

ANALYZING THE LECTURERS' PERCEPTION OF GENERATIVE AI IN DEVELOPING ENGLISH WRITING

THESIS

Submitted by

SITI MUNAWARAH

Reg. No: 190203043

Student of the Faculty of Education and Teacher Training

Department of English Language Education



FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING

AR-RANIRY STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY

BANDA ACEH

2026 M/ 1448 H

STATEMENT OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY OF SCIENTIFIC THESIS

I, the undersigned below:

Name : Siti Munawarah
Student ID : 190203043
Study Program : English Language Education
Faculty : Tarbiyah and Teacher Training
Thesis Title : Analyzing The Lecturers' perception of generative AI in
developing English Writing

Hereby declare that in writing this thesis, I:

1. Did not use the ideas of others without being able to develop and be accountable for them;
2. Did not plagiarize the work of others;
3. Did not use others' works without proper citation or permission;
4. Did not manipulate or falsify data;
5. Completed this work independently and am fully responsible for it.

If at any point in the future, a parties raises a legitimate concern and proves that I have violated this declaration, I am willing to accept the sanctions in accordance with prevailing regulations of the Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training, Ar-Raniry State Islamic University Banda Aceh.

The statement is made truthfully and without coercion from any party.

Banda Aceh, 29th May 2026



Siti Munawarah

ACKNOWLEDGMENT



Alhamdulillah, first I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Allah Subhanahu wa Ta'ala for providing me with the blessings, guidance, and strength to complete this thesis. Peace and blessing be upon Prophet Muhammad, Shallallahu Alaihi wa Sallam, who has brought guidance and enlightenment to mankind and whose teachings continue to inspire my life and learning.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Mr. Mulia, M. Ed., for her valuable guidance, patience, and constructive suggestions throughout the completion of this thesis. Her support, encouragement, and insightful feedback have played an important role in helping me accomplish this research. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all lecturers and teaching staff of the English Department at UIN Ar-Raniry for their invaluable assistance and guidance during my English Education program.

My special appreciation and thanks go to my beloved parents, M. Isa Ansari and Nurhayati, for their priceless support and unwavering belief in me. Additionally, I extend my gratitude to my elder brother, Jun Ichsan and Hidayat, for being a role model and a supportive presence since day one.

Special appreciation is addressed to my friends, Nia, Fina, Yeni, Fathya, who have always support, motivation and companionship throughout the process of completing this thesis. Finally, sincere gratitude is extended to all individuals who contributed directly or indirectly to the completion of this thesis. Hopefully, this thesis will provide benefits and insight for readers and future researchers, particularly in the field of English language education.

Lastly, I express thanks to myself for all the hard work and dedication in completing this study, and for maintaining belief in myself despite the challenges faced. Additionally, I extend thanks to all those who have contributed to the successful completion of this undergraduate thesis, although I cannot mention each

one individually at this time. Nevertheless, your presence and support remain deeply cherished in my heart. Finally, I acknowledge that this thesis may not be perfect due to my limitations; therefore, any constructive suggestions and criticisms are most welcome.

Banda Aceh, 29th May 2026
The writer

Siti Munawarah



ANALYZING THE LECTURERS' PERCEPTION OF GENERATIVE AI IN DEVELOPING ENGLISH WRITING

THESIS

Has been Approved and Submitted to the Thesis Munaqasyah Defense as One of the Requirements to Obtain a Bachelor's Degree in the field of English English Language Education.

By

Siti Munawarah
Student ID Number: 190203043

Student of the English Language Education Study Program
Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training Ar- Raniry State Islamic University
Banda Aceh

Approved by:

Supervisor



Mulia, M. Ed
NIP. 197810132014111001

Head of Department English
Language Education



Syarifah Dahliana, M.Ed., Ph.D
NIP. 197504162000032001

It has been defended in *Sidang Munaqasyah*
in front of the board of the Examination for the working paper
and has been accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Bachelor Degree of Education in English Language Teaching

On:

Friday,

May, 29th 2026 M

12 Dzulhijjah 1447 H

In Darussalam, Banda Aceh

Board of Examiner,

Chairperson

Secretary

Mulia, M. Ed

Ayuma Nelta, S.Pd.I, M.Pd.

Examiner I

Examiner II

Dr. Chamisah, S.Ag., M.Ed.

Fithriyah, S.Ag., M. Pd

Certified by:

The Dean of *Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan*
Universitas Islam Negeri Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh

Prof. Saiful Munik, S.Ag., M.A., M.Ed., Ph.D

NIP. 197301021997031003

ABSTRACT

Name : Siti Munawarah
NIM : 190203043
Faculty : Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Keguruan
Major : Department of English Language Education
Thesis's Title : Analyzing The lecturer's perception of generative AI in developing English Writing
Main Supervisor : Mulia, M. Ed
Keyword : Generative Artificial Intelligence; English Writing Skills; Lecturers' Perceptions phenomenology, higher education

This qualitative phenomenological study examines how English lecturers at UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh perceive the role of Generative Artificial Intelligence tools, such as ChatGPT and Gemini, in developing students' writing skills, and identifies the challenges they face integrating these tools into instruction and assessment, a topic underexplored from the vantage point of lecturers within Indonesian Islamic higher education. Guided by Moustakas's (1994) transcendental phenomenological design and interpreted through the Technology Acceptance Model, the TPACK framework, and Vygotskian scaffolding theory, the study drew on semi-structured interviews with three purposively selected lecturers with direct experience teaching writing and employing Generative AI, analyzed via Moustakas's six-step procedure. Findings reveal that lecturers regard Generative AI as a conditionally beneficial, supplementary tool rather than a substitute for genuine writing effort, crediting it with fostering gains in grammatical accuracy, lexical range, textual organization, idea generation, and learner confidence. Simultaneously, they grapple with an array of pedagogical challenges, including preserving students' independent writing capacity, mitigating over-reliance, safeguarding academic integrity, and reorienting assessment toward process rather than product, compounded by technical constraints such as inequitable access to devices and connectivity and the inconsistent reliability of AI-generated output. The study concludes that lecturers function as reflective practitioners who deliberately calibrate the boundaries of AI integration in line with their pedagogical convictions, treating emergent challenges as surmountable through clearer institutional guidelines and deliberate task design. Although context-bound and not statistically generalizable, these findings extend TAM, TPACK, and scaffolding theory into an underrepresented setting, with implications for lecturers, curriculum developers, and policymakers.

TABLE OF CONTENT

STATEMENT OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY OF SCIENTIFIC THESIS ...	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	iii
ABSTRACT	vii
LIST OF APPENDICES	x
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Background of the Study	1
B. Research Questions	3
C. Aims of the Study	4
D. Significance of the Study	4
E. Terminology	6
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW	7
A. Generative Artificial Intelligence (Generative AI)	7
1. Definition of Artificial Intelligence (Generative AI)	7
2. Generative AI in Educational Contexts.....	9
3. Lecturers' Perceptions of Generative AI in Language Education	10
B. English Writing Skills	12
1. The Importance of English Writing	12
2. Pedagogical Approaches to Teaching English Writing	13
3. The Role of Generative AI in Developing English Writing Skills	14
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	16
A. Research Design.....	16
B. Research Site and Participants	17
C. Methods of Data Collection	18
D. Methods of Analysis	21
E. Trustworthiness of the Data	22
F. Ethical Considerations	23
CHAPTER IV FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	24
A. Findings.....	24
B. Discussion	34
CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION.....	40
REFERENCES.....	45

APPENDIXES	49
------------------	----



LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A. Interview Data Lecture A

Appendix B. Interview Data Lecture B

Appendix C. Interview Data Lecture C

Appendix D. Autobiography



CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) has fundamentally transformed numerous sectors of human activity, and education is no exception. In particular, the emergence of Generative Artificial Intelligence (Generative AI) tools such as ChatGPT, Google Gemini, Grammarly AI, and Quillbot has introduced unprecedented possibilities and challenges for language education at the tertiary level. These tools can produce human-like text, provide instant feedback, generate writing prompts, and assist learners in structuring and revising their written work. As a result, they have increasingly become part of the academic writing ecosystem in universities around the world, including in Indonesia.

English writing is widely regarded as one of the most complex and cognitively demanding skills in second language acquisition. It requires learners to integrate linguistic competence, critical thinking, rhetorical awareness, and metacognitive strategies simultaneously (Graham & Harris, 2023). For Indonesian university students studying English, writing in a second language carries additional cognitive burdens, including navigating cross-linguistic interference, limited vocabulary range, and unfamiliarity with Anglo-American academic conventions. In this context, Generative AI tools have emerged as potentially powerful scaffolding resources that can ease these challenges by offering real-time linguistic support, structural guidance, and personalized feedback.

The integration of Generative AI into English writing instruction is not without controversy. While proponents argue that these tools democratize access to high-quality writing support and promote learner autonomy (Kasneci et al., 2023), critics raise significant concerns about academic integrity, over-reliance on AI-generated content, the erosion of authentic writing development, and the ethical dimensions of AI use in assessment contexts (Lim et al., 2023). These debates have placed university lecturers at the center of a profound pedagogical dilemma: how to harness the potential benefits of Generative AI while mitigating its risks in the teaching and assessment of English writing.

In the Indonesian higher education context, the discourse on Generative AI in English language teaching (ELT) is still at a nascent level. At the same time, while the Indonesian Ministry of Training and Culture has begun to acknowledge the transformative potential of AI in schooling, there may currently be no unified countrywide policy governing the use of Generative AI in college classrooms. This regulatory ambiguity places individual establishments and academics in a position where they must navigate complex decisions independently, often without adequate expert guidance or institutional guidance (Wiyaka et al., 2023).

UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh, as one of the leading Islamic state universities in Aceh, Indonesia, offers a Bachelor's degree program in English Language Education (Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris) that places significant emphasis on developing students' academic writing proficiency. English lecturers at this institution face the dual challenge of maintaining academic quality and integrity while adapting to a technological landscape in which students increasingly use

Generative AI tools, whether sanctioned or not. Understanding how those lecturers understand Generative AI's role, its benefits, and its challenges is therefore a matter of both scholarly and practical urgency. Despite the growing body of international literature on Generative AI in education, there remains a significant gap in research focusing on the perceptions of English lecturers in Indonesian Islamic university contexts, particularly regarding the specific domain of English writing instruction. Most existing studies have been conducted in Western or East Asian educational settings and have predominantly focused on student perspectives rather than those of educators (Baidoo-Anu & Ansah, 2023; Farrokhnia et al., 2023). Furthermore, few studies have examined the intersection of pedagogical beliefs, assessment practices, and institutional constraints that shape lecturers' responses to Generative AI in ELT contexts in Indonesia.

This research gap motivates the present study, which seeks to investigate the perceptions of English lecturers at UIN Ar-Raniry regarding the role of Generative AI in developing students' English writing skills, as well as the pedagogical and technical challenges they encounter when integrating or navigating AI use in their instructional and assessment practices. By foregrounding lecturer perspectives, this study aims to contribute context-specific insights that can inform policy development, curriculum design, and professional development programs in Indonesian higher education.

B. Research Questions

This study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How do university English lecturers perceive the role and integration of Generative AI tools in developing students' English language writing skills?
2. What pedagogical and technical challenges do English lecturers experience when navigating the use of Generative AI in their instructional and assessment practices?

C. Aims of the Study

In accordance with the research questions stated above, this study aims to:

- Explore and analyze the perceptions of English lecturers at UIN Ar-Raniry regarding the role and integration of Generative AI tools in supporting the development of students' English writing skills.
- Identify and describe the pedagogical and technical challenges experienced by English lecturers when integrating or navigating Generative AI within their instructional and writing assessment practices.

D. Significance of the Study

This study holds significant value from both theoretical and practical standpoints. Theoretically, it contributes to the growing body of literature on AI-mediated language learning, particularly within the domain of English writing instruction in non-Western educational contexts. By examining lecturer perceptions in an Indonesian Islamic university setting, this study extends existing theoretical frameworks such as the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and the TPACK

(Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge) framework to a context that has been underrepresented in the scholarly literature.

Practically, the findings of this study have direct implications for several key stakeholders. For English lecturers and language educators, the study provides a reflective mirror that foregrounds professional challenges and pedagogical dilemmas, potentially fostering greater awareness and more informed decision-making regarding AI integration. For curriculum developers and program coordinators, the study provides evidence-based insights that can inform the revision of English writing courses and writing assessment policies to address the realities of AI-assisted writing environments.

For university administrators and policymakers at UIN Ar-Raniry and similar institutions, the study's findings can serve as a foundation for the development of institutional AI use policies, faculty professional development programs, and academic integrity frameworks that are responsive to the current technological landscape. At the national level, the study contributes to the broader conversation on AI in Indonesian higher education, providing context-specific data that can supplement macro-level policy deliberations.

Finally, for the field of English Language Teaching (ELT) and Applied Linguistics, this study adds a qualitative, educator-centered perspective to a discourse that has been dominated by quantitative studies and student-focused inquiries. In doing so, it enriches our understanding of how Generative AI is perceived, contested, and negotiated within authentic university teaching contexts.

E. Terminology

1. Generative Artificial Intelligence (Generative AI)

Generative Artificial Intelligence (Generative AI), according to Kasneci (2023), refers to a category of AI systems capable of producing new content, including text, images, audio, and code, in response to user prompts. In the context of this study, Generative AI specifically refers to large language model (LLM)-based tools such as ChatGPT (OpenAI), Google Gemini, Grammarly AI, and Quillbot, which can generate, edit, and provide feedback on written texts.

2. English Writing Skills

Graham & Harris (2023) state that English writing skills refer to the ability to produce coherent, organized, and linguistically accurate written texts in English across various genres, including academic essays, argumentative writing, descriptive paragraphs, and narrative compositions. Writing skills encompass sub-skills such as content development, text organization, vocabulary use, grammatical accuracy, and mechanical conventions.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Generative Artificial Intelligence (Generative AI)

1. Definition of Artificial Intelligence (Generative AI)

GenAI tools' ability to "learn" means they can be deployed in varied situations to engage in a multitude of tasks without being pre-programmed (Jiang et al., 2022). GenAI tools can generate text, generate ideas, analyze and evaluate data, summarise text, translate, engage in conversations, analyze sentiment, classify text, paraphrase, generate codes, generate images, and recognize named entities (Lim et al., 2023). However, the generative capability also means the content GenAI tools generate cannot be pre-defined, leading to issues with bias and accuracy (Rudolph et al., 2023). The effects of GenAI tools on human behaviours and actions are becoming apparent. Examples of their use in various fields (e.g. law, medicine, education) have been reported widely. In language education, their potential benefits for teaching and learning are beginning to be postulated. Scholars have suggested that teachers can use GenAI tools to create lesson plans, tailor their materials to their students' needs and proficiency levels, provide individualised personal feedback and, suggest bespoke learning paths (Kohnke et al., 2023; Chiu, 2023; Kuhail et al., 2023). In addition, GenAI tools could potentially play the roles of language tutors, students, partners, and experts (Hwang & Chen, 2023) - increasing opportunities for self-directed learning (Meniado, 2023).

The release of ChatGPT by OpenAI in November 2022 marked a watershed moment in the public visibility of Generative AI, catalyzing widespread interest and debate across academic, professional, and policy domains. Since then, the landscape has evolved rapidly, with successive generations of LLMs demonstrating ever-greater capacity for nuanced language generation, reasoning, and multimodal interaction. Scholars such as Kasneci et al. (2023) and Farrokhnia et al. (2023) have documented the transformative implications of these developments for education, arguing that Generative AI constitutes a disruptive technology that necessitates fundamental rethinking of pedagogical approaches, curriculum design, and assessment practices.

In the context of language education, Generative AI tools are particularly relevant because they operate within the medium of language itself. Tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly AI, and Quillbot are designed to interact with users through natural language prompts, generating responses, suggestions, corrections, and elaborations that are linguistically coherent and contextually appropriate. This characteristic makes them uniquely positioned to serve as writing assistants, grammar checkers, brainstorming partners, and feedback providers for language learners' functions that were previously the exclusive domain of human teachers and peers.

2. Generative AI in Educational Contexts

The educational applications of Generative AI have been the subject of rapidly expanding scholarly inquiry since 2023. Researchers have explored the potential of these tools across a wide range of educational levels and disciplinary

domains, including medical education, STEM fields, social sciences, and language education. A recurring theme in this literature is the dual nature of Generative AI as both an opportunity and a risk for educational practice.

Baidoo-Anu and Ansah (2023) conducted one of the early systematic examinations of ChatGPT's implications for higher education, identifying several potential benefits, including personalized learning, enhanced accessibility for students with diverse learning needs, and the automation of routine educational tasks. However, they also highlighted significant concerns about academic integrity, the potential displacement of critical thinking, and the epistemological risks of AI-generated misinformation. Their work established a foundational framework for understanding Generative AI in education that has been widely cited in subsequent scholarship.

Farrokhnia et al. (2023) extended this inquiry through a SWOT analysis of ChatGPT in educational settings, systematically mapping the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats associated with its integration into university pedagogy. Their analysis underscored the importance of developing AI literacy among both students and educators and called for the establishment of clear institutional policies governing AI use. Particularly relevant to the present study is their observation that teacher attitudes and perceptions constitute a critical mediating variable in determining whether AI integration is ultimately beneficial or harmful to learning outcomes.

In the Indonesian context, emerging research has begun to document the penetration of Generative AI tools among university students and the varied responses of educators. Wiyaka et al. (2023) conducted a preliminary survey-based study of English teachers in Indonesian universities, finding that while a majority were aware of Generative AI tools, fewer than a third had received any formal professional development on their educational implications. This finding points to a significant readiness gap that this study seeks to further illuminate through in-depth qualitative inquiry.

3. Lecturers' Perceptions of Generative AI in Language Education

Lecturer perceptions of Generative AI are a rapidly emerging area of scholarly interest, with studies converging on a picture of complex, often ambivalent orientations shaped by individual experience, disciplinary identity, and institutional context. Lim et al. (2023) examined the attitudes of university educators in Singapore toward ChatGPT, finding a spectrum of responses ranging from cautious optimism to outright resistance. Notably, many participants expressed difficulty in reconciling their belief in AI's pedagogical potential with their professional obligations to uphold academic integrity standards.

Moorhouse et al. (2023) explored language teacher cognition in the age of Generative AI, emphasizing that teachers' existing beliefs about language learning and pedagogy significantly shaped their interpretation of what AI tools could and should do in writing classrooms. Teachers who held strong beliefs in process-oriented writing pedagogy were more likely to perceive Generative AI as a threat to authentic writing development, while those with more product-oriented

orientations were more receptive to AI as a feedback tool. This study highlights the importance of examining how existing pedagogical frameworks interact with emerging AI technologies.

Mah (2023) investigated the perceptions of EFL (English as a Foreign Language) lecturers in Malaysian universities regarding AI writing tools, revealing that technical challenges including unreliable internet access, lack of institutional support, and unfamiliarity with AI platforms constituted significant barriers to informed AI integration. Her findings are particularly relevant to the Indonesian context, where similar infrastructural and professional development gaps are likely to exist.

More recently, Yan et al. (2024) conducted a qualitative study of Chinese university English teachers' perceptions of Generative AI in writing assessment, identifying four key themes: perceived utility, assessment validity concerns, academic integrity anxiety, and uncertainty about institutional direction. This multidimensional picture of lecturer perception resonates with the theoretical premise of the present study and informs the development of its interview framework.

B. English Writing Skills

1. The Importance of English Writing

Writing is widely recognized as one of the four foundational macro skills in second language acquisition alongside reading, listening, and speaking and is frequently cited as the most cognitively demanding and pedagogically complex of

these skills (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). At the tertiary level, academic writing in English occupies a position of particular importance, serving simultaneously as a medium for the expression of disciplinary knowledge, a criterion for academic assessment, and a credential for professional and academic advancement. For students in English Language Education programs, writing competence is not merely an instrumental goal but also a subject of professional preparation: they are learning to write not only for their own academic purposes but also to develop the capacity to teach writing effectively in future careers as English language educators.

The process of developing English writing skills involves the mastery of multiple interdependent sub-components, including content generation and organization, rhetorical awareness and genre knowledge, grammatical accuracy, lexical range and precision, and mechanical conventions such as spelling, punctuation, and citation (Hyland, 2019). Research in second language writing has consistently demonstrated that L2 writers face distinctive challenges in all of these domains, particularly with respect to the transfer of first-language writing conventions, the management of cognitive load, and the development of writer identity in an additional language.

2. Pedagogical Approaches to Teaching English Writing

The pedagogy of English writing instruction has undergone significant evolution over the past five decades, shifting from product-oriented approaches, which emphasized the analysis and imitation of model texts, to process-oriented approaches that foregrounded the recursive, cognitive dimensions of composing, including planning, drafting, revising, and editing. More recently, sociocultural and

genre-based approaches have emphasized the importance of contextual, collaborative, and socially situated dimensions of writing development (Hyland, 2019).

In contemporary Indonesian ELT practice, writing pedagogy tends to reflect an eclectic mix of these orientations, with many lecturers drawing on elements of process writing (e.g., multiple drafting, peer feedback, self-revision) and product writing (e.g., genre analysis, model text imitation) within the same instructional sequence. The emergence of Generative AI introduces a new and potentially disruptive variable into this pedagogical landscape, one that intersects with and in some cases challenges each of these established approaches.

3. The Role of Generative AI in Developing English Writing Skills

A growing body of research has begun to examine the specific ways in which Generative AI tools can support or hinder the development of English writing skills. Proponents argue that AI writing tools can serve as scaffolding resources that help learners move from current to potential levels of writing competence, analogous to the "more knowledgeable other" in Vygotsky's sociocultural theory by providing immediate, accessible, and personalized linguistic support (Graham & Harris, 2023).

Specific benefits documented in the empirical literature include AI's capacity to provide grammatical error correction and feedback, generate vocabulary suggestions and paraphrase options, offer structural templates and discourse markers for academic writing, and assist with brainstorming and idea generation.

Studies such as that of Lo (2023), who examined the use of ChatGPT in EFL writing classes in Taiwan, found that students who received AI-assisted feedback demonstrated improvements in grammatical accuracy and cohesion, although improvements in content depth and argumentative quality were less consistent.

However, critics have raised substantive concerns about the implications of AI writing assistance for deep learning and authentic skill development. Particularly prominent in the literature is the concern that students who over-rely on AI-generated text may fail to develop the metacognitive strategies, linguistic resources, and writerly disposition that constitute genuinely internalized writing competence (Lim et al., 2023). This concern is especially salient in the context of English Language Education programs, where developing students' autonomous writing capacity is a core curricular goal.

Assessment of English writing in the age of Generative AI presents additional challenges. Traditional assessment methods including timed in-class writing tasks, take-home essays, and portfolio-based assessment have all been rendered partially vulnerable to AI-assisted completion, undermining their validity as measures of individual student competence. As Yan et al. (2024) observe, this assessment validity crisis is one of the most pressing practical challenges facing writing instructors in higher education today, and it demands innovative pedagogical and policy responses.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

This study employs a qualitative approach with a phenomenological research design. Qualitative research is appropriate for this study because it focuses on understanding meaning, experience, and perception rather than measuring variables numerically (Busetto, Wick, & Gumbinger, 2020). Since this study seeks to explore how English lecturers at UIN Ar-Raniry perceive and make sense of Generative AI in developing students' English writing skills, a qualitative design allows the researcher to capture the richness, nuance, and complexity of these perceptions in a way that quantitative methods cannot.

More specifically, this study adopts a transcendental phenomenological design, following the framework developed by Moustakas (1994) and further elaborated by Creswell and Poth (2018). Phenomenology is concerned with describing the essence of a lived experience as it is understood by the individuals who have directly experienced it (Alhazmi & Kaufmann, 2022). In this study, the shared phenomenon under investigation is the lecturers' engagement with and perception of Generative AI tools, such as ChatGPT and Google Gemini, within the context of teaching and assessing English writing. A phenomenological design is considered the most suitable approach because it allows the researcher to move beyond surface-level description and to interpret the underlying meaning that

lecturers attach to their experiences with this emerging technology (Errasti-Ibarrondo, Jordán, Díez-Del-Corral, & Arantzamendi, 2020).

Consistent with this design, the researcher does not attempt to test a hypothesis or establish causal relationships between variables. Instead, the aim is to describe, interpret, and synthesize the perceptions of three English lecturers so that a coherent picture of the phenomenon emerges, one that is grounded in the participants' own words and framed by the theoretical lenses of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and the TPACK framework introduced in Chapter II.

B. Research Site and Participants

1. Research Site

This research was conducted at the Department of English Language Education, Faculty of Education and Teacher Training, Ar-Raniry State Islamic University (UIN Ar-Raniry) Banda Aceh. This site was selected because it offers an undergraduate program in English Language Education in which academic writing occupies a central place in the curriculum, and because, as discussed in Chapter I, lecturers in this department are already navigating student use of Generative AI without clear institutional guidance.

2. Research Participants

The participants of this study were three English lecturers at UIN Ar-Raniry, referred to throughout this study by the pseudonyms Lecturer A, Lecturer B, and Lecturer C to protect their identity and privacy. The participants were selected using purposive sampling, a technique in which participants are deliberately chosen because they possess characteristics or experiences that are directly relevant to the

research questions (Campbell et al., 2020). Purposive sampling is considered appropriate for phenomenological research because the goal is not statistical generalization but an in-depth understanding of a phenomenon as experienced by information-rich participants (Andrade, 2021).

The participants were selected based on the following criteria: (1) they are active lecturers in the Department of English Language Education who have taught at least one English writing course, such as Paragraph Writing, Essay Writing, or Academic Writing, within the past two academic years; (2) they have direct personal experience using or encountering Generative AI tools, such as ChatGPT or Google Gemini, either in their own teaching preparation or in evaluating students' written work; and (3) they were willing to participate voluntarily and to provide informed consent. A sample of three participants is considered acceptable for a phenomenological study of this scope, since such designs prioritize depth of insight over breadth, and data saturation, meaning that no new significant information emerges from additional interviews, can often be achieved with a small, carefully selected group of participants (Alhazmi & Kaufmann, 2022).

C. Methods of Data Collection

1. Semi-Structured Interview

The primary data collection technique used in this study was the semi-structured interview. A semi-structured interview combines the flexibility of an open, conversational format with the structure of a predetermined set of guiding questions, thereby allowing the researcher to explore participants' perceptions in depth while keeping the discussion focused on the research questions (Ruslin,

Mashuri, Rasak, Alhabsyi, & Syam, 2022). This technique was selected because it is widely regarded as one of the most suitable instruments for phenomenological studies that aim to capture participants' subjective experiences, beliefs, and interpretations in their own words (Adeoye-Olatunde & Olenik, 2021). Unlike a fully structured interview, a semi-structured format allows the researcher to ask follow-up or probing questions whenever a participant raises an unanticipated but relevant point, which is particularly valuable when investigating an emerging and evolving phenomenon such as Generative AI in writing instruction.

2. Development of the Interview Guide

The interview guide was developed based on the two research questions presented in Chapter I and was informed by the theoretical frameworks discussed in Chapter II, namely the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989) and the TPACK framework (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). The guide consisted of open-ended questions organized into two main sections corresponding to each research question: the first section addressed lecturers' perceptions of the role of Generative AI in developing students' English writing skills, while the second addressed the pedagogical and technical challenges they experience when navigating its use. Sample guiding questions included the following:

1. How would you describe your overall perception of AI's role in supporting students' English writing development?
2. Can you walk me through how, if at all, you've integrated AI into your writing instruction or course design?

3. What specific benefits or improvements in student writing have you noticed (or expect to notice) when AI is used?
- 4 What pedagogical challenges, such as adapting lesson plans, maintaining academic integrity, or rethinking assessment criteria have you faced when using AI?
5. What technical difficulties (e.g., accessibility, reliability, output quality, integration with your LMS) have you encountered when using AI for teaching or assessment?

Before being used in actual data collection, the interview guide was reviewed by the thesis supervisor to ensure that the questions were clear, relevant to the research questions, and appropriate for the participants' professional context

3. Interview Procedures

Each interview was conducted individually with the three participating lecturers at a time and place agreed upon by both the researcher and the participant, either face-to-face on campus or through a video-conferencing platform when an in-person meeting was not feasible. Prior to each interview, participants were given an informed consent form explaining the purpose of the study, their right to withdraw at any time, and the measures taken to protect their confidentiality. Each interview lasted approximately 30 to 45 minutes and was conducted in a combination of Indonesian and English, depending on the participant's preference, so that participants could express their perceptions accurately and comfortably. With the participants' permission, all interviews were audio-recorded and

subsequently transcribed verbatim to preserve the authenticity of their responses for analysis.

D. Methods of Analysis

The data collected from the semi-structured interviews were analyzed using Moustakas's (1994) transcendental phenomenological analysis method, which is widely used in qualitative studies that aim to describe the essence of a shared experience. This method involves several interrelated steps. First, the researcher engaged in *epoche*, or bracketing, a process of setting aside personal assumptions and prior knowledge about Generative AI to approach the data with openness (Alhazmi & Kaufmann, 2022). Second, the transcripts were examined through horizontalization, in which every statement relevant to the participants' experience was treated as having equal value and listed without judgment. Third, these statements were reduced to invariant constituents, meaning that overlapping, repetitive, or irrelevant statements were removed, leaving only the meaning units that were essential to the phenomenon.

Fourth, the remaining meaning units were clustered into themes based on shared patterns of meaning across the three participants. To strengthen the rigor and transparency of this thematic clustering process, the researcher additionally followed the step-by-step codebook development procedure outlined by Naeem, Ozuem, Howell, and Ranfagni (2023), which involves generating initial codes, grouping related codes into candidate categories, and refining these categories into coherent themes through repeated comparison with the raw data. Fifth, based on

these themes, the researcher developed a textural description of what the participants experienced and a structural description of how they experienced it for each participant. Finally, these individual descriptions were synthesized into a composite description that captures the essence of the lecturers' shared experience of Generative AI in developing English writing skills, which forms the basis for the findings presented in Chapter IV.

E. Trustworthiness of the Data

To ensure the trustworthiness of the data and findings, this study applied the four criteria commonly used in qualitative research: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Stahl & King, 2020). Credibility was strengthened through member checking, in which participants were given the opportunity to review the transcripts and preliminary interpretations of their interviews to confirm that these accurately reflected their intended meaning. Transferability was addressed by providing a thick, detailed description of the research context, participants, and procedures, so that readers can judge the extent to which the findings may be relevant to similar settings. Dependability was maintained by keeping a clear audit trail of the research process, including the interview guide, recordings, transcripts, and analytical notes, so that the study's procedures could be traced and reviewed. Finally, confirmability was pursued through reflexive bracketing throughout data collection and analysis, which allowed the researcher to remain aware of, and to minimize, the influence of

personal assumptions on the interpretation of the data (Busetto, Wick, & Gumbinger, 2020).

F. Ethical Considerations

This study was conducted in accordance with standard ethical principles for research involving human participants. Before data collection began, the researcher obtained informed consent from all participants, ensuring that they fully understood the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of their participation, and their right to withdraw at any point without any negative consequence. To protect the participants' privacy, their identities were anonymized using the pseudonyms Lecturer A, Lecturer B, and Lecturer C throughout the reporting of the findings, and all data, including audio recordings and transcripts, were stored securely and used solely for the purposes of this research. The researcher also secured formal approval to conduct this study from the Department of English Language Education, Faculty of Education and Teacher Training, UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh, prior to approaching the participants.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Findings

1. Lecturers' Perceptions of the Role and Integration of Generative AI in Developing Students' English Writing Skills

Horizontalization and thematic clustering of the transcripts pertaining to the first research question yielded five interrelated themes: (a) Generative AI as a supplementary tool rather than a replacement for student writing, (b) enhancement of grammatical accuracy and lexical range, (c) improvement in organization, coherence, and cohesion, (d) facilitation of idea generation and brainstorming, and (e) increased writing confidence through sustained practice.

a. Generative AI as a Supplementary and Supportive Tool, Not a Replacement

Across all three interviews, a strongly convergent perception emerged: Generative AI was consistently framed as a supportive resource that scaffolds the writing process rather than a substitute for students' own cognitive and linguistic effort. Lecturer A articulated this position explicitly, explaining that AI is most beneficial “when students use it to receive feedback and revise their own work, rather than relying on it to write complete assignments or replace their own writing” (Lecturer A, personal communication, 2026). This view was echoed by Lecturer C, who described Generative AI as a tool that “should be used as a learning aid rather

than a replacement for students' own thinking and writing skills" (Lecturer C, personal communication, 2026). Both lecturers explicitly positioned independent critical thinking as the primary learning outcome that AI use must not compromise. Lecturer B's account, while framed more instrumentally around consistent practice, similarly implied a supplementary role, describing AI as something students could consult "anytime they want to ... practice their writing," suggesting a view of Generative AI as an on-demand practice partner rather than a producer of finished text (Lecturer B, personal communication, 2026).

b. Enhancement of Grammatical Accuracy and Lexical Range

All three lecturers reported observing measurable improvements in the grammatical and lexical dimensions of students' writing when Generative AI tools were used. Lecturer A noted that students "make fewer grammar mistakes and produce more accurate sentences because AI provides useful suggestions and examples of sentence structures" (Lecturer A, personal communication, 2026). Lecturer C similarly reported "better grammar, vocabulary, and sentence structure" in AI-assisted writing (Lecturer C, personal communication, 2026), while Lecturer B pointed to visible gains in word choice as one of the clearest indicators of improvement (Lecturer B, personal communication, 2026). This convergence suggests that, from the lecturers' vantage point, the most immediately observable benefit of Generative AI use lies at the level of surface linguistic accuracy, corroborating existing evidence that AI tools are particularly effective at providing corrective feedback on discrete linguistic features (Lo, 2023).

c. Improvement in Organization, Coherence, and Cohesion

Beyond sentence-level accuracy, the participants also identified improvements in the higher-order textual qualities of coherence, cohesion, and organization. Lecturer A explained that AI helps students “organize their ideas more clearly before they start writing” (Lecturer A, personal communication, 2026), while Lecturer C observed that AI-assisted writing “becomes clearer and more organized” (Lecturer C, personal communication, 2026). Lecturer B specifically highlighted “the coherence and cohesion from their writing” as a dimension in which improvement was most visible (Lecturer B, personal communication, 2026). Taken together, these accounts indicate that the lecturers perceive Generative AI as operating not only at the sentence level but also at the level of discourse organization, a finding that extends the largely grammar-focused benefits reported by Lo (2023) to encompass broader rhetorical competencies.

d. Facilitation of Idea Generation and Brainstorming

A further recurring pattern concerned the role of Generative AI in supporting the pre-writing stages of the composing process. Lecturer A reported that students “are able to generate ideas more easily” when using AI (Lecturer A, personal communication, 2026), and Lecturer C described integrating AI specifically “for brainstorming ideas, creating outlines” (Lecturer C, personal communication, 2026). Although Lecturer B did not foreground brainstorming as explicitly as the other two participants, this lecturer’s description of using AI to “consult any ideas or any ... structure of writing” reflects a comparable orientation toward AI as a resource for the planning phase of writing (Lecturer B, personal

communication, 2026). This shared emphasis on idea generation positions Generative AI, in the lecturers' collective experience, as functioning analogously to a brainstorming partner that reduces the cognitive burden associated with content generation, consistent with the scaffolding function proposed by Graham and Harris (2023).

e. Increased Writing Confidence through Sustained Practice

A final theme concerned the affective dimension of AI-assisted writing, namely, its perceived contribution to students' confidence. Lecturer A observed that reviewing and revising AI-generated suggestions helps students "write more confidently" (Lecturer A, personal communication, 2026), and Lecturer C reported that Generative AI use "makes them more confident during the writing process" (Lecturer C, personal communication, 2026). Lecturer B linked this confidence-building function explicitly to frequency of use, asserting that AI can improve students' writing skill "as long as they practice with AI daily," and that its constant availability allows students to consult it "anytime they want" (Lecturer B, personal communication, 2026). This theme suggests that the benefits of Generative AI, as perceived by the lecturers, are not confined to measurable linguistic gains but extend to learners' self-efficacy and willingness to engage with the writing process.

f. Composite Description of Research Question One

Synthesizing across the five themes above, the essence of the lecturers' shared experience regarding the role of Generative AI in developing students' English writing skills can be described as follows: the three lecturers perceive

Generative AI as a conditionally beneficial, supplementary instrument that most effectively supports writing development when it is deployed at specific points in the writing process, chiefly brainstorming, drafting, and revision, and when its use is accompanied by deliberate teacher guidance and student reflection. None of the three participants described Generative AI as a substitute for direct instruction or for students' own composing effort; rather, all three situated its value in its capacity to scaffold discrete sub-skills of writing, including grammar, vocabulary, organization, coherence, and idea generation, while cultivating learners' confidence through repeated, guided engagement.

2. Pedagogical and Technical Challenges Experienced by Lecturers

The second research question concerned the pedagogical and technical challenges lecturers encounter when navigating Generative AI in their instructional and assessment practices. Thematic analysis of the transcripts yielded two broad clusters of challenges, **pedagogical and technical**, further differentiated into seven specific themes.

Pedagogical Challenges

a. Balancing AI Support with the Development of Independent Writing Skills

All three lecturers described the difficulty of designing instruction that harnesses the benefits of Generative AI without displacing students' own intellectual effort. Lecturer A explained that a central challenge lies in “find[ing] the right balance between using AI as a learning support and encouraging students

to develop their own skills,” which requires the deliberate design of “activities where students can use AI for brainstorming, feedback, and improvement, but they still need to think critically and produce their own ideas independently” (Lecturer A, personal communication, 2026). Lecturer C reported a parallel adjustment, having revised lesson plans and assessment methods “to emphasize the writing process, critical thinking, and originality ... rather than focusing only on the final written product” (Lecturer C, personal communication, 2026). This theme indicates that pedagogical redesign, rather than outright restriction or unrestricted permission, has become the primary mechanism through which the lecturers attempt to reconcile the benefits and risks of Generative AI.

b. Student Over-Reliance and the Risk of Dependency

Closely related to, yet distinct from, the balancing challenge described above was the specific concern that students may become dependent on Generative AI to the detriment of their own thinking. Lecturer B raised this concern most directly, describing how students become “addicted to using the AI” and “lazy to use their own ... thinking,” which this lecturer identified as the greatest challenge in AI-integrated teaching (Lecturer B, personal communication, 2026). Lecturer C likewise cautioned that “some students may rely or depend too much on AI instead of writing independently and developing their own skills” (Lecturer C, personal communication, 2026). Although Lecturer A did not use the language of dependency explicitly, this lecturer’s repeated emphasis on ensuring that “students still need to think critically, practice regularly, and develop their own writing ability” reflects an underlying awareness of the same risk (Lecturer A, personal

communication, 2026). This theme resonates strongly with concerns raised in the literature regarding the erosion of authentic writing competence through over-reliance on AI-generated content (Lim et al., 2023).

c. Maintaining Academic Integrity in Assessment

A third pedagogical challenge concerned the difficulty of upholding academic integrity when Generative AI can produce polished written text on demand. Lecturer A reported finding it “difficult to know how much of students’ work represents their own ability and how much relies on AI,” necessitating “clearer guidelines about appropriate AI use” (Lecturer A, personal communication, 2026). Lecturer B connected this challenge directly to grading, explaining that because students “depend on the use of AI[,] it can be ... hard to honestly give the score,” and further noted that AI-assisted work is often detectable and consequently reduces students’ scores and affects their grades (Lecturer B, personal communication, 2026). Lecturer C identified academic integrity as “one of the main challenges” encountered in AI-integrated instruction (Lecturer C, personal communication, 2026). The convergence of all three lecturers on this theme underscores academic integrity as perhaps the most pervasive pedagogical concern associated with Generative AI in this context, echoing the assessment validity crisis described by Yan et al. (2024).

d. Rethinking Assessment Criteria toward Process-Oriented Evaluation

Partly in response to the integrity concerns described above, all three lecturers reported adapting their assessment criteria to place greater emphasis on

the writing process rather than solely on the finished product. Lecturer A stated a need to “assess students’ writing process, creativity, improvement, and understanding” rather than focusing exclusively on the final product (Lecturer A, personal communication, 2026). Lecturer C described a comparable shift toward evaluating “the writing process, critical thinking, and originality” (Lecturer C, personal communication, 2026). This shared movement toward process-oriented assessment suggests that, at least among these three lecturers, Generative AI has functioned as a catalyst for pedagogical reflection and innovation in assessment design, even as it has simultaneously introduced new sources of uncertainty into grading practices.

Technical Challenges

e. Unequal Access to Devices, Internet, and Digital Literacy

Beyond pedagogical concerns, the lecturers identified a set of technical and infrastructural barriers that constrain equitable AI integration. Lecturer A observed that “not all students have the same level of digital skills, internet access, or devices, so some need more guidance to use AI effectively” (Lecturer A, personal communication, 2026), a concern reiterated almost identically by Lecturer C, who noted that “not all students have equal access to reliable internet or devices” (Lecturer C, personal communication, 2026). Lecturer B likewise identified internet access as a recurring source of difficulty (Lecturer B, personal communication, 2026). The consistency of this theme across all three participants indicates that infrastructural inequality, rather than pedagogical resistance, constitutes a foundational barrier to consistent Generative AI integration at this research site.

f. Reliability and Quality of AI-Generated Output

A second technical concern involved the inconsistent reliability of the content generated by AI tools. Lecturer A cautioned that AI “sometimes gives answers that are too general or not fully suitable for students’ level,” requiring careful review “before using them in teaching materials or assessments” (Lecturer A, personal communication, 2026). Lecturer C offered a closely aligned account, noting that AI “sometimes gives inaccurate, inconsistent, or incomplete responses, so students need to verify the information” and that corrections were needed before use in teaching materials or assessments (Lecturer C, personal communication, 2026). Lecturer B added that technical errors sometimes appear when using AI, with consequences for instructional time and students’ grades (Lecturer B, personal communication, 2026). Collectively, these accounts reveal that the lecturers do not treat Generative AI output as inherently trustworthy but instead position themselves as active gatekeepers who must verify and adapt AI-generated content before it reaches students.

g. Difficulties Integrating Generative AI into Existing Teaching Systems

The final technical theme concerned the practical challenge of incorporating Generative AI tools into established teaching infrastructures, including the learning management system (LMS). Lecturer A reported difficulty “integrating AI tools into [an] existing teaching system or LMS, since it takes time to learn new features and adjust ... teaching materials” (Lecturer A, personal communication, 2026), while Lecturer C similarly observed that “integrating AI with the LMS is not always straightforward” (Lecturer C, personal communication, 2026). This theme suggests

that, beyond questions of pedagogy and access, the practical labor of aligning Generative AI tools with existing institutional systems constitutes a meaningful, if less frequently discussed, barrier to integration.

h. Composite Description of Research Question Two

Synthesizing the seven themes above, the essence of the lecturers' shared experience of navigating Generative AI can be characterized as a continuous process of negotiation across three fronts: pedagogical design, assessment integrity, and infrastructural constraint. On the pedagogical front, all three lecturers reported actively redesigning lesson plans and assessment criteria to preserve space for independent student thinking amid the availability of AI assistance, while simultaneously confronting genuine uncertainty about how to fairly evaluate work that may be AI-assisted. On the technical front, unequal access to devices and reliable internet, combined with the variable reliability of AI-generated content and the practical burden of system integration, emerged as barriers that lie largely outside the lecturers' individual control. Rather than describing these challenges as reasons to reject Generative AI outright, however, all three lecturers framed them as problems to be managed through clearer guidelines, more deliberate task design, and continued professional adaptation.

B. Discussion

1. Generative AI as a Scaffolding Tool for English Writing Development

The findings pertaining to the first research question align closely with the theoretical proposition, advanced in Chapter II, that Generative AI functions as a scaffolding resource analogous to the “more knowledgeable other” in Vygotskian sociocultural theory (Graham & Harris, 2023). The three lecturers’ shared insistence that AI should support, rather than substitute for, students’ own writing effort reflects precisely the kind of assisted-performance relationship that scaffolding theory anticipates: a competent external resource that extends the learner’s current capability toward a higher level of independent performance before that support is gradually withdrawn. Viewed through the lens of the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989), the lecturers’ generally positive orientation toward Generative AI, evidenced by their voluntary, and in Lecturer C’s case fairly systematic, integration of AI into brainstorming, outlining, and revision activities, can be interpreted as an expression of high perceived usefulness. All three lecturers explicitly linked AI use to concrete gains in grammar, vocabulary, organization, and idea generation, echoing the specific benefits documented by Lo (2023) in the Taiwanese EFL context, while extending those benefits to the discourse-level qualities of coherence and cohesion.

At the same time, perceived ease of use appears to have shaped the depth of integration: Lecturer B’s account, which emphasized the practicality and free accessibility of AI tools as a condition for their effective use, suggests that ease of

access operates as a gating factor determining whether perceived usefulness translates into sustained classroom use, a pattern consistent with the TAM's core proposition that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use jointly determine technology adoption. The emphasis that all three lecturers placed on responsible, guided use rather than unrestricted delegation of writing tasks to AI further situates these findings within the TPACK framework (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). Rather than treating Generative AI merely as a technological resource to be deployed, the lecturers demonstrated an integration of technological knowledge with pedagogical knowledge, for instance by specifying at which stage of the writing process AI should be introduced, and content knowledge, by directing students to attend to specific linguistic features such as sentence structure and vocabulary. This triadic integration suggests that, at least among these three participants, Generative AI has been absorbed into an already well-developed pedagogical repertoire rather than treated as an isolated technological novelty, a pattern that contrasts somewhat with the readiness gap reported by Wiyaka et al. (2023), in which a majority of surveyed teachers had received no formal professional development on the educational implications of Generative AI. The depth and specificity of the pedagogical adaptations described by the present participants may indicate that direct, sustained personal experience with these tools, one of the participant selection criteria for this study, fosters a more integrated TPACK profile than mere awareness.

2. Navigating the Tension between Support and Independence: Pedagogical Challenges Revisited

The pedagogical challenges identified in response to the second research question, particularly the risk of student over-reliance and the difficulty of maintaining academic integrity, corroborate the concerns raised by Lim et al. (2023) regarding the erosion of authentic writing development among students who over-rely on AI-generated text. Notably, the present findings extend this concern by illustrating the concrete pedagogical adjustments through which lecturers attempt to mitigate it. Rather than resorting to prohibition, all three lecturers described a shift toward process-oriented assessment, evaluating drafts, revisions, and demonstrated critical thinking rather than only the polished final product, as their primary strategy for preserving assessment validity. This finding resonates with, yet also enriches, the assessment validity crisis identified by Yan et al. (2024) among Chinese university English teachers: whereas Yan et al. (2024) documented assessment validity concerns primarily as a source of anxiety, the lecturers in the present study appear to have moved beyond anxiety toward active pedagogical redesign, suggesting a degree of professional agency that may be linked to the relatively small, information-rich sample recruited for this phenomenological inquiry.

The tension between fostering independent thinking and permitting AI-assisted support, most vividly captured in Lecturer B's description of students becoming dependent on and "lazy" with AI, further substantiates the observation by Moorhouse et al. (2023) that teachers' existing beliefs about writing pedagogy

shape their interpretation of what AI tools should be permitted to do in the classroom. All three lecturers in this study appear to hold process-oriented beliefs about writing development, prioritizing students' cognitive and metacognitive engagement over the mere production of grammatically accurate text, which likely explains their consistent framing of Generative AI as a resource to be bounded and supervised rather than embraced without qualification.

3. Infrastructural and Systemic Barriers: Technical Challenges Revisited

The technical challenges reported by the participants, particularly unequal access to devices and reliable internet connectivity, align closely with the barriers documented by Mah (2023) among EFL lecturers in Malaysian universities, where unreliable internet access and limited institutional support similarly constrained informed AI integration. The recurrence of this theme across three lecturers working within a single Indonesian institution suggests that infrastructural inequality is not merely an idiosyncratic obstacle but a structural condition that shapes the boundaries of feasible Generative AI integration at this research site, regardless of individual lecturers' pedagogical willingness to adopt these tools.

The concern regarding the variable reliability and accuracy of AI-generated output, meanwhile, reflects a broader caution documented in the literature regarding the epistemological risks associated with Generative AI, including its capacity to produce plausible yet inaccurate or superficial content (Baidoo-Anu & Ansah, 2023; Rudolph et al., 2023). That all three lecturers described actively verifying and correcting AI output before using it in teaching materials or assessments indicates

a critically reflective stance toward these tools, one that positions the lecturer, rather than the AI system itself, as the ultimate arbiter of instructional quality. This finding suggests that effective Generative AI integration in this context depends less on the sophistication of the AI tools themselves than on lecturers' capacity and willingness to exercise sustained professional judgment over their output, a form of critical AI literacy that aligns with the institutional guidance called for by Farrokhnia et al. (2023).

Finally, the difficulty of integrating Generative AI into existing learning management systems, though the least frequently discussed of the seven challenge themes, points to a dimension of AI integration that has received comparatively limited attention in the literature reviewed in Chapter II. Whereas prior studies have concentrated primarily on the pedagogical and ethical dimensions of Generative AI in writing instruction (Lim et al., 2023; Yan et al., 2024), the present findings suggest that purely operational, systems-level friction, that is, the time and effort required to adapt unfamiliar tools to established institutional workflows, also constitutes a non-trivial barrier that warrants further institutional attention, particularly in the absence of the unified national policy noted in Chapter I (Wiyaka et al., 2023).

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

A. Conclusion

This study set out to investigate how English lecturers at UIN Ar-Raniry perceive the role of Generative AI in developing students' English writing skills, and to identify the pedagogical and technical challenges they encounter when navigating its use in their instructional and assessment practices. Drawing on semi-structured interviews with three lecturers, analyzed through Moustakas's (1994) transcendental phenomenological procedure and interpreted through the complementary lenses of the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989), the TPACK framework (Mishra & Koehler, 2006), and Vygotskian scaffolding theory (Graham & Harris, 2023), the study has produced a coherent, context-specific account of this still-emerging phenomenon within an Indonesian Islamic higher education setting. Based on the findings and discussion presented in Chapter IV, the following conclusions may be drawn in relation to the two research questions that guided this inquiry.

About the first research question, the three participating lecturers converged on a view of Generative AI as a conditionally beneficial, supplementary instrument rather than a substitute for students' own composing effort. Across five interrelated themes, the lecturers reported that AI tools function most productively as scaffolding resources at specific points in the writing process, namely brainstorming, drafting, and revision, where they contribute to measurable gains in

grammatical accuracy, lexical range, organization, coherence, and cohesion, while also fostering students' confidence through repeated, guided use. Interpreted through the Technology Acceptance Model, this pattern indicates that the lecturers' adoption of Generative AI is driven primarily by a high perceived usefulness, tempered by the perceived ease of access that determines how consistently such usefulness translates into classroom practice. Read through TPACK, the lecturers' careful specification of when and how AI should be introduced into the writing process further suggests that Generative AI has, for these three participants, been absorbed into an already well-developed pedagogical repertoire rather than adopted as an isolated technological novelty.

Concerning the second research question, the lecturers described a continuous process of negotiation across pedagogical and technical fronts. On the pedagogical side, the central and most pervasive difficulty was that of preserving students' independent thinking and upholding academic integrity while still allowing them to benefit from AI assistance; in response, all three lecturers reported redesigning their assessment criteria to emphasize process, critical thinking, and originality rather than the polished final product alone. On the technical side, unequal access to devices and reliable internet connectivity, the variable reliability of AI-generated content, and the practical burden of integrating Generative AI into existing learning management systems emerged as barriers that lie largely outside individual lecturers' control. Importantly, none of the three lecturers treated these challenges as grounds for rejecting Generative AI outright; rather, they consistently

reframed them as problems to be managed through clearer guidelines, more deliberate task design, and continued professional adaptation.

Taken together, these findings depict the three lecturers not as passive recipients of a disruptive technology but as reflective practitioners and active gatekeepers who consciously calibrate the boundaries of AI use in accordance with their existing pedagogical beliefs. Theoretically, the study extends the applicability of the Technology Acceptance Model, the TPACK framework, and Vygotskian scaffolding theory to an Indonesian Islamic higher education context that has been underrepresented in the existing literature, while empirically corroborating and enriching earlier findings from Taiwanese (Lo, 2023), Malaysian (Mah, 2023), Chinese (Yan et al., 2024), and Indonesian (Wiyaka et al., 2023) settings. At the same time, because the study relied on a small, purposively selected sample of three lecturers at a single institution, a design well suited to the depth of insight sought by phenomenological inquiry (Alhazmi & Kaufmann, 2022; Andrade, 2021), its findings are not intended to be statistically generalizable; rather, they offer a transferable, richly contextualized account that future research, outlined below, may extend and test in broader settings.

B. Suggestions

On the basis of the conclusions above, the following suggestions are offered to English lecturers, the institution and policymakers, students, and future researchers.

1. For English Lecturers

English lecturers, particularly those teaching writing courses, are encouraged to move beyond individual, informal accommodation of Generative AI and to articulate explicit, shareable guidelines that specify at which stages of the writing process, such as brainstorming, drafting, or revision, AI assistance is permitted, and at which stages independent effort is required. Given that all three lecturers in this study already position themselves as active gatekeepers who verify and correct AI-generated content, it would further be beneficial to make this critical evaluation of AI output an explicit, taught component of writing instruction rather than a tacit lecturer practice, so that students themselves develop the capacity to assess the accuracy and appropriateness of AI-generated suggestions. Continuing and formalizing the shift toward process-oriented assessment, for instance through structured drafting portfolios or reflective writing logs, is likewise recommended as a means of preserving assessment validity in the presence of readily available AI tools.

2. For the Institution and Policymakers

Because the pedagogical and technical challenges identified in this study, particularly the ambiguity surrounding academic integrity and the unequal distribution of devices and internet access, largely exceed what individual lecturers can resolve on their own, the Department of English Language Education and the broader UIN Ar-Raniry administration are encouraged to formulate a clear, written policy on the acceptable use of Generative AI in coursework and assessment, consistent with calls for institutional guidance raised by Farrokhnia et al. (2023)

and Wiyaka et al. (2023). Structured professional development programs that build lecturers' critical AI literacy, together with targeted investment in equitable access to devices, internet connectivity, and compatible learning management system features, would help ensure that the benefits of Generative AI documented in this study are available to all students and lecturers rather than contingent on individual resourcefulness.

3. For Students

Students of English Language Education are encouraged to treat Generative AI as a learning aid that supports, rather than substitutes for, their own thinking, in line with the boundary that all three lecturers in this study consistently emphasized. This entails approaching AI-generated suggestions critically rather than accepting them uncritically, using AI primarily to support planning, feedback, and revision, and remaining mindful of the academic integrity implications of AI-assisted work, particularly given lecturers' explicit concern about the erosion of independent writing competence through over-reliance on such tools (Lim et al., 2023).

4. For Future Researchers

Because this study was limited to three lecturers at a single institution, future researchers are encouraged to replicate this inquiry with larger and more diverse samples, including lecturers from multiple Islamic and non-Islamic universities across Indonesia, to examine the transferability of the themes identified here. A mixed methods design that complements phenomenological interviewing with a quantitative survey, following precedents such as Wiyaka et al. (2023), could help

test the prevalence of these themes across a wider population, while research that triangulates lecturer perceptions with those of students would offer a more complete picture of Generative AI's role in the writing classroom. Longitudinal studies tracking how lecturers' perceptions and practices evolve as institutional policies and AI tools themselves develop would also represent a valuable extension of the present findings.



REFERENCES

- Baidoo-Anu, D., & Ansah, L. O. (2023). Education in the era of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. *Journal of AI*, 7(1), 52–62. <https://doi.org/10.61969/jai.1337500>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (2018)*. SAGE Publications.
- Farrokhnia, M., Banihashem, S. K., Noroozi, O., & Wals, A. (2023). A SWOT analysis of ChatGPT: Implications for educational practice and research. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61(3), 460–474. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2195846>
- Jiang, H., Cheng, Y., Yang, J., & Gao, S. (2022). AI-Powered chatbot communication with customers: Dialogic interactions, satisfaction, engagement, and customer behavior. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 134, Article 107329.
- Rudolph, J., Tan, S., & Tan, S. (2023). ChatGPT: Bullshit spewer or the end of traditional assessments in higher education. ? *J. Appl. Learn. Teach.*, 6(1).
- Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023). ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. *RELC Journal*, 54(2), 537–550. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868>
- Chiu, T. K. F. (2023). The impact of generative AI (GenAI) on practices, policies and research direction in education: A case of ChatGPT and midjourney. *Interactive Learning Environments*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2023.2253861>. Epub Online.
- Kuhail, M. A., Alturki, N., Alramlawi, S., & Alhejori, K. (2023). Interacting with educational chatbots: A systematic review. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28 (1), 973–1018.
- Hwang, G.-J., & Chen, N.-S. (2023). Editorial position paper: Exploring the potential of generative artificial intelligence in education: Applications, challenges, and future research directions. *Educational Technology & Society*, 26(2).
- Meniado, J. C. (2023). Digital Language teaching 5.0: Technologies, trends and competencies. *RELC Journal*, 54(2).
- Lim, W. M., Gunasekara, A., Pallant, J. L., Pallant, J. I., & Pechenkina, E. (2023). Generative AI and the future of education: Ragnar’ok or reformation? A paradoxical perspective from management

- educators. *International Journal of Management in Education*, 21(2), Article 100790.
- Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2023). Writing and writing instruction: Introduction and overview. *Reading and Writing*, 36(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-022-10383-w>
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. Longman.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Pearson Longman.
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kasneci, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, Article 102274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- Lo, C. K. (2023). What is the impact of ChatGPT on education? A rapid review of the literature. *Education Sciences*, 13(4), Article 410. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13040410>
- Mah, D. K. (2023). The affordances of Grammarly and ChatGPT for supporting EFL writing: A perspective study of Malaysian English teachers. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 19(3), 65–78. <https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v19i3.23499>
- Mertens, D. M. (2020). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods (5th ed.)*. SAGE Publications.
- Moorhouse, B. L., Yeo, M., & Wan, Y. (2023). Generative AI tools and assessment: Guidelines of the world's top-ranking universities. *Computers and Education Open*, 5, Article 100151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2023.100151>
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. SAGE Publications.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods (3rd ed.)*. SAGE Publications.
- Wiyaka, W., Mujiyanto, J., & Rukmini, D. (2023). EFL teachers' perspectives on AI writing tools: A preliminary study of Indonesian university contexts. *English Language Teaching*, 16(9), 44–55. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v16n9p44>

- Yan, L., Sha, L., Zhao, L., Li, Y., Martinez-Maldonado, R., Chen, G., Li, X., Jin, Y., & Gašević, D. (2024). Practical and ethical challenges of large language models in education: A systematic scoping review. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 55(1), 90–112. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13370>
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340.
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 1017–1054.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Adeoye-Olatunde, O. A., & Olenik, N. L. (2021). Research and scholarly methods: Semi-structured interviews. *JACCP: Journal of the American College of Clinical Pharmacy*, 4(10), 1358–1367. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jac5.1441>
- Alhazmi, A. A., & Kaufmann, A. (2022). Phenomenological qualitative methods applied to the analysis of cross-cultural experience in novel educational social contexts. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 785134. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.785134>
- Andrade, C. (2021). The inconvenient truth about convenience and purposive samples. *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine*, 43(1), 86–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0253717620977000>
- Busetto, L., Wick, W., & Gumbinger, C. (2020). How to use and assess qualitative research methods. *Neurological Research and Practice*, 2, 14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42466-020-00059-z>
- Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 25(8), 652–661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340.
- Meihami, H., & Rashidi, N. (2022). A transcendental phenomenology into how teacher educators address social and psychological elements of teachers' professional identity. *The Qualitative Report*, 27(8), 1509–1528. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5306>
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 1017–1054.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. SAGE Publications.
- Naeem, M., Ozuem, W., Howell, K., & Ranfagni, S. (2023). A step-by-step process of thematic analysis to develop a conceptual model in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231205789>

- Ruslin, R., Mashuri, S., Rasak, M. S. A., Alhabsyi, F., & Syam, H. (2022). Semi-structured interview: A methodological reflection on the development of a qualitative research instrument in educational studies. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 12(1), 22–29. <https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-1201052229>
- Stahl, N. A., & King, J. R. (2020). Expanding approaches for research: Understanding and using trustworthiness in qualitative research. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 44(1), 26–28. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45381095>



APPENDIXES

Lecture A:

Question:

1. How would you describe your overall perception of AI's role in supporting students' English writing development?

Answer: In my opinion, AI can play a supportive role in helping students develop their English writing skills. It can help them brainstorm ideas, suggest better vocabulary, improve grammar, and organize their writing more clearly. I believe it is most beneficial when students use it to receive feedback and revise their own work, rather than relying on it to write complete assignments or replace their own writing. Students still need to think critically, practice regularly, and develop their own writing ability. So, I see AI as a supplementary learning tool that can contribute positively to English writing development when it is used responsibly and with guidance from the teacher.

2. Can you walk me through how, if at all, you've integrated AI into your writing instruction or course design?

Answer: Occasionally, for some writing activities, I ask students to use AI after they complete their first draft to check grammar, improve vocabulary, or get suggestions for organizing their ideas more clearly. In class, I remind students that they should not simply copy the AI-generated text; instead, they should use it as a tool to help them revise and improve their own writing. At this stage, AI is only a supplementary resource that supports revision and independent learning, not a central part of my course design.

3. What specific benefits or improvements in student writing have you noticed (or expect to notice) when AI is used?

Answer: Students are able to generate ideas more easily, organize their ideas more clearly before they start writing, and use a wider range of vocabulary. They also make fewer grammar mistakes and produce more accurate sentences because AI

provides useful suggestions and examples of sentence structures, which helps them write more confidently and revise their drafts more effectively. However, the greatest benefit is seen when students use AI as a learning tool rather than relying on it to complete their assignments. I encourage students to review and revise the AI-generated suggestions so they can understand their mistakes and develop their own writing skills. With proper guidance from the teacher, I think AI can support the development of students' confidence and overall writing ability.

4. What pedagogical challenges, such as adapting lesson plans, maintaining academic integrity, or rethinking assessment criteria have you faced when using AI?

Answer: One challenge is adapting my lesson plans, because I need to find the right balance between using AI as a learning support and encouraging students to develop their own skills. I have to design activities where students can use AI for brainstorming, feedback, and improvement, but they still need to think critically and produce their own ideas independently. Another challenge is maintaining academic integrity — it can be difficult to know how much of students' work represents their own ability and how much relies on AI, so I need to set clearer guidelines about appropriate AI use and encourage students to be honest about their process. I also need to rethink my assessment criteria; instead of only focusing on the final writing product, I think it is important to assess students' writing process, creativity, improvement, and understanding. Using AI has encouraged me to become more flexible and continue learning about new teaching approaches.

5. What technical difficulties (e.g., accessibility, reliability, output quality, integration with your LMS) have you encountered when using AI for teaching or assessment?

Answer: The first one is accessibility, because not all students have the same level of digital skills, internet access, or devices, so some need more guidance to use AI effectively. Another issue is reliability and output quality — sometimes AI gives

answers that are too general or not fully suitable for students' level, so I need to review the suggestions carefully before using them in teaching materials or assessments to make sure they match the learning objectives. I also face challenges integrating AI tools into my existing teaching system or LMS, since it takes time to learn new features and adjust my teaching materials. However, through continuous learning and practice, I believe AI can become a useful support for improving teaching and assessment.

Lecture b:

Question:

1. How would you describe your overall perception of AI's role in supporting students' English writing development?

Answer: Okay, so about AI supporting students in English writing development, I think it's really good and it can improve uh their students writing skill, as long as they practice with AI daily. It's also really important uh to help the students improve their uh writing, because they can consult the AI uh anytime they want to uh practice their uh writing.

2. Can you walk me through how if at all, you've integrated AI into your writing instruction or course design?

Answer: Okay. Uh, usually I use the AI to um give some instruction in writing, uh by integrating the AI uh to, you know, consult any ideas or any uh structure of writing, and the students can refer to the AI to do the writing. Um, as long as the AI is uh practical and also simple to use, the students can easily uh refer their writing to the AI, and they can um access it uh free from their computers or their uh mobiles.

3. What specific benefits or improvements in student writing have you noticed (or expect to notice) when AI is used?

Answer: Okay, the especially uh the correction that I can see is uh the way they write, and then the word use, and also uh the coherence and cohesion from their

writing. The students' writing is improved by uh using this AI, and it can be seen from their uh vocabulary use and also the structure of their writing.

4. What pedagogical challenges, such as adapting lesson plans, maintaining academic integrity, or rethinking assessment criteria have you faced when using AI?

Answer: Okay, I think it's really um, it's not really difficult but it's a bit uh troublesome, because uh the students uh dependently — I mean uh get addicted to using the AI, and they uh are lazy to use their own uh ideas, their own thinking. That's the most uh challenge in teaching by using AI. Another challenge is uh based on giving the score for the students, because the students uh depend on the use of AI and it can be uh hard to honestly give the score. So that's a problem.

5. What technical difficulties (e.g., accessibility, reliability, output quality, integration with your LMS) have you encountered when using AI for teaching or assessment?

Answer: Yeah, because uh officially the use of AI will be detected easily, and it's uh reduce the student score and also impact on their grade, of course, when they assess uh using AI. The technical one is uh accessing the internet, and also the uh error may appear when using AI, and it affects the time and also the grade for the students. So uh the most is the access of uh internet, and sometimes it's a problem.

Lecture C:

Question:

1. How would you describe your overall perception of AI's role in supporting students' English writing development?

Answer: I perceive AI as a useful tool that supports students' English writing development by helping them generate ideas, improve grammar and vocabulary, organize their writing, and receive quick feedback. However, it should be used as a learning aid rather than a replacement for students' own thinking and writing skills.

2. Can you walk me through how, if at all, you've integrated AI into your writing instruction or course design?

Answer: Yes. I have integrated AI into my writing instruction by using it as a supporting tool. I ask students to use it for brainstorming ideas, creating outlines, checking grammar, and getting feedback on their drafts. I also remind them to think critically and revise the suggestions themselves, rather than accepting them without thinking, so the writing stays their own.

3. What specific benefits or improvements in student writing have you noticed (or expect to notice) when AI is used?

Answer: When students use AI, I notice that their writing becomes clearer and more organized, with better grammar, vocabulary, and sentence structure. It also helps them generate ideas more quickly and easily, and it makes them more confident during the writing process.

4. What pedagogical challenges, such as adapting lesson plans, maintaining academic integrity, or rethinking assessment criteria have you faced when using AI?

Answer: One of the main challenges is maintaining academic integrity, because some students may rely or depend too much on AI instead of writing independently and developing their own skills. I have also adjusted my lesson plans and assessment methods to emphasize the writing process, critical thinking, and originality, students' own ideas rather than focusing only on the final written product.

5. What technical difficulties (e.g., accessibility, reliability, output quality, integration with your LMS) have you encountered when using AI for teaching or assessment?

Answer: The main technical difficulties are that AI sometimes gives inaccurate, inconsistent, or incomplete responses, so students need to verify the information and I need to check and correct it before using it in teaching materials or

assessments. In addition, not all students have equal access to reliable internet or devices, and integrating AI with the LMS is not always straightforward.

