



ELT Echo: The Journal of English Language Teaching in Foreign Language Context

journal homepage: <https://syekhnurjati.ac.id/jurnal/index.php/eltecho>



EFL Students' Attitudes Toward Generative AI in English Writing

Baby Farhana L. Tunggay^{a*}, Najwa Hanna Habibah^b, Mitsni Uswatun Hasanah^c, Mohammad Ade Rifki^d, Zahroh Arofah^e

^{a,b,c,d,e} English Language Teaching Department, UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: Perjuangan Street, Sunyaragi, Kesambi, Cirebon, West Java, 45132, Indonesia, E-mail Address:

babyfarhanatunggay@gmail.com

article info

Article history:
Received: 11 November 2025
Accepted: 10 December 2025
Available online: 23 December 2025

Keywords:
Attitudes
English writing
EFL students
Generative artificial intelligence

abstract

EFL students often face significant difficulties in English writing, particularly regarding vocabulary limitations, grammatical accuracy, idea organization, and coherence. The rapid development of generative artificial intelligence (AI) has significantly influenced educational practices, particularly in English writing instruction. Tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, and QuillBot are increasingly used by students to support various writing activities. This study aimed to investigate EFL students' attitudes toward the use of generative AI in English writing activities, including their habits, perceived effects, and challenges associated with its use. The study employed a quantitative descriptive survey design involving 54 students from the English Language Teaching Department of a university in Indonesia. Data were collected through an online questionnaire consisting of 16 items grouped into four dimensions: attitudes, habits, effects, and challenges. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, mean, median, mode, range, and standard deviation. The findings revealed that students generally demonstrated positive attitudes toward the use of generative AI in English writing activities. Among the four dimensions, the effects of generative AI obtained the highest mean score ($M = 3.25$), followed by habits ($M = 3.21$), attitudes ($M = 3.17$), and challenges ($M = 3.10$). The findings indicate that students perceived generative AI as beneficial, practical, and supportive in improving their writing activities. Students reported using AI tools to generate ideas, improve grammar and vocabulary, paraphrase sentences, and complete writing assignments more efficiently. However, concerns regarding dependency, reduced independent thinking, and the accuracy of AI-generated content were also identified.

INTRODUCTION

EFL learners constantly struggle with vocabulary limitations, grammatical errors, poor idea organization, and a lack of coherence, making writing one of the most difficult skills to master in language learning. The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) has significantly transformed educational practices, particularly in language learning and teaching. One of the most recent developments is generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), which is capable of producing human-like text and assisting users in a wide range of writing tasks. Tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, and QuillBot are increasingly used by students to generate ideas, revise drafts, and improve the quality of their writing. These tools provide immediate feedback and suggestions, making them valuable resources in modern educational contexts (Shoufan, 2023; Kasneci et al., 2023).

In the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), writing is widely recognized as one of the most challenging skills to master. Learners often struggle with vocabulary limitations, grammatical accuracy, idea organization, and coherence. As noted by Hyland (2003), writing requires both linguistic competence and the ability to structure ideas effectively. To address these challenges, technological tools have been increasingly integrated into language learning. Recent studies have shown that generative AI can support writing development by helping students improve grammar, generate ideas, and organize their texts more effectively (Yang et al., 2025; Kim, 2023). The ability of AI tools to provide instant feedback allows learners to revise their writing in real time, which can enhance both writing quality and learning efficiency.

From a theoretical perspective, students' acceptance of generative AI can be explained through the Technology Acceptance Model proposed by Fred Davis (1989), which emphasizes perceived usefulness and ease of use as key factors influencing technology adoption. In line with this model, previous research indicates that students are more likely to use AI tools when they find them helpful and easy to operate. In addition, the interactive features of generative AI, such as providing suggestions and corrections, can increase students' motivation and confidence in completing writing tasks (Shoufan, 2023).

However, despite these benefits, the use of generative AI in academic writing also raises important concerns. Several studies highlight issues related to academic integrity, plagiarism, and students' overreliance on AI-generated content (Perkins, 2023). When students depend excessively on AI tools, they may have fewer opportunities to develop critical thinking skills and independent writing abilities. Furthermore, distinguishing between human-written and AI-generated texts presents challenges for educators in assessing students' work, raising concerns about authorship and authenticity.

In addition to benefits and challenges, students' perceptions and attitudes toward generative AI have become an important focus in recent research. Studies by Tlili et al. (2023), Liang & Mao (2023), Almassaad et al. (2024), and Eairheart & Azimzadeh (2024) indicate that students generally have positive attitudes toward AI tools due to their usefulness and efficiency in completing writing tasks. However, some students also express concerns regarding the accuracy of AI-generated content and the potential negative impact on their independence and writing skills. These findings suggest that students' attitudes toward generative AI are complex and influenced by various factors, including digital literacy, prior experience, and learning context.

Empirical evidence further supports these findings. A study conducted in Vietnam in 2023 involving 369 English-major students found that learners perceived ChatGPT as easy to use and beneficial for language learning, although their perceptions of its usefulness were relatively neutral (Shoufan, 2023). The study also revealed that students demonstrated generally positive attitudes toward the use of generative AI, while negative attitudes remained low. These findings highlight the importance of balancing AI use with appropriate pedagogical strategies to ensure effective learning outcomes.

Despite the growing body of research on generative AI in education, several gaps remain in the existing literature. First, many studies focus on the general use of AI rather than specifically examining its role in EFL writing contexts. Second, research that directly investigates students' attitudes toward generative AI in writing is still limited. Third, there is a lack of studies conducted in developing country contexts, particularly in Indonesia. Therefore, this study aims to explore EFL students' attitudes toward the use of generative AI in English writing. Understanding these attitudes is essential for helping educators integrate AI technologies effectively while maintaining students' independent writing development.

Therefore, this study aimed to investigate EFL students' attitudes toward the use of generative AI in English writing activities. In addition, this study explores students' habits, perceived effects, and challenges regarding the use of generative AI in English writing. The findings of this study are expected to provide insights for educators regarding the integration of generative AI in EFL writing instruction. To guide the investigation, this research formulation is formulated into the following specific research questions:

1. What are the EFL students' attitudes toward the use of generative AI in English writing?
2. What are the students' specific habits in using generative AI in their writing activities?
3. What are the perceived effects and challenges associated with the use of generative AI tools in English writing?

Benefits of Generative AI in Language Learning (TAM)

Recent studies have highlighted the potential of generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools in supporting language learning, particularly in writing development. Research by Kasneci et al. (2023), and Yang et al., (2025) indicates that AI-powered writing tools can assist students in improving grammatical accuracy, generating ideas, and organizing texts more effectively. These tools provide immediate feedback, enabling learners to revise their writing in real time. As a result, students can identify errors more efficiently and enhance the overall quality of their writing. In EFL contexts, where learners often struggle with vocabulary, grammar, and coherence, such technological support plays a crucial role in facilitating writing development.

From a theoretical perspective, students' acceptance of generative AI can be explained through the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) developed by Davis (1989). TAM emphasizes two key factors: perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. When students perceive AI tools as beneficial and easy to operate, they are more likely to adopt them in their learning process. Supporting this view, Shoufan (2023) found that students tentative to engage with AI tools because they simplify writing tasks and provide practical assistance during brainstorming and revision stages. Consequently, generative AI not only improves students' writing performance but also enhances their motivation and confidence in completing writing tasks.

Challenges and Ethical Concerns of AI Use

Despite its advantages, a growing body of research has raised concerns regarding the use of generative AI in academic writing. Study by Perkins (2023) highlights issues related to academic integrity, plagiarism, and students' overreliance on AI-generated content. These studies suggest that students may depend excessively on AI tools to produce complete texts without actively engaging in the writing process. As a consequence, learners may have fewer opportunities to develop essential skills such as critical thinking, idea generation, and independent writing.

Furthermore, the increasing use of AI-generated content presents challenges for educators in maintaining academic honesty. It is often difficult to distinguish between human-written and AI-generated texts, complicating assessment practices and raising concerns about authorship. Kasneci et al. (2023) also argue that excessive reliance on AI tools may negatively affect students' cognitive engagement and learning autonomy. These findings indicate that while generative AI offers valuable support, it simultaneously introduces significant pedagogical and ethical challenges that must be carefully addressed.

Students' Attitudes Toward Generative AI in English Writing

Another important area of research focuses on students' attitudes toward the use of generative AI in education. Studies by Tlili et al. (2023), Liang & Mao (2023), Almassaad et al. (2024), and Fairheart & Azimzadeh (2025) report that students generally demonstrate positive attitudes

toward AI tools due to their perceived usefulness and ease of use. Many learners find these tools helpful in completing writing tasks more efficiently, particularly because of their ability to provide instant feedback and suggestions.

However, students' attitudes are not entirely positive. Some learners express concerns about the accuracy and reliability of AI-generated content, while others worry that frequent use of AI tools may reduce their independence and negatively affect their writing ability. In addition, students' attitudes are influenced by various factors, including digital literacy, prior experience with technology, and learning context (Getenet et al., 2024). These findings suggest that students' attitudes toward generative AI are complex, dynamic, and require further investigation, particularly in specific learning contexts such as EFL writing.

Although previous studies have explored the benefits, challenges, and students' perceptions of generative AI in education, several gaps remain in the existing literature. First, many studies focus on general AI use rather than specifically examining EFL writing contexts. Second, research directly investigating students' attitudes toward generative AI in English writing remains limited. Third, studies conducted in developing country contexts are still insufficient. Therefore, further research is needed to investigate EFL students' attitudes toward the use of generative AI in English writing activities. Understanding students' attitudes, habits, perceived effects, and challenges may provide valuable insights for educators regarding the effective integration of generative AI in EFL writing instruction.

METHOD

This study employed a quantitative descriptive survey design to investigate EFL students' attitudes toward the use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) in English writing. This design was selected because the research aims to describe students' attitudes and identify patterns based on their responses. According to Creswell and Creswell (2018), survey research is used to provide a quantitative description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population. Survey research is particularly appropriate for examining learners' attitudes in educational contexts. This study is grounded in the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) proposed by Davis (1989), which explains that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use influence users' acceptance of technology. TAM has been widely applied in educational technology research to examine users' attitudes toward digital tools (Venkatesh & Davis, 2000; Scherer et al., 2019).

This study was conducted at the English Language Teaching (ELT) Department of a university in Indonesia. The participants consisted of 54 EFL students who had experience using generative AI tools in English writing activities. The participants were familiar with tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, and QuillBot, which are commonly used to support writing activities, including idea generation, grammar checking, and paraphrasing. A convenience sampling technique was employed, where participants were selected based on their availability and willingness to participate. Convenience sampling is commonly used in educational research when participants are easily accessible (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Although the sample size is relatively small, it is considered sufficient for descriptive studies that aim to explore attitudes within a specific context (Fraenkel et al., 2012).

The data were collected using an online questionnaire distributed through Google Forms, which was specifically designed to measure students' attitudes toward the use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) in English writing. The instrument itself consisted of two main sections: Demographic Information and the Attitudes Toward Generative AI Scale. The demographic section collected participants' background data, including gender, academic level, level of experience in using AI tools (such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, etc.) in English writing,

and the overall frequency of using AI in English writing. Meanwhile, the Attitudes Toward Generative AI Scale included statements adapted from the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and relevant previous studies on AI in education (Davis, 1989; Venkatesh & Davis, 2000; Shoufan, 2023). The items were grouped into four distinct aspects: Students' Attitudes toward Generative AI, Students' Habits in Using Generative AI, Effects of Generative AI on English Writing, and Challenges of Using Generative AI. All items were measured using a 4-point Likert scale, consisting of 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, and 4 = Strongly Agree. The use of a four-point Likert scale without a neutral option was intentionally intended to reduce central tendency bias and encourage respondents to provide clear and decisive responses (Chyung et al., 2017).

After the questionnaire was developed and reviewed to ensure clarity and relevance, the researcher distributed the online questionnaire using Google Forms. The link to the questionnaire was shared through student communication platforms, such as WhatsApp groups. Before completing the questionnaire, participants were informed about the purpose of the study and asked to provide their consent. A total of 54 EFL students voluntarily responded to the questionnaire within the given time frame. All responses were automatically recorded in Google Forms and subsequently downloaded in spreadsheet format for analysis. The collected data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics were used to summarize students' attitudes, including frequency, percentage, mean, median, mode, range, and standard deviation (Pallant, 2020).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Data from 54 EFL students were gathered and analyzed in this study. The participants consisted of students from the 2nd, 4th, 6th, and 8th semesters of the English Language Teaching Department who had experience using generative AI in English writing activities. Most respondents came from the 4th semester with 28 students, followed by the 2nd semester with 16 students. Meanwhile, the 8th semester consisted of 5 students, and the 6th semester consisted of 3 students. Most participants were female students, indicating that female students outnumbered male students in this study. Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the participants based on gender and academic level.

Table 1. Demographic profile of participants

Academic Level	N	Gender (Male) f	Gender (Male) %	Gender (Female) f	Gender (Female) %
2nd Semester	16	5	31.25	11	68.75
4th Semester	28	5	17.86	23	82.14
6th Semester	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
8th Semester	5	2	40.00	3	60.00

The student participants responded to statements representing their attitudes toward using generative AI in English writing activities. Items 1–4 examined students' attitudes toward AI-assisted writing activities. Based on Table 2, students' attitudes toward using generative AI obtained a mean score of 3.17, a median score of 3, a mode score of 3, a range score of 2.5, and

a standard deviation of 0.61, indicating a high level of positive attitudes toward the use of generative AI in English writing activities.

Table 2. Frequency percentages of students' responses

No	Item	SD (%)	D (%)	A (%)	SA (%)
1	I believe AI is beneficial for improving my English writing skills.	0	5.7	71.7	21.6
2	I find AI easy to use in writing assignments.	3.8	3.8	62.3	30.2
3	AI helps me understand how to write in English better.	3.7	3.7	68.5	24.1
4	AI is important in current English writing learning.	0	9.3	64.8	25.9
5	I use AI to generate ideas for writing.	1.9	5.6	55.6	37
6	I use AI to improve grammar and vocabulary.	1.9	5.6	57.4	35.2
7	I use AI to paraphrase or restructure sentences.	3.7	18.5	53.7	24.1
8	I use AI for all types of English writing assignments.	7.4	24.1	50	18.5
9	AI helps me complete writing assignments more quickly.	0	9.3	55.6	35.2
10	AI increases my confidence in writing English.	1.9	16.7	57.4	24.1
11	AI helps me learn from my writing mistakes.	3.7	3.7	57.4	35.2
12	AI makes me more independent in learning writing skills.	1.9	18.9	58.5	28.8
13	I feel too dependent on AI in writing activities.	5.6	27.8	35.2	31.5
14	I worry that using AI may reduce my writing ability.	1.9	13	53.7	31.5
15	I doubt the accuracy of the results provided by AI.	0	11.1	61.1	27.8
16	The use of AI makes me less independent in thinking while writing.	0	14.8	51.9	33.3

Most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that AI is beneficial for improving English writing skills (93.3%). Students also believed that AI is easy to use in writing assignments and helps them understand English writing more effectively. In addition, many respondents agreed that AI supports current English writing learning activities. Overall, respondents demonstrated positive attitudes toward integrating generative AI into English writing activities.

Items 5–8 examined students' habits in using generative AI for English writing activities. This aspect focused on students' routines in generating ideas, improving grammar and vocabulary, paraphrasing sentences, and completing writing assignments using AI tools. Based on Table 3, this aspect obtained a mean score of 3.21, a median score of 3.5, a mode score of 3.5, a range score of 3, and a standard deviation of 0.78, indicating a high level of AI usage habits among students. Most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they use AI to generate ideas for writing activities (92.6%). Students also reported using AI to improve grammar and vocabulary during writing activities. In addition, many respondents agreed that AI helps them paraphrase and restructure sentences more effectively. However, compared to the other items, some students showed lower agreement regarding the use of AI for all writing assignments. This indicates that several students still limit the use of AI depending on the type

of assignment. Overall, respondents demonstrated active habits in utilizing generative AI for English writing activities.

Items 9–12 examined the effects of generative AI on students’ English writing activities. This aspect focused on writing productivity, confidence, and writing development. Based on Table 3, this aspect obtained the highest mean score of 3.25, a median score of 3, a mode score of 3, a range score of 2.5, and a standard deviation of 0.69, indicating a high level of positive effects from using generative AI in English writing activities. Most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that AI helps them complete writing assignments more quickly (90.8%). Students also believed that AI increases their confidence in writing English and helps them learn from writing mistakes. Furthermore, many respondents agreed that AI supports them in developing writing skills independently. Overall, respondents demonstrated positive responses regarding the effects of generative AI on English writing activities.

Items 13–16 examined the challenges experienced by students while using generative AI in English writing activities. This aspect focused on dependency, writing ability, information accuracy, and independent thinking. The descriptive statistics showed that this aspect obtained a mean score of 3.10, a median score of 3, a mode score of 3, a range score of 2.5, and a standard deviation of 0.72, indicating a high level of agreement regarding the challenges associated with the use of generative AI in English writing. To complement the findings presented in the previous sections, Table 3 summarizes the descriptive statistics for all four aspects examined in this study: attitudes, habits, effects, and challenges. This comparison provides a comprehensive overview of students’ perceptions and experiences regarding the use of generative AI in English writing.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics of students’ attitudes toward using generative AI in English writing

Aspect	Mean	Median	Mode	Range	Standard Deviation
Attitudes (1-4)	3.17	3	3	2.5	0.61
Habits (5-8)	3.21	3.25	3.5	3	0.78
Effects (9-12)	3.25	3	3	2.5	0.69
Challenges (13-16)	3.10	3	3	2.5	0.72
Overall	3.10	3	4	3	0.70

As shown in Table 3, the “Effects” aspect obtained the highest mean score ($M = 3.25$), whereas the “Challenges” aspect recorded the lowest mean score ($M = 3.10$). The “Habits” and “Attitudes” aspects obtained mean scores of 3.21 and 3.17, respectively. Although variations were observed among the four aspects, all of them achieved mean scores above 3.00, indicating a generally high level of agreement among the respondents regarding the use of generative AI in English writing activities.

Discussion

The findings of this study revealed that EFL students generally demonstrated positive attitudes toward the use of generative AI in English writing activities. The overall mean score indicated a high level of agreement across all investigated aspects. Among the four aspects, the effects of generative AI on English writing obtained the highest mean score ($M = 3.25$), followed by students’ habits in using generative AI ($M = 3.21$), students’ attitudes toward generative AI ($M = 3.17$), and challenges of using generative AI ($M = 3.10$). These findings suggest that students perceived generative AI as beneficial, practical, and supportive in

completing English writing activities. However, students also expressed concerns regarding dependency, critical thinking, and writing independence, indicating that their perceptions toward AI were not entirely positive but also reflected critical awareness regarding the limitations of AI-assisted learning. Overall, these findings can be interpreted through the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) developed by Davis (1989), which explains that users' acceptance of a technology is primarily influenced by their perceptions of its usefulness and ease of use.

The findings regarding students' attitudes toward generative AI showed that most students perceived AI tools as useful and easy to use in English writing activities. Students believed that AI could help improve writing skills, support writing learning, and assist them in understanding English writing more effectively. This finding indicates that generative AI has become an accessible learning support tool for EFL students, particularly in overcoming difficulties related to grammar, vocabulary, and idea organization. This finding aligns with previous studies conducted by Tlili et al. (2023), Liang & Mao (2023), and Shoufan (2023), which reported that students generally demonstrated positive attitudes toward AI tools because of their usefulness and efficiency. Furthermore, these findings strongly support the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) developed by Davis (1989), which posits that users' acceptance of a technology is primarily influenced by perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use. Students were more willing to accept and utilize AI tools because they considered them beneficial and practical in supporting their writing tasks.

The findings regarding students' habits in using generative AI demonstrated a high mean score ($M = 3.21$), suggesting that students actively used AI tools for generating ideas, improving grammar and vocabulary, paraphrasing sentences, and completing writing assignments. This finding reflects that generative AI has become part of students' writing routines and learning practices. Many students relied on AI particularly during brainstorming and revision stages because AI tools could provide immediate assistance and writing support. This finding corroborates studies conducted by Yang et al., (2025), and Kasneci et al. (2023), which found that AI-powered tools could facilitate writing development by improving grammatical accuracy, supporting idea generation, and helping students organize texts more effectively. In relation to TAM (Davis, 1989), students' active habits in using AI reflect perceived usefulness because students continuously used the technology after experiencing its benefits in writing activities. However, several students showed lower agreement regarding the use of AI for all writing assignments, indicating that students still considered the context and purpose of assignments before deciding to use AI tools.

The findings concerning the effects of generative AI on English writing obtained the highest mean score ($M = 3.25$) among all aspects. Most students agreed that AI helped them complete writing assignments more quickly, increased their confidence in writing English, and helped them learn from writing mistakes. These findings imply that generative AI not only functioned as a technical writing assistant but also contributed to students' confidence and learning development during writing activities. In EFL contexts, students often experience anxiety and lack confidence when writing in English. Therefore, AI-generated suggestions and instant feedback may help students feel more confident and motivated during the writing process. These findings are consistent with previous studies conducted by Shoufan (2023), and Yang et al., (2025) which emphasized that generative AI could improve writing productivity, learning efficiency, and students' motivation in language learning. In addition, these findings support Hyland's (2003) perspective that writing development requires both linguistic competence and idea organization, which may be supported through technological assistance. From the TAM perspective (Davis, 1989), students' positive

responses regarding the effects of AI further strengthen the argument that technologies perceived as beneficial are more likely to be accepted and continuously used in educational settings.

The findings regarding the challenges of using generative AI revealed that students were aware of several concerns related to dependency, reduced writing ability, information accuracy, and independent thinking. Although students generally showed positive attitudes toward AI, many respondents agreed that excessive use of AI might negatively affect students' independence in writing and thinking processes. This finding indicates that students recognized the potential risks of becoming overly dependent on AI-generated content. In addition, doubts regarding the accuracy of AI-generated information suggest that students did not completely trust AI outputs and still considered human evaluation necessary. These findings support previous studies conducted by Perkins (2023), and Kasneci et al. (2023), which highlighted concerns regarding academic integrity, plagiarism, reduced cognitive engagement, and overreliance on AI technologies. In relation to TAM (Davis, 1989), although students perceived AI as useful and easy to use, the findings indicate that technology acceptance does not eliminate users' awareness of the limitations and risks associated with AI use. Therefore, the integration of generative AI in EFL writing instruction should be balanced with activities that encourage critical thinking, creativity, and independent writing practices.

The findings of this study provide several pedagogical implications for stakeholders, teachers, and students regarding the integration of generative AI in EFL writing instruction. In general, the positive attitudes demonstrated by students indicate that generative AI has strong potential to support English writing learning activities in higher education contexts. However, the findings also showed that students were concerned about dependency and reduced independent thinking. Therefore, the implementation of AI in education should not only focus on technological adoption but also on responsible and balanced usage. For educational stakeholders, the findings imply the importance of establishing clear institutional policies and ethical guidelines regarding the use of generative AI in academic writing. Since AI tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, and QuillBot are increasingly accessible among students, educational institutions should provide regulations concerning academic honesty, plagiarism prevention, and responsible AI-assisted learning practices. These implications are supported by Perkins (2023), who emphasized that the rapid development of AI technologies presents challenges related to educational assessment and authorship authenticity. Furthermore, from the perspective of the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989), institutional support and accessibility may influence users' willingness to adopt technology effectively.

For teachers, the findings suggest that generative AI can be integrated as an instructional support tool in English writing classrooms. Teachers may use AI tools to facilitate brainstorming activities, provide writing feedback, support grammar correction exercises, and encourage students to revise their drafts independently. These findings align with studies conducted by Yang et al., (2025), and Shoufan (2023), which found that AI tools could improve students' writing performance and learning efficiency when integrated appropriately into educational practices. Nevertheless, teachers should also encourage critical thinking, creativity, and originality to prevent excessive dependence on AI-generated content. For students, the findings imply that generative AI can become an effective learning companion in improving English writing skills. AI tools may help students generate ideas, improve grammar and vocabulary, revise writing drafts, and increase confidence in completing writing assignments. These implications are consistent with studies conducted by Tlili et al. (2023) and Almassaad et al. (2024), which found that students benefited from AI technologies because of their practicality and efficiency. However, students should also maintain active engagement in the

writing process and avoid relying entirely on AI-generated responses. Instead, AI should be used as a supportive learning tool that enhances students' creativity, critical thinking, and writing competence.

This study has several limitations that should be considered. First, the study involved only 54 EFL students from one university in Indonesia using a convenience sampling technique. Therefore, the findings may not fully represent the attitudes of EFL students in different educational contexts. Second, this study focused specifically on students' attitudes, habits, perceived effects, and challenges regarding generative AI in English writing activities. Other variables, such as students' writing achievement, digital literacy, motivation, and teachers' perceptions, were not investigated in this study. In addition, this study employed a quantitative descriptive survey design, which mainly described students' responses without exploring deeper experiences related to AI use in writing activities. Therefore, future research is recommended to involve larger and more diverse participant groups from different educational institutions and contexts. Future studies may also employ mixed-method or qualitative approaches to obtain deeper insights into students' experiences and perceptions regarding generative AI in language learning. Furthermore, future researchers may investigate the long-term effects of generative AI on students' writing development, creativity, critical thinking skills, and academic integrity in EFL contexts.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that EFL students exhibit highly positive attitudes toward generative AI, viewing tools like ChatGPT, Grammarly, and QuillBot as useful, accessible, and practical resources for enhancing writing productivity, confidence, and grammatical proficiency. These active usage habits align directly with the core assumptions of the Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989). However, this acceptance is critically balanced by an acute awareness of key pedagogical challenges, specifically around psychological dependency, diminished independent thinking, and concerns over the baseline accuracy of AI content. Ultimately, while generative AI yields significant potential to streamline language acquisition and text production, educational institutions must implement deliberate pedagogical strategies that actively safeguard critical thinking and independent writing development.

DECLARATION OF AI AND AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES

The use of generative AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT) or other AI-supported technologies in the preparation of this manuscript must be disclosed by the authors. For instance, during the development of this work, DeepL (version 24.4.3) was employed to enhance linguistic accuracy and readability. All AI-assisted output was subsequently reviewed and revised by the authors, who assume full responsibility for the final content of the publication.

REFERENCES

- Almassaad, A., Alajlan, H., & Alebaikan, R. (2024). Student perceptions of generative artificial intelligence: Investigating utilization, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *Systems*, 12(10), 385. <https://doi.org/10.3390/systems12100385>
- Chyung, S. Y., Roberts, K., Swanson, I., & Hankinson, A. (2017). Evidence-based survey design: The use of a midpoint on the Likert scale. *Performance Improvement*, 56(10), 15–23. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pfi.21727>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th 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. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Eairheart, G. and Azimzadeh, R. (2025) The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on College Students' Education and Social Behavior. *Open Access Library Journal*, **12**, 1-11. doi: [10.4236/oalib.1112961](https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1112961).
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Getenet, S., Cantle, R., Redmond, P., & Albion, P. (2024). Students' digital technology attitude, literacy and self-efficacy and their effect on online learning engagement. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21(1), 3.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeiffer, F., 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, 102274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274>
- Liang, H., & Mao, X. (2025). Students' attitudes toward generative artificial intelligence in academic contexts: A multi-factor analysis. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 119, 103434. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2025.103434>
- Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual: A step-by-step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Perkins, M. (2023). Academic integrity considerations of AI-generated content. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.02.07>
- Scherer, R., Siddiq, F., & Tondeur, J. (2019). The technology acceptance model (TAM): A meta-analytic structural equation modeling approach. *Computers & Education*, 128, 13–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.09.009>
- Shoufan, A. (2023). Exploring students' perceptions of ChatGPT: Thematic analysis and follow-up survey. *IEEE access*, 11, 38805–38818. doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3268224
- Tlili, A., Shehata, B., Adarkwah, M. A., Bozkurt, A., Hickey, D. T., Huang, R., & Agyemang, B. (2023). What if the devil is my guardian angel: ChatGPT as a case study of using chatbots in education. *Smart Learning Environments*, 10(1), 15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00237-x>
- Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. *Management Science*, 46(2), 186–204. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.46.2.186.11926>
- Yang, C., Li, R., & Yang, L. (2025). Revisiting trends in GenAI-assisted second language writing: Retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 63(7-8), 1819-1863. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07356331251367309>