reflection.

This study has several limitations. The participants consisted of only five students from a single academic program at one institution, which may result in a higher level of metalinguistic awareness compared to students from other disciplines. The data were derived solely from brief, self-reported interviews conducted at a single point in time, which precluded methodological triangulation, and the reported practices may not accurately reflect actual behaviors. Furthermore, the coding was conducted by a single researcher.

5. CONCLUSION

This study suggests that EFL postgraduate students in Indonesia use ChatGPT, Grammarly, and QuillBot according to their distinct functionalities, rather than as replacements for writing skills. They engaged in verification process and strove to maintain intellectual ownership of their ideas, even without explicit institutional guidelines. However, they also exhibited a dependency on AI-generated outputs, which can sometimes be overly generic. The findings highlighted the necessity of developing critical AI literacy for each tool, as each influences different aspects of the writing process. Practically, lecturers

can teach students how to verify AI-generated content and appropriately disclose tools such as ChatGPT. Additionally, lecturers may require students to justify corrections suggested by Grammarly, thereby ensuring these tools complement the lecturer's feedback. Training on paraphrasing techniques that maintain the integrity of original sources when using QuillBot is also recommended. At the institutional level, it is essential to translate national guidelines into clear, actionable program-level policies, including explicit requirements for disclosing tool use. However, these findings should be interpreted cautiously, as the study involved only five participants and relied on self-reported data. Future research should include a more diverse range of participants from multiple institutions and academic disciplines. Such studies might also integrate interviews with direct observations of the writing process or analyses of AI conversation histories to assess the alignment between reported and actual practices, as well as monitor the longitudinal development of students' AI literacy.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

The authors' contributions to this article are as follows: Author 1 designed the study and the interview protocol, collected and analyzed the data, and wrote the manuscript; Author 2 provided direction on the research topic. All authors approved the final content of the article and are responsible for all aspects of this research.

STATEMENT OF INTEREST

All authors declare that they have no financial or non-financial conflicts of interest relevant to this research.

DECLARATION OF AI AND AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES

During the preparation and revision of this manuscript, the authors used Google Translate (web version) to translate the Indonesian draft into English, and Grammarly Plus to check the grammar and refine the academic style of the sentences throughout the text. Additionally, the authors utilized Claude (Anthropic) to convert the manuscript into the journal template and to incorporate adjustments based on the journal's author guidelines. All suggestions and references were verified against their sources, and any suggested phrasing was rewritten in the authors' own words. AI was not used to collect or analyze data, nor to generate, alter, or fabricate data, analyses, images, or references. The authors have reviewed and edited all AI-generated output and take full responsibility for the content of this publication.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We express our gratitude to the expert in information and communication technology for validating the interview protocol for this study. We also appreciate the five participants who dedicated their time, shared their experiences, and reviewed our interpretations of their interviews.

REFERENCES

Barrot, J. S. (2023). Using ChatGPT for second language writing: Pitfalls and potentials. *Assessing Writing*, *57*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100745

Bozkurt, A. (2024). GenAI et al.: Cocreation, authorship, ownership, academic ethics and integrity in a time of generative AI. In *Open Praxis* (Vol. 16, Number 1, pp. 1–10). International Council for Open and Distance Education. https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.16.1.654

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2023). Toward good practice in thematic analysis: Avoiding common problems and be(com)ing a knowing researcher. In *International Journal of Transgender Health* (Vol. 24, Number 1, pp. 1–6). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1080/26895269.2022.2129597

Cui, Y., He, W., Du, X., Zeng, M., & Liu, D. (2025). The impact of AI writing assistants on academic writing performance: From the perspective of subjectivity. *International Journal of Distance Education Technologies*, *23*(1). https://doi.org/10.4018/IJDET.391326

Direktorat Pembelajaran dan Kemahasiswaan. (2024). *Panduan penggunaan generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) pada pembelajaran di perguruan tinggi*. https://lib.ugm.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/sites/44/2025/04/panduan_penggunaan_generative_ai_di_perguruan_tinggi.pdf

Dizon, G., & Gayed, J. M. (2024). A systematic review of Grammarly in L2 English writing contexts. In *Cogent Education* (Vol. 11, Number 1). Taylor and Francis Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2397882

Farinosi, M., & Melchior, C. (2025). To adopt or to ban? Student perceptions and use of generative AI in higher education. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05982-7

Febriyanti, R. H., Sundari, H., Baron, R., Arfani, S., & Rahman, A. (2026). Human–AI collaboration in academic writing: Indonesian EFL students' perspectives on AI-assisted writing. *Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching) Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa & Seni Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris IKIP*, *13*(1), 135–152. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v13i1.19807

Haetami, H. (2025). AI-driven educational transformation in Indonesia: From learning personalization to institutional management. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *17*(2), 1819–1832. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v17i2.7448

Hamdani, M. H., & Abid, N. (2025). Indonesian EFL students' writing challenges: A qualitative meta-analysis. *Getsempena English Education Journal (GEEJ)*, *12*(1), 14–36. https://ejournal.bbg.ac.id/geej

Hanh, N. Van, & Duyen, N. T. (2025). AI-assisted academic cheating: a conceptual model based on postgraduate student voices. *Frontiers in Computer Science*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomp.2025.1682190

Herda, R. K., Travero, A. S., Kafabih, A., Koeswoyo, A. W., Sari, R. N., Hakiki, F. I., & Wahidah, N. (2024). Opportunities of using ChatGPT in academic writing: Perceptions of the Philippines and Indonesian students. *Jurnal Wahana Pendidikan*, *11*(2), 205–214. https://doi.org/10.25157/jwp.v%vi%i.14922

Jiang, Y., Xie, L., & Cao, X. (2025). Exploring the effectiveness of institutional policies and regulations for generative AI usage in higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *79*(4). https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.70054

Jose, B., Cherian, J., Molly Verghis, A., Mary Varghise, S., Joseph, S., & S, M. (2025). The cognitive paradox of AI in education: between enhancement and erosion. *Frontiers in Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1550621

Koltovskaia, S. (2020). Student engagement with automated written corrective feedback (AWCF) provided by Grammarly: A multiple case study. *Assessing Writing*, *44*, 100450. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100450

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2015). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford University Press.

Levine, S., Beck, S. W., Mah, C., Phalen, L., & PIttman, J. (2025). How do students use ChatGPT as a writing support? *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, *68*(5), 445–457. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.1373

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1986). But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic evaluation. *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, *1986*(30), 73–84. https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.1427

Lo, C. K., Yu, P. L. H., Xu, S., Ng, D. T. K., & Jong, M. S. yung. (2024). Exploring the application of ChatGPT in ESL/EFL education and related research issues: a systematic review of empirical studies. In *Smart Learning Environments* (Vol. 11, Number 1). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00342-5

Long, D., & Magerko, B. (2020, April 21). What is AI literacy? Competencies and design considerations. *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - Proceedings*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376727

Luo, J. (2024). A critical review of GenAI policies in higher education assessment: a call to reconsider the "originality" of students' work. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *49*(5), 651–664. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2309963

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

Martha, A. S. D., Widowati, S., & Rahayu, D. P. (2025). Assessing student readiness and perceptions of ChatGPT in learning: A case study in Indonesian higher education. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, *24*, 3–26. https://doi.org/10.28945/5599

Mohammad, T., Alzubi, A. A. F., Nazim, M., & Khan, S. I. (2023). EFL paraphrasing skills with QuillBot: Unveiling students' enthusiasm and insights. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, *7*(5), 359–373. https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.202324645

Morse, J. M. (2000). Determining sample size. *Qualitative Health Research*, *10*(1), 3–5. https://doi.org/10.1177/104973200129118183

Ng, D. T. K., Leung, J. K. L., Chu, S. K. W., & Qiao, M. S. (2021). Conceptualizing AI literacy: An exploratory review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *2*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100041

Noble, H., & Heale, R. (2019). Triangulation in research, with examples. *Evidence-Based Nursing*, *22*(3), 67–68. https://doi.org/10.1136/ebnurs-2019-103145

Polakova, P., & Ivenz, P. (2024). The impact of ChatGPT feedback on the development of EFL students' writing skills. *Cogent Education*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2410101

Putri, B. G., Suryati, N., Ivone, F. M., & Hayati, N. (2025). The role of AI in academic writing: Unveiling strategies among EFL students. *A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, *12*(2), 774–792. https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v12i2

Rafida, T., Suwandi, S., & Ananda, R. (2024). EFL students' perception in Indonesia and Taiwan on using artificial intelligence to enhance writing skills. *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun*, *12*(3), 987–1016. https://doi.org/10.26811/peuradeun.v12i3.1520

Resnik, D. B., & Hosseini, M. (2025). Disclosing artificial intelligence use in scientific research and publication: When should disclosure be mandatory, optional, or unnecessary? *Accountability in Research*. https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2025.2481949

Roe, J., & Perkins, M. (2022). What are Automated Paraphrasing Tools and how do we address them? A review of a growing threat to academic integrity. In *International Journal for Educational Integrity* (Vol. 18, Number 1). BioMed Central Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-022-00109-w

Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing & Health*, *23*(4), 334–340. https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X(200008)23:4<334::AID-NUR9>3.0.CO;2-G

Su, Y., Lin, Y., & Lai, C. (2023). Collaborating with ChatGPT in argumentative writing classrooms. *Assessing Writing*, *57*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100752

Tao, Y., Viberg, O., Baker, R. S., & Kizilcec, R. F. (2024). Cultural bias and cultural alignment of large language models. *PNAS Nexus*, *3*(9). https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae346

Teng, M. F. (2024). "ChatGPT is the companion, not enemies": EFL learners' perceptions and experiences in using ChatGPT for feedback in writing. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100270

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Harvard University Press. https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

Wang, C. (2025). 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

Wang, C., & Wang, Z. (2025). Investigating L2 writers' critical AI literacy in AI-assisted writing: An APSE model. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *67*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101187

Weber-Wulff, D., Anohina-Naumeca, A., Bjelobaba, S., Foltýnek, T., Guerrero-Dib, J., Popoola, O., Šigut, P., & Waddington, L. (2023). Testing of detection tools for AI-generated text. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *19*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00146-z

Werdiningsih, I., Marzuki, Indrawati, I., Rusdin, D., Ivone, F. M., Basthomi, Y., & Zulfahreza. (2024). Revolutionizing EFL writing: unveiling the strategic use of ChatGPT by Indonesian master's students. *Cogent Education*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2399431

Werdiningsih, I., Marzuki, & Rusdin, D. (2024). Balancing AI and authenticity: EFL students' experiences with ChatGPT in academic writing. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2024.2392388

Zhai, C., Wibowo, S., & Li, L. D. (2024). The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: a systematic review. *Smart Learning Environments*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7