



Journal of Educational Sciences

Journal homepage: <https://jes.ejournal.unri.ac.id/index.php/JES>



P-ISSN
2581-1657

E-ISSN
2581-2203

Integration of AI GPTs in Writing Journal Article and Their Impact on Academic Writing Academy Participant's Perception

Azra Nur Izzati Aziz*, Moh. Nur Arifin, Kheryadi

English Department, Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin State Islamic University, Banten, 42118, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 15 Jan 2026

Revised: 06 April 2026

Accepted: 08 April 2026

Published online: 15 April 2026

Keywords:

AI, GPT,
Writing Journal,
Perception,
Impact

* Corresponding author:

E-mail: 211230108.azra@uinbanten.ac.id

Article Doi:

<https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.4.p.880-896>

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-
SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/) license.



ABSTRACT

This study examines students' perceptions of ChatGPT use in scientific journal writing following participation in the Academic Writing Academy at UIN Banten. The growing adoption of artificial intelligence in academic settings motivated this research, given its potential to improve writing efficiency while raising ethical and pedagogical concerns. A qualitative design was employed, utilizing open-ended questionnaires distributed to 15 students from various academic departments. Data were analyzed through thematic analysis to identify recurring patterns in student perceptions. Findings indicate that students generally regard AI as beneficial for enhancing textual coherence, enriching vocabulary, and reducing time spent on academic writing. These results align with previous studies affirming AI's role in supporting writing quality. Nevertheless, participants expressed concerns over diminished originality, excessive reliance on AI-generated content, and insufficient critical evaluation of such outputs. Overall, this study confirms that AI integration in academic writing presents both opportunities and challenges. While AI holds potential to boost student productivity, its use in educational contexts must be accompanied by the development of digital literacy, critical thinking, and academic ethical awareness. Educator guidance remains essential to ensure that AI serves as a supportive tool rather than a replacement for students' creativity and originality.

1. Introduction

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) has brought profound transformations across various sectors, particularly in higher education. Among the most significant developments is the emergence of Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT)-based AI systems, which enable human-machine interaction through the generation of natural and contextual text that emulates human thought processes and writing styles (Graham & Milan, 2025). In academic settings, GPT-

based AI tools such as ChatGPT are increasingly adopted by students, instructors, and researchers to comprehend material, organize ideas, and compose scientific papers, including journal articles (Anthony et al., 2025). This trend reflects a broader shift in academic culture, where technology serves not merely as a technical instrument but also as a cognitive partner in the writing process (Sharshova et al., 2025). In the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education, ChatGPT has been found to support students' grammar learning and academic writing through instant feedback and contextual explanations, fulfilling psychological needs for competence and autonomy in the learning process (Yusriani & Fithriani, 2025).

Academic writing has traditionally relied on individuals' capacity to organize ideas, think critically, and express arguments in structured scientific discourse. The integration of AI into this process has introduced new dynamics, as students now have access to tools that can accelerate drafting, improve grammar, enrich vocabulary, and enhance stylistic coherence (Ahme et al., 2024). Studies involving AI-based writing tools such as QuillBot have shown that EFL learners report increased self-confidence, reduced writing anxiety, and greater efficiency in paraphrasing and organizing sentences, indicating that AI tools function as effective cognitive and affective scaffolds in academic writing (Amara et al., 2025). Meanwhile, constructivist learning theory underscores that meaningful learning occurs through active engagement with tools and environments, suggesting that AI, when used reflectively, can support knowledge construction rather than replace it (Wibowo et al., 2025). According to the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), the adoption of AI in academic writing is shaped by students' perceptions of its usefulness and ease of use, which in turn influence their behavioral intentions and actual usage patterns (Ma & Liu, 2011).

Previous studies have documented both the benefits and limitations of AI integration in academic writing and language learning. Teng (2024) noted that students who use AI tools report greater confidence in producing standardized academic work and experience more systematic idea development. These findings are consistent with constructivist principles, which frame learning as an active process shaped by interaction between individuals and their environment. In the Indonesian vocational education context, research has found that EFL teachers adopt AI to improve teaching efficiency but face significant barriers including inadequate infrastructure, limited digital literacy, and ethical concerns around academic integrity and student autonomy (Septiani et al., 2025). Similarly, empirical evidence from Indonesian higher education demonstrates that AI usage through tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, and programming assistants has a positive and significant influence on both learning motivation and task independence among students, driven by ease of information access, real-time feedback, and personalized learning experiences (Pratama & Ekarini, 2025).

However, the literature also highlights significant concerns. Luther et al. (2024) identified risks including loss of originality, unintentional plagiarism, and excessive reliance on AI, which may gradually erode students' critical thinking capacities. Dwivedi et al. (2023) further emphasized the ethical and academic integrity challenges associated with AI use, warning that over-dependence on automated

systems could diminish intellectual independence among students. In the framework of critical thinking theory, these concerns point to the necessity of maintaining a balance between leveraging AI capabilities and cultivating students' evaluative and reflective competencies (Bretag et al., 2011). Research analyzing AI-generated text in language learning has also shown that while generative AI tools like DeepSeek support paragraph pattern development, differences in structure still emerge between AI-assisted and independently produced writing, underscoring the continued importance of human authorship (Ravellia et al., 2025).

The ethical discourse surrounding AI in education has also intensified among institutional stakeholders. Universities are increasingly confronted with the challenge of balancing technological innovation and academic integrity (Cotton et al., 2024). As a response, many institutions have begun developing AI literacy frameworks, workshop programs, and policy guidelines to ensure responsible usage (Mun, 2024). AI literacy, defined as the capacity to critically interpret, evaluate, and apply AI outputs responsibly, is now recognized as an essential competency for contemporary academic writers (Fuchs & Aguilos, 2023). Studies have shown that AI-based teaching materials, developed through applications such as the Teachy App, demonstrate high validity, practicality, and effectiveness in supporting student learning outcomes, suggesting that when properly designed and implemented, AI-based instructional tools can significantly enhance educational quality (Rahayu et al., 2025). Furthermore, research conducted in the context of education in disadvantaged regions of Indonesia confirms that AI integration into platform-based learning yields significant benefits including personalized learning, automated assessments, and inclusive learning environments, though success remains contingent on adequate digital infrastructure and continuous professional development (Sahputra et al., 2025).

In parallel, the role of educators is undergoing significant transformation. Lecturers are increasingly required to act not only as evaluators of written output but as facilitators who guide students in critically engaging with AI-generated content (Nguyen & Bich Dieu, 2024). This pedagogical shift demands instructional agility, where educators balance technological integration with explicit instruction in academic reasoning, argumentation, and source evaluation (Raad et al., 2023). As academic writing becomes a hybrid process involving both human cognition and AI augmentation, teaching strategies must evolve to cultivate intellectual independence and ethical awareness among students. Evidence from Indonesian secondary school settings further confirms that AI-based learning models simultaneously improve students' motivation and learning interest, with particularly notable results across personalization, exploration, and immediate feedback dimensions (Kurniawan et al., 2026).

Despite the growing body of literature on AI in education, empirical studies focusing specifically on students' perceptions within structured academic writing training contexts remain limited, particularly in the Indonesian higher education setting. Most existing research has been conducted in Western academic environments, leaving a gap in understanding how students in developing countries perceive and respond to AI integration in their writing practices. Furthermore, few

studies have examined students' perceptions immediately following participation in structured training programs, such as academic writing academies, which offer a controlled context for observing how guided exposure to AI tools shapes student attitudes, concerns, and behavioral intentions.

This study addresses that gap by investigating students' perceptions of ChatGPT use in scientific journal writing among participants of the Academic Writing Academy at UIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten. By employing a qualitative approach grounded in thematic analysis, this study captures the nuanced views of students regarding the benefits, challenges, and ethical implications of AI-assisted academic writing. The findings are expected to contribute to the existing literature on AI integration in higher education and to provide practical insights for developing more adaptive and ethically grounded pedagogical strategies.

2. Methodology

Design

The strategy used for this study was qualitative with a descriptive subtype. These methods are ideal for this study because they allow for the collection of rich research data through open-ended questionnaires from a diverse set of respondents (Bazen et al., 2021). The data is then condensed into a narrative form, offering a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the subject matter. Presenting the results in narrative or descriptive form allows the author to offer a personal perspective on the conclusions drawn from the collected data. This approach allows for a more thorough exploration of phenomena related to AI usage.

Participant

Researchers randomly selected 15 participants from the 2024 Academic Writing Academy. All participants in this study were from UIN Banten University. Of these participants, four were male and eleven were female. The participants were in their fourth to eighth semesters and were randomly selected. Their English proficiency levels varied, but most were at beginner or early intermediate levels. All were learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Participants of the research

No	Participants' Department	Occupation	Number of Participants
1	English	Students	8
2	Arabic Language and Literature	Students	3
3	Islamic Elementary School Teacher Education	Students	3
4	Library and Information Science	Students	1

Instrument

During the data collection process, the researcher used a questionnaire to gather responses to inquiries relevant to the research topic (Sharma & Ruikar, 2025). To

facilitate comprehension and ensure accurate responses, the researcher used Indonesian to formulate the questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into five sections, with the fourth and fifth sections containing crucial questions that would lead to conclusions about the research data.

The researcher organized the questions into subsections to ensure that respondents would not be overwhelmed by a single, lengthy page. The first sub-section was designed to provide an introduction and background on the creation and distribution of the questionnaire. The second sub-section was populated with respondents' personal information. The third subchapter comprises inquiries about the clarity of the aforementioned statement and whether the respondents meet the specified criteria or have participated in writing training. The fourth subchapter begins with pivotal questions about the title, specifically the respondents' perceptions of the research topic. The fifth subchapter presents respondents' suggestions and reflections on the research topic. Then, the questions are sent to the respondents via Google Forms. The researcher will then observe the data collected from each respondent's answers and initiate the analysis process.

The fundamental questions in subsections four and five are designed to determine how respondents perceive the integration of AI GPT in journal article composition and its subsequent impact. After providing their perceptions in subsection five, respondents are asked to share their suggestions and expectations about the research topic. Given the relevance of AI utilization for writing to the research topic, it is imperative to ascertain its impact by obtaining the views or perceptions of individuals who frequently use AI for writing. This approach ensures that the answers obtained align with the research objectives. Table 2 below shows the contains questions for each sub-chapter.

Table 2. List of Question

No	Questions
1.	What aspects or types of information do you typically seek when using ChatGPT in the process of writing a journal article?
2.	How frequently do you use AI GPT for academic writing purposes?
3.	In your opinion, does the use of AI GPT enhance the quality of your academic writing?
4.	Do you feel more confident in writing journal articles after using AI GPT?
5.	Do you believe that the use of AI GPT may reduce the originality of your academic writing?
6.	In your view, to what degree can AI GPT replace the role of the author in producing academic journals?
7.	Do you have ethical concerns regarding the use of AI GPT in academic writing (e.g., plagiarism, data manipulation, etc.)?
8.	What do you consider to be the main advantages of using AI GPT in the context of academic writing? (essay question)
9.	What concerns or challenges do you experience when using AI GPT for academic writing? (essay question)
10.	What are your expectations regarding the integration of AI in future academic activities? (essay question)

Data analysis technique

Data analysis techniques are systematic approaches used to gather information and help researchers draw conclusions (Ali Khan et al., 2023; Imran & Almusharraf, 2023). This process involves the structured collection and examination of data obtained from questionnaires and other sources. The data are then presented in a clear manner to ensure comprehensibility and facilitate communication of the findings to relevant stakeholders. Data analysis encompasses three interrelated activities: data reduction, data display, and drawing and verifying conclusions. Data reduction is an ongoing process that involves selecting, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming raw data from field notes. After this step, the reduced data are displayed using tables, diagrams, and other visual tools to organize and convey information. The final step is to draw conclusions based on the systematically reduced and presented data.

3. Results and Discussion

The research yielded responses from fifteen participants who completed the distributed questionnaires. The subsequent section outlines the findings derived from these responses. Of the five sub-sections, only ten questions were related to the research title. The rest were personal data of the respondents. The following is an explanation of the questions and the respondents' answers.

Results

1. What aspects or types of information do you typically seek when using ChatGPT in the process of writing a journal article? (translated into a more appropriate language)

To identify the primary aspects of ChatGPT utilization in academic writing, respondents were asked about the types of information they typically seek when using ChatGPT during the journal-writing process. The distribution of responses is presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Additional information on the diagram from the question “What aspects or types of information do you typically seek when using ChatGPT in the process of writing a journal article?”

Using ChatGPT AI to Write Journal Articles	Percentage	Number of respondents
As a tool to help find ideas and topics	100%	15
Helps compose sentences and paragraphs	46.7%	7
Helps improve grammar and writing style	26.7%	4
Can write almost the entire content	0%	0
Others	0%	0

As shown in the table above, all 15 respondents answered that they use ChatGPT, an AI tool, to help find ideas when writing journal articles. Seven people answered that ChatGPT helps them construct sentences and paragraphs. Four respondents said it helps them improve their grammar and writing style. All 15 respondents (100%) indicated that they use ChatGPT primarily as a tool to help find and develop ideas when writing journal articles. Seven respondents (46.7%) also reported using it to compose sentences and paragraphs, while four (26.7%) used it to improve grammar and writing style. Notably, none of the respondents selected the option that AI "can write almost the entire content," suggesting that students are conscious of maintaining authorial agency.

2. How frequently do you use AI GPT for academic writing purposes?

To determine the frequency of AI GPT usage for academic writing purposes, respondents were asked how often they use AI tools in their writing activities. The response distribution is shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Additional information on the diagram from the question "How often do you use AI GPT for academic writing purposes?"

Color	Color Meaning	Percentage	Number of Respondents
Blue	Very Often	6.7%	1
Red	Quite Often	33.3%	5
Yellow	Often	13.3%	2
Green	Sometimes	46.7%	7
Purple	Never	0%	0

As illustrated in the above table 4, it is evident that a total of 15 individuals, constituting the entire sample of respondents, have indicated that they employ AI ChatGPT as a tool to assist in the generation of ideas while drafting journal articles. Seven respondents indicated that it facilitates the construction of sentences and paragraphs. Four respondents indicated that it has contributed to their enhancement of grammar and writing style.

The aforementioned inquiry is of the checkbox variety, presenting a quartet of options, with participants permitted to select multiple answers. In their essay responses, participants elaborated on these benefits in ways that reveal a nuanced understanding of AI's supportive role. Several respondents described ChatGPT as a starting point rather than a final product. For instance, one participant stated that ChatGPT helps when they are "stuck at the beginning" and cannot determine how to frame their argument, while another noted that it helps "translate vague ideas into structured sentences." These responses suggest that students perceive AI primarily as a cognitive scaffold a tool that supports the early stages of the writing process without taking over the intellectual responsibility of authorship.

3. In your opinion, does the use of AI GPT enhance the quality of your academic writing?

To assess respondents' perceptions regarding whether AI GPT improves the quality of academic writing, participants were asked to evaluate the usefulness of AI GPT in enhancing their writing quality. The distribution of responses is presented in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Additional information on the diagram from the question "In your opinion, does the use of AI GPT enhance the quality of your academic writing?"

Code number	Code meaning	Percentage	Number of Respondents
2	Unhelpful	6.7%	1
3	Moderately helpful	26.7%	4
4	Helpful	33.3%	5
5	Very helpful	33.3%	5

As illustrated in the table 5, one respondent indicated that it was not helpful, four respondents indicated that it was Moderately helpful, five respondents indicated that using AI could help them improve the quality of their academic writing, and five respondents indicated that it was very helpful. This question is included in subchapter 4, where respondents were asked to provide their perceptions regarding the research title. The summary of respondent data in this question is presented in the form of a bar chart because the question is in a linear scale format. The scale ranges from 1 to 5, with 1 representing "not helpful at all" and 5 representing "very helpful."

Regarding writing quality, 33.3% of respondents rated ChatGPT as "helpful" and another 33.3% as "very helpful" in enhancing the quality of their academic writing. Only one respondent (6.7%) indicated it was "unhelpful." These quantitative patterns are reinforced by qualitative accounts in which participants described improvements in textual coherence, clarity of argumentation, and vocabulary richness after using ChatGPT.

4. Do you feel more confident in writing journal articles after using AI GPT?

The question format employed in this instance is a linear scale, with the data summary presented in the form of a bar chart. The respondents were asked to choose a scale ranging from 1 to 5, with 1 representing "strongly disagree" and 5 representing "strongly agree." The responses obtained are as follows Table 6:

Table 6. Additional information on the diagram from the question "Do you feel more confident in writing journal articles after using AI GPT?"

Code number	Code meaning	Percentage	Number of Respondents
2	Disagree	33.3%	5
3	Neutral	40%	6
4	Agree	13.3%	2
5	Strongly agree	13.3%	2

The data presented in the table 6 as tabular format indicate that five respondents indicated a response of "disagree," six indicated a response of "neutral," two respondents indicated a response of "agree," and two respondents indicated a

response of "strongly agree." A substantial majority of respondents (80%, n=12) acknowledged having ethical concerns about using AI in academic writing, particularly related to plagiarism and data manipulation. This finding was echoed in essay responses, where participants expressed awareness that AI-generated content may not always reflect their original thinking. One respondent noted that "the words may sound good, but they are not really mine," while another expressed concern that "ChatGPT sometimes gives information without clear sources, which is risky for academic credibility."

5. Do you believe that the use of AI GPT may reduce the originality of your academic writing?

To investigate respondents' perceptions regarding the impact of AI GPT on writing originality, participants were asked whether they believe the use of AI GPT may reduce the originality of their academic writing. The results are displayed in Table 7 below.

Tabel 7. Additional information on the diagram from the question "Do you believe that the use of AI GPT may reduce the originality of your academic writing?"

Code number	Code meaning	Percentage	Number of Respondents
1	Strongly disagree	6.7%	1
2	Disagree	26.7%	4
3	Neutral	13.3%	2
4	Agree	33.3%	5
5	Strongly agree	20%	3

Based on the table 7. It can be seen that 1 respondent said strongly disagree on this question, 4 answered disagree, 2 answered neutrally, 5 answered disagree, and 3 answered strongly agree. When asked whether AI use may reduce originality, 33.3% agreed and 20% strongly agreed, while only a small portion disagreed. These figures indicate that students are not uncritical consumers of AI outputs; rather, they actively reflect on the tension between convenience and scholarly authenticity. Essay responses further revealed that participants felt pressured to verify AI-generated information against credible sources, indicating an emerging practice of critical cross-referencing even among undergraduate-level writers.

6. In your view, to what extent can AI GPT replace the role of the author in producing academic journals?

To explore respondents' perspectives on the extent to which AI GPT can replace the role of authors in producing academic journals, participants were asked to evaluate their views regarding this issue. The distribution of responses is presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Additional information on the diagram from the question “In your view, to what extent can AI GPT replace the role of the author in producing academic journals?”

Color code	Meaning	Percentage	Number of Respondents
Blue	AI can completely replace the author's role in compiling journal articles	0%	0
Red	AI can mostly replace the author's role in compiling journal articles	13.3%	2
Yellow	AI can partially replace the author's role in compiling journal articles	66.7%	10
Green	AI cannot replace the author's role in compiling journal articles at all	13.3%	2
Purple	Another answer written by respondent. It shows that the respondent says AI plays a small role in writing but not to replace it, but to find an idea that is being discussed to be developed into research	6.7%	1

Seen below show in the table 8, the diagram above is a pie chart with the results showing that there are 66.7% of the yellow part of the circle or in other words, there are 10 people who agree that AI can partially replace the role of the author in producing a journal article. The green part with 13.3% or 2 out of 15 respondents chose the option that AI cannot replace the role of writers in compiling journal articles at all. The red part of the circle with the same percentage as green, namely 13.3% and 2 out of 15 respondents chose the option that AI can mostly replace the role of writers in compiling journal articles. The smallest part of the circle which is 6.7% marked in purple has 1 with the meaning Another answer written by respondent. It shows that the respondent says AI plays a small role in writing but not replacing, but to find an idea that is being discussed to be developed into research. And 0 answers with the AI option can replace the entire role of the writer in compiling journal articles.

7. Do you have ethical concerns regarding the use of AI GPT in academic writing (e.g., plagiarism, data manipulation, etc.)?

It can be seen that there are 80% or 12 people who answered that they have ethical concerns in using AI GPT for academic writing such as plagiarism and data manipulation. Then there were 13.3% or 2 people answered that they were not sure and 1 person stated that they had no ethical concerns about using AI GPT for academic writing. Despite recognizing AI's technical benefits, the majority of respondents did not report increased confidence in writing. Forty percent indicated a "neutral" response, and 33.3% "disagreed" that ChatGPT had made them more confident. Only 13.3% agreed and 13.3% strongly agreed. In essay responses, participants articulated a nuanced distinction between ease of writing and actual competence. One respondent explained that "ChatGPT makes the process faster, but I am still not sure whether what I write is truly good," while another stated that "using AI sometimes makes me feel like I did not really write the article myself."

8. What do you consider to be the main advantages of using AI GPT in the context of academic writing? (Essay Questions)

Given the nature of the essay question, the utilization of diagrams or tables is not permissible. The total number of responses to this essay question is 15. The respondents indicated that the advantages of AI facilitated the process of conceiving and developing ideas. A more comprehensive discussion of this topic can be found in the section designated for discussion.

9. What concerns or challenges do you experience when using AI GPT for academic writing? (Essay Questions)

The inquiry posed was articulated in the form of an essay. The respondents provided answers, and the content varied. However, a general consensus emerged among the respondents regarding the credibility of the data produced by AI. For instance, considerations such as congruence with the prevailing context, the enumeration of sources, and other pertinent factors must be taken into account. A more comprehensive description of this phenomenon will be provided in the discussion section.

10. What are your expectations regarding the integration of AI in future academic activities? (Essay Questions)

This inquiry constitutes the final question, which is posed in the form of an essay. The respondents offered a range of perspectives, reflecting the diversity of opinions held. The prevailing response indicates that respondents anticipate that advancements in artificial intelligence and their own intellectual aptitude will enhance the efficacy with which technology is utilized. Regarding AI's potential to replace the author's role, the majority (66.7%) believed AI can only partially replace the author, and 13.3% believed it cannot replace the author at all. One respondent offered a particularly reflective comment, noting that "AI is useful for finding the direction of an idea, but the depth of the argument must come from the writer." These qualitative insights demonstrate that students maintain a clear boundary between AI assistance and intellectual ownership.

Discussion

The findings of this study reveal a complex and layered set of perceptions toward ChatGPT among students who participated in a structured academic writing training program. Rather than viewing AI as either purely beneficial or entirely problematic, respondents demonstrated a critical awareness of both its affordances and its risks a stance that warrants deeper theoretical and pedagogical analysis. The near-unanimous use of ChatGPT for idea generation (100%) reflects what constructivist theorists describe as the use of cognitive tools to scaffold knowledge construction (Wibowo et al., 2025). In this view, ChatGPT functions similarly to brainstorming frameworks or concept maps external structures that help learners externalize and organize their thinking. This finding is consistent with Shakeel (2024), who identified AI as a cognitive facilitator in scientific writing. However,

the present study adds nuance by revealing that this facilitative role is most valued at the ideation stage, not during the critical analysis or argumentation phases. This distinction is important: it suggests that students are selectively integrating AI into their writing process rather than wholesale delegating authorship, which is a more sophisticated and academically responsible form of AI use than often assumed in the literature.

The disconnect between perceived technical improvement and increased confidence is one of the most theoretically significant findings of this study. While the majority of respondents acknowledged that ChatGPT improved the quality of their writing, most did not feel more confident as writers as a result. This paradox can be explained through the lens of self-efficacy theory (Bouzar et al, 2024): confidence in writing is built through the experience of successfully completing a writing task through one's own effort and judgment. When AI mediates that process, students may question whether the quality they observe in their output reflects their own competence or the machine's capability. This finding differs from Teng (2024), who reported increased confidence among AI users, possibly because Teng's sample had more experienced academic writers who were better positioned to integrate AI outputs critically. The present study, involving undergraduate students relatively new to journal writing, suggests that AI may temporarily enhance output quality without building the internal sense of competence that sustained academic development requires.

The high prevalence of ethical concern (80%) among respondents is consistent with the warnings raised by Dwivedi et al. (2023) and Luther et al. (2024) regarding academic integrity risks. However, the current study extends these findings by revealing the specific mechanism through which ethical concern shapes behavior: rather than deterring AI use altogether, ethical awareness appears to prompt students toward verification practices cross-checking AI-generated content against credible sources and questioning the provenance of AI outputs. This finding aligns with AI literacy frameworks proposed by Fuchs & Aguilos (2023), which emphasize critical evaluation as a core competency. What distinguishes this study from prior literature is the observation that ethical awareness and AI adoption coexist rather than conflict students use AI while simultaneously developing a critical stance toward it, a pattern that suggests the Academic Writing Academy may have contributed to more reflective AI engagement.

The concern about diminished originality, expressed by over half of the respondents, reflects a deeper epistemological anxiety about authorship and intellectual identity in the age of generative AI. Lund et al. (2023) similarly documented concerns about authenticity in AI-assisted writing, but the present study adds a qualitative dimension by illustrating how students articulate the felt experience of this concern describing a sense of alienation from their own texts when AI mediates the writing process too heavily. This is particularly relevant from a pedagogical standpoint: if students feel disconnected from their writing, the formative value of the writing process as a tool for developing disciplinary thinking is compromised. Educators must therefore be attentive not only to the products

students submit but also to the processes through which those products are generated.

From a TAM perspective (Ma & Liu, 2011), the variability in usage frequency ranging from "sometimes" (46.7%) to "very often" (6.7%) suggests that while perceived usefulness is broadly acknowledged, actual behavioral adoption remains moderate and selective. This pattern may indicate that students are calibrating their use of AI in response to both task demands and ethical considerations, rather than adopting it indiscriminately. This selective adoption is pedagogically promising, as it implies that structured training environments like the Academic Writing Academy can shape more deliberate and responsible AI use patterns among students.

Overall, the findings underscore that the integration of Chat GPT in academic writing is neither uniformly beneficial nor uniformly harmful, but is mediated by students' critical awareness, ethical sensitivity, and the quality of instructional guidance they receive. The implication for higher education is clear: AI literacy must be embedded within academic writing curricula not as an optional add-on, but as a foundational competency that enables students to harness AI's cognitive affordances while preserving the intellectual integrity and creative ownership that define scholarly work.

4. Conclusion

This study explores undergraduate students' perceptions of the use of GPT-based AI, specifically ChatGPT, in writing scientific journal articles after participating in the Academic Writing Academy at UIN Banten. The present study involved 15 students from various departments and used an open-ended questionnaire. The study's results revealed three main conclusions that were in line with the research questions. First, students regard ChatGPT as a substantial instrument in the writing process. The findings of the study indicate that students employ ChatGPT to develop ideas, construct sentences, and enhance their language style, thereby ensuring that their writing aligns more closely with academic standards. The most significant impacts of this approach are the ease of writing journal articles, increased coherence, and time savings.

These findings corroborate earlier research, which has demonstrated that AI can enhance writers' confidence and improve the quality of their text, particularly for non-native English speakers. Secondly, the study underscores the challenges and limitations encountered by students. While ChatGPT offers a technological solution, some respondents have expressed concerns regarding the potential loss of originality, the tendency to rely on technology, and the limitations of critical thinking skills in evaluating AI output. This indicates that the integration of AI in education carries potential risks, as highlighted by (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Amara et al., 2025), who underscore the concerns regarding threats to ethics and academic integrity.

Thirdly, this study underscores the significance of the ethical dimension in the utilization of AI. Students are cognizant of the ethical dilemmas associated with plagiarism, intellectual property, and academic integrity. Consequently, the integration of AI in educational settings necessitates the implementation of pedagogical strategies that are designed to equip students with not only technical writing skills but also an understanding of academic ethics, digital literacy, and critical thinking skills.

The present study corroborates the notion that the incorporation of artificial intelligence in academic writing is a double-edged sword, offering both opportunities and challenges. On the one hand, artificial intelligence (AI) has the potential to serve as an effective tool, assisting students in navigating the intricacies of scientific writing. On the other hand, its integration into academic processes necessitates the establishment of explicit institutional policies and the supervision of faculty members to ensure its responsible use. This study provides a foundation for further research by expanding the number of respondents, applying triangulation methods, and comparing contexts across universities and countries to enrich our understanding of the role of AI in academic writing.

It is recommended that lecturers and writing instructors adopt a more proactive approach in promoting the judicious utilization of AI. It is imperative to dispel the notion of AI as a mere substitute for writers. Instead, AI should be regarded as an invaluable learning partner that assists students in achieving a harmonious balance between artificial intelligence and personal reflection, creativity, and originality. Consequently, the integration of AI within higher education can enhance the quality of academic learning while preserving the integrity of scientific writing.

References

- Ahme, Z., Shanto, S. S., & Jony, A. I. (2024). Potentiality of Generative AI Tools in Higher Education: Evaluating ChatGPT's Viability as a Teaching Assistant for Introductory Programming Courses. *STEM Education*, 4(3), 165–182. <https://doi.org/10.3934/steme.2024011>
- Ali Khan, J., Raman, A. M., Sambamoorthy, N., & Prashanth, K. (2023). *Research Methodology (Methods, Approaches and Techniques)*. <https://doi.org/10.59646/rmmethods/040>
- Amara, R., Rahmah, L. S., & Ruswandi, R. (2025). The University EFL Students' Perceptions of QuillBot as an AI-Based Tool for Enhancing Paraphrasing Skills and Academic Writing in English. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9(5), 4298–4307. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.9.5.p.4298-4307>
- Anthony, A., Sharma, S., & Colleagues. (2025). Is ChatGPT the Future of Academic Writing? A Sequential Explanatory Study to Explore Generative Conversational AI as an Academic Writing Support Tool. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02704676251353105>
- Bazen, A., Barg, F. K., & Takeshita, J. (2021). Research Techniques Made Simple: An Introduction to Qualitative Research. *Journal of Investigative*
-

-
- Dermatology*, 141(2), 241–247. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jid.2020.11.029>
- Bouzar, A., EL Idrissi, K., & Ghourdou, T. (2024). ChatGPT and Academic Writing Self-Efficacy: Unveiling Correlations and Technological Dependency among Postgraduate Students. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on ChatGPT*, 225–236. <https://awej.org/chatgpt-and-academic-writing-self-efficacy-unveiling-correlations-and-technological-dependency-among-postgraduate-students/>
- Bretag, T., East, J., & James, C. (2011). Academic Integrity Standards: A Preliminary Analysis of the Academic Integrity Policies at Australian Universities. *ResearchGate*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269913471>
- Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). Chatting and Cheating: Ensuring Academic Integrity in the Era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61(2), 228–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>
- Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., Baabdullah, A. M., Koochang, A., Raghavan, V., Ahuja, M., Albanna, H., Albashrawi, M. A., Al-Busaidi, A. S., Balakrishnan, J., Barlette, Y., Basu, S., Bose, I., Brooks, L., Buhalis, D., ... Wright, R. (2023). Opinion Paper: "So What if ChatGPT Wrote It?" Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Opportunities, Challenges and Implications of Generative Conversational AI for Research, Practice and Policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, 71, 102642. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642>
- Fuchs, K., & Aguilos, V. (2023). Integrating Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: Empirical Insights from Students about Using ChatGPT. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 13(9), 1365–1371. <https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2023.13.9.1939>
- Imran, M., & Almusharraf, N. (2023). Analyzing the Role of ChatGPT as a Writing Assistant at Higher Education Level: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 15(4), ep464. <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13605>
- Kurniawan, Y. D., Sucipto, & Tobing, V. M. T. L. (2026). The Effect of Artificial Intelligence (AI)-Based Learning Models on Students' Motivation and Learning Interests (Case Study at SMA Negeri 2 Tabang Kutai Kartanegara). *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10(1), 1508–1521. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.1.p.1508-1521>
- Lund, B. D., Wang, T., Mannuru, N. R., Nie, B., Shimray, S., & Wang, Z. (2023). ChatGPT and a New Academic Reality: Artificial Intelligence-Written Research Papers and the Ethics of the Large Language Models in Scholarly Publishing. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 74(5), 570–581. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24750>
- Luther, T., Kimmerle, J., & Cress, U. (2024). Teaming Up with an AI: Exploring Human–AI Collaboration in a Writing Scenario with ChatGPT. *AI (Switzerland)*, 5(3), 1357–1376. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ai5030065>
- Ma, Q., & Liu, L. (2011). The Technology Acceptance Model. In *Advanced Topics in End User Computing, Volume 4*. IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/9781591404743.ch006.ch000>
- Mun, C. (2024). EFL Learners' English Writing Feedback and Their Perception of
-

-
- Using ChatGPT. *STEM Journal*, 25(2), 26–39. <https://doi.org/10.16875/stem.2024.25.2.26>
- Nguyen, P. H., & Bich Dieu, N. (2024). An Investigation into Third-Year ELT Students' Perceptions of Using ChatGPT as an AI Writing-Assistant Tool: A Case Study in Vietnam. *International Journal of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences Studies*, 9(5), 41–54. www.ijahss.com
- Pratama, F. R. R., & Ekarini, F. (2025). The Influence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Use on Learning Motivation and Task Independence among PTIK Students at Semarang State University. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9(5), 3412–3423. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.9.5.p.3412-3423>
- Raad, B., Anjum, F., & Ghafar, Z. N. (2023). Exploring the Profound Impact of Artificial Intelligence Applications (Quillbot, Grammarly and ChatGPT) on English Academic Writing: A Systematic Review. *International Journal of Integrative Research (IJIR)*, 1(10), 622. <https://doi.org/10.59890/ijir.v1i10.366>
- Rahayu, S., Hakim, A. R., & Fitrianiingsih, N. (2025). Development of Teaching Materials Using AI-Based Teachy App at Pela Elementary School. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9(5), 3788–3799. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.9.5.p.3788-3799>
- Ravellia, R., Nirmalasari, Y., & Airlinda, A. D. (2025). Analysis of the Use of DeepSeek in Paragraph Patterns in Chinese Learning. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9(4), 2895–2905. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.9.4.p.2895-2905>
- Sahputra, D., Sari, S. M., & Syarfuni. (2025). Utilization of AI in Platform-Based Learning to Improve the Quality of Education in Banda Aceh. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9(5), 4461–4470. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.9.5.p.4461-4470>
- Septiani, R. P., Nugraha, S. I., & Ambarwati, E. K. (2025). Exploring AI-Driven Language Teaching for English as a Foreign Language Teachers in Vocational High School in Karawang. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9(4), 2073–2084. <https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.9.4.p.2073-2084>
- Sharma, H., & Ruikar, M. (2025). Crafting an Effective Questionnaire: An Essential Prerequisite of Engaging Surveys. *Perspectives in Clinical Research*, 16(3), 118–126. https://doi.org/10.4103/picr.picr_157_24
- Sharshova, R., Salkhanova, Z., Yelubayeva, P., Maral, A., Sholakhova, A., & Ainur, K. (2025). The Use of AI Writing Tools in Second Language Learning to Enhance Kazakh IT Students' Academic Writing Skills. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(8). <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i8.10408>
- Teng, M. F. (2024). A Systematic Review of ChatGPT for English as a Foreign Language Writing: Opportunities, Challenges, and Recommendations. *International Journal of TESOL Studies*, 6(3), 36–57. <https://doi.org/10.58304/ijts.20240304>
- Wibowo, S., Wangid, M. N., & Firdaus, F. M. (2025). The Relevance of Vygotsky's Constructivism Learning Theory with the Differentiated Learning Primary Schools. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 19(1), 431–440. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v19i1.21197>
- Yusriani, & Fithriani, R. (2025). Exploring English Language Learning via ChatGPT: A Case Study from a Self-Determination Theory Perspective.
-

Journal of Educational Sciences, 9(4), 3064–3076.
<https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.9.4.p.3064-3076>

How to cite this article:

Aziz, A. N. I., Arifin, M. N., & Kheryadi. (2026). Integration of AI GPTs in Writing Journal Article and Their Impact on Academic Writing Academy Participant's Perception. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10(4), 880-896.
