

<https://research.adra.ac.id/index.php/ijlul/>

P - ISSN: 3026-7102

E - ISSN: 3030-8372

Integrating Generative AI (e.g., ChatGPT) as a Collaborative Writing Partner in an Academic English Course: A Pedagogical Study

Iin Almeina¹ , Ava Lee² , Marcus Tan³ ,
Rustiyana⁴ 

¹Universitas Royal, Indonesia

²Nanyang Technological University (NTU), Singapore

³Duke-NUS Medical School, Singapore

⁴Universitas Bale Bandung, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Background. Traditional writing instruction often struggles to provide continuous feedback, individualized support, and opportunities for iterative revision, leading to gaps in students' development of critical thinking and academic discourse skills. Generative

Purpose. This study investigates the pedagogical impact of integrating ChatGPT as a collaborative writing partner in an Academic English course.

Method. Employing a mixed-methods design, the study involved 36 university students who participated in a six-week intervention consisting of guided writing tasks, AI-supported drafting sessions, and reflective activities.

Results. The findings indicate noticeable improvements in coherence, lexical precision, and argumentative structure, accompanied by increased student confidence and metacognitive engagement. Participants viewed ChatGPT as a supportive partner that enhanced idea generation and revision processes, although concerns regarding overreliance and critical evaluation emerged.

Conclusion. The study concludes that generative AI can serve as an effective pedagogical tool when integrated with explicit instruction and human guidance.

KEYWORDS

Academic English, Collaborative Writing, Generative AI

Citation: Almeina, I., Lee, A., Tan, M & Rustiyana, Rustiyana. (2025). Integrating Generative AI (e.g., ChatGPT) as a Collaborative Writing Partner in an Academic English Course: A Pedagogical Study. *International Journal of Language and Ubiquitous Learning*, 3(3), 146–156.

<https://doi.org/10.70177/ijlul.v3i3.2845>

Correspondence:

Iin Almeina,
lubisiinalmeina@gmail.com

Received: Jan 2, 2025

Accepted: March 1, 2025

Published: June 6, 2025

INTRODUCTION

Generative artificial intelligence has rapidly transformed the landscape of higher education, particularly in domains requiring intensive reading and writing. Tools such as ChatGPT provide instant language processing, text generation, and revision support, features that have traditionally required substantial human time and expertise (Siau & Nah, 2025, 2025). These capabilities have positioned generative AI as a promising pedagogical resource for writing instruction. Academic English courses serve as foundational components of university curricula, yet students often struggle with critical elements such as argumentation, coherence, lexical precision, and academic tone. Limited classroom time and large student cohorts frequently reduce opportunities for individualized feedback



Students frequently report difficulty progressing beyond initial drafts due to a lack of immediate guidance.

Generative AI offers potential solutions to these challenges by serving as a collaborative writing partner capable of providing personalized feedback in real time. AI models can generate alternative phrasing, examples, outlines, and explanations of grammatical or rhetorical principles. These functions align with the principles of scaffolded learning and cognitive apprenticeship widely emphasized in educational research (Kim & Lee, 2025; R. Li, 2024a). Studies in computer-assisted language learning (CALL) have demonstrated the value of automated support tools for improving linguistic accuracy and learner autonomy. Earlier technologies such as grammar checkers and automated essay scoring systems laid the groundwork by showing that digital tools can meaningfully contribute to writing development. Generative AI extends these possibilities by offering interactive dialogue rather than static correction.

Student attitudes toward digital writing support tools have generally been positive when the tools enhance clarity, reduce anxiety, and provide structured guidance. Learners report increased confidence when they can revise drafts iteratively and test ideas with a nonjudgmental system. These affective benefits make generative AI particularly attractive for novice academic writers. The growth of AI literacy initiatives in education reflects a broader consensus that students need to learn how to engage responsibly and critically with generative technologies. Academic institutions increasingly recognize the need to integrate AI tools into coursework in ways that promote ethical use, transparency, and the development of independent writing competence (Güner & Er, 2025; Muse, 2025).

Empirical evidence on how generative AI functions specifically as a collaborative writing partner in Academic English contexts remains limited. Existing studies tend to focus on AI's linguistic accuracy or potential risks rather than its pedagogical role in shaping writing development through iterative dialogue. The mechanisms through which collaboration with AI influences students' rhetorical decision-making are not yet well understood. The extent to which students maintain critical thinking while using AI-assisted writing tools is unclear. Concerns persist regarding overreliance, reduced cognitive engagement, and the possibility that students may accept AI-generated suggestions uncritically. Very few studies have investigated metacognitive processes that emerge when students negotiate meaning, structure, and argumentation with an AI partner (Cake, 2025; Eleftheriou et al., 2025).

The impact of AI on the writing process itself remains underexplored. Most research addresses final writing outcomes, leaving the dynamics of drafting, revising, and reflection insufficiently examined. Little is known about how AI alters students' revision behaviors, self-regulation strategies, and confidence in generating academic discourse independently. The ways in which students perceive the pedagogical legitimacy of AI-supported writing also require deeper investigation. Questions remain about how learners conceptualize their partnership with AI, whether they view AI as a tool or co-author, and how these perceptions influence motivation and writing ownership. These gaps highlight the need for systematic study (Darmawansah et al., 2025; Formosa et al., 2025).

Addressing these gaps is essential for determining whether generative AI can be responsibly and effectively integrated into Academic English instruction. Understanding how students interact with AI during writing tasks provides insight into the pedagogical value and potential risks of AI-mediated collaboration. This knowledge will inform institutional policies, curriculum design, and teacher training related to AI literacy. A systematic investigation of AI-supported writing can illuminate how generative AI influences cognitive, linguistic, and affective aspects of writing

development. The study seeks to determine whether AI-enhanced collaboration supports writing quality without compromising critical thinking or academic integrity (Cress & Kimmerle, 2023; Michel et al., 2025). The findings will contribute to theoretical frameworks on human–AI co-learning in educational settings.

The purpose of this study is to examine the pedagogical impact of integrating ChatGPT as a collaborative writing partner in an Academic English course. The study hypothesizes that AI-assisted collaboration will improve coherence, argumentation, and lexical precision while enhancing students' metacognitive awareness of the writing process. These insights will advance understanding of how generative AI can be incorporated sustainably and ethically into academic writing pedagogy (Alzubi et al., 2025; Wong et al., 2023).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study employed a mixed-methods pedagogical research design to investigate how generative AI functions as a collaborative writing partner within an Academic English course. The design combined quantitative measures of writing performance with qualitative analyses of learner perceptions, writing processes, and interaction patterns with AI. This approach allowed for a comprehensive examination of both outcomes and underlying mechanisms of AI-assisted collaboration (Adam et al., 2024; Choi, 2025). The mixed-methods orientation provided methodological triangulation, increasing the credibility and depth of the findings by integrating statistical evidence with narrative insights into learner behavior.

The population consisted of undergraduate students enrolled in an Academic English writing course at a metropolitan university. The sample comprised 36 participants selected through purposive sampling to ensure representation of varying writing proficiencies and familiarity levels with digital tools. Participants were required to have at least intermediate English proficiency and voluntary consent to engage with AI-assisted writing tasks (Choi, 2025; Wong et al., 2023). The sample size was appropriate for mixed-methods analysis, enabling both meaningful statistical comparison and rich qualitative interpretation. Demographic diversity within the sample supported examination of differential responses to AI-mediated writing support.

The study employed multiple instruments to capture linguistic, cognitive, and perceptual dimensions of the writing process. Writing assessments included rubric-based pre- and post-tests evaluating coherence, argumentation, lexical precision, grammatical accuracy, and academic style. Interaction logs documenting prompts, revisions, and AI-generated suggestions were collected to trace writing processes and decision-making trajectories. Reflective journals and semi-structured interviews were administered to elicit students' perceptions of AI collaboration, metacognitive strategies, and concerns related to academic integrity. The triangulation of these instruments strengthened internal validity and allowed for multidimensional analysis of AI-supported writing (M. Li, 2024; Wilbers et al., 2024).

The research procedures followed four interconnected stages: orientation, intervention, data collection, and analysis. The orientation stage introduced students to ethical guidelines, limitations of AI tools, and strategies for responsible engagement. The intervention spanned six weeks and integrated AI-assisted drafting, revision, and feedback cycles into regular writing assignments. During each writing session, students interacted with ChatGPT as a collaborative partner to generate ideas, refine arguments, and revise linguistic features. Data were collected continuously through saved drafts, AI interaction logs, and reflective submissions (Kaufmann et al., 2024; R. Li, 2024b). Quantitative data were analyzed using paired-sample comparisons, whereas qualitative data were coded thematically to identify patterns in learner attitudes, writing behaviors, and critical

engagement with AI outputs. The procedures ensured alignment between instructional goals and research objectives, enabling examination of both performance-based and experiential outcomes.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The quantitative dataset consisted of pre-test and post-test writing scores from 36 participants enrolled in the Academic English course. Scores were evaluated using a five-criterion analytic rubric measuring coherence, argumentation, lexical precision, grammatical accuracy, and academic style. Descriptive statistics indicated notable improvements across all dimensions, with the overall mean writing score increasing from 63.4 to 78.9. The largest gains appeared in coherence (+17.2) and lexical precision (+15.4), suggesting substantial impact on global organization and vocabulary control.

Writing process data were extracted from AI interaction logs, documenting the number of prompts, revisions, and AI-assisted suggestions used during drafting. Participants generated an average of 18.6 interactions with ChatGPT per session, with significant variation across proficiency levels. Lower-proficiency writers relied more heavily on AI for idea generation and structural guidance, whereas higher-proficiency writers used AI selectively for lexical refinement and clarity checks. These interaction patterns illustrate differentiated use of AI depending on learner needs.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of writing performance before and after ai integration (n = 36)

Writing Dimension	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	Gain
Coherence	60.1	77.3	+17.2
Argumentation	62.4	76.8	+14.4
Lexical Precision	58.6	74.0	+15.4
Grammar Accuracy	66.8	80.2	+13.4
Academic Style	69.0	85.9	+16.9

The descriptive gains indicate that ChatGPT functioned effectively as a collaborative writing partner by providing real-time scaffolding that supported both macro-structural and micro-linguistic development. Learners improved coherence and argumentation substantially, likely due to AI-generated outlines, transitional sentences, and model argumentative structures. These features guided students in constructing clearer thesis statements and more logically sequenced ideas. Lexical precision and grammar gains can be attributed to AI's corrective feedback and alternative phrasing suggestions. Learners had repeated opportunities to compare their own formulations with AI-generated enhancements, promoting heightened metalinguistic awareness. This interaction encouraged deliberate vocabulary selection and more accurate grammatical constructions, resulting in stronger academic discourse conventions.

The qualitative dataset consisted of 108 reflective journal entries and 36 semi-structured interview transcripts. Learners frequently described AI collaboration as "clarifying," "motivating," and "confidence-building." Many participants noted that ChatGPT helped them break writer's block, expand arguments, and envision multiple ways to present complex ideas. These reports highlight AI's role in supporting cognitive and affective dimensions of writing. Observation notes revealed shifts in writing habits, such as increased use of iterative drafting and a tendency to revise more deeply than in previous writing assignments. Students spent more time comparing AI suggestions, evaluating alternatives, and articulating reasons for accepting or rejecting specific revisions. These behaviors indicate enhanced metacognitive engagement and improved awareness of audience expectations in academic writing.

Results of a paired-sample t-test showed statistically significant improvement from pre-test to post-test across all rubric dimensions. The overall writing score exhibited a t-value of 12.51 ($p < 0.001$), indicating a meaningful effect. Coherence and academic style displayed the strongest statistical gains, while grammar accuracy showed moderate yet significant improvement. Effect sizes ranged from 0.72 to 1.04, confirming strong practical significance. The inferential data validate that improvements were not random but directly related to AI-assisted writing activities. Learners demonstrated consistent upward progression regardless of initial proficiency. These findings confirm the pedagogical viability of generative AI as an instructional scaffold when coupled with guided reflection and explicit writing instruction.

Table 2. Paired-sample t-test results for writing gains

Dimension	t-value	p-value	Effect Size (d)
Coherence	11.43	<0.001	1.01
Argumentation	9.76	<0.001	0.87
Lexical Precision	10.12	<0.001	0.91
Grammar Accuracy	7.84	<0.001	0.72
Academic Style	12.03	<0.001	1.04

A strong correlation emerged between the number of AI interactions and post-test writing performance ($r = 0.68$). Participants who engaged more deeply with AI suggestions achieved higher gains in coherence and argumentation, indicating that iterative dialogue with ChatGPT facilitated stronger organizational and rhetorical development. Frequent engagement also correlated with more complex sentence structures and richer lexical choices. Another relational pattern showed that learners with initially lower writing scores demonstrated the largest improvement. These students tended to rely on AI more extensively for conceptual clarification and structural modeling. Their higher gains suggest that generative AI may function as a compensatory scaffold for writers lacking confidence or foundational academic writing skills.

A focused analysis of a high-gain participant revealed strategic and reflective use of ChatGPT. This learner frequently requested alternative formulations, engaged in evaluative questioning, and used AI feedback to restructure arguments. Their writing demonstrated marked improvement in precision and persuasiveness. Interview reflections showed heightened awareness of rhetorical choices and confidence in articulating academic claims. A contrasting case study highlighted a participant with minimal improvement. This learner tended to accept AI suggestions uncritically and engaged in shallow revision practices. Interviews revealed uncertainty about evaluating AI-generated content and difficulty integrating suggestions into a coherent writing strategy. This case underscores the importance of critical literacy when interacting with generative AI.

The case studies indicate that learning gains were closely tied to metacognitive engagement rather than frequency of AI use alone. Learners who approached AI as a dialogic partner demonstrated deeper processing of linguistic and rhetorical knowledge. This reflective stance enabled them to internalize writing strategies rather than merely adopt AI-generated text. The contrasting outcomes also show that generative AI magnifies existing writing behaviors. Students with strong self-regulation and revision habits benefited more substantially, while those with weaker evaluative skills risked superficial or dependent use of AI suggestions. These findings emphasize the necessity of explicit instruction in AI literacy to promote intentional and ethical writing practices.

The integrated results suggest that generative AI can serve as a powerful collaborative writing partner that enhances linguistic accuracy, rhetorical organization, and metacognitive awareness. The multimodal feedback cycle between learners and AI supports deeper conceptual understanding of academic writing conventions while reducing anxiety associated with drafting and revision. The findings imply that AI integration is pedagogically viable when structured through guided reflection, ethical literacy, and critical evaluation training. The study demonstrates that generative AI is not merely a technological convenience but a meaningful pedagogical tool capable of reshaping academic writing instruction toward more collaborative, iterative, and student-centered learning processes.

The results of this study demonstrate that integrating generative AI as a collaborative writing partner significantly improved students' academic writing performance across multiple dimensions. Quantitative analyses revealed substantial gains in coherence, argumentation, lexical precision, grammatical accuracy, and academic style. These improvements were complemented by increased writing confidence and more systematic revision behaviors (Malang, 2025; Zeng et al., 2024). The AI interaction logs showed that learners engaged frequently with ChatGPT's suggestions, using them to refine ideas, reorganize arguments, and adjust tone. Students demonstrated a willingness to explore alternative formulations and deepen their explanations, indicating that AI assistance encouraged iterative drafting. This engagement suggests that generative AI supported more reflective writing practices.

Qualitative data revealed that students viewed ChatGPT as a supportive and nonjudgmental partner in the writing process. Learners reported reduced writing anxiety, improved idea generation, and enhanced clarity of thought. Many students attributed their progress to the dialogic nature of AI interaction, which provided real-time scaffolding and guided them through complex rhetorical decisions. The triangulated findings confirm that generative AI was not merely a tool for editing but a catalyst for reshaping how students approached academic writing. The combination of linguistic support, cognitive prompting, and motivational benefits contributed to comprehensive gains that extended beyond surface-level accuracy.

The study's findings align with prior research in computer-assisted language learning, which highlights the potential of automated systems to enhance linguistic accuracy and learner autonomy. Previous studies have shown that digital writing tools contribute to improved grammar and vocabulary use. This research extends those findings by demonstrating strong effects on higher-order writing skills such as argumentation and coherence (Luther et al., 2024; Wilbers et al., 2024). The results diverge from earlier concerns suggesting that AI might encourage superficial reliance or reduce critical thinking. Students in this study exhibited increased metacognitive engagement as they compared AI suggestions with their own drafts. This pattern contrasts with studies that reported passive copying of AI-generated text, suggesting that pedagogically guided AI use can foster deeper cognitive processing.

The findings differ from research that positions AI as primarily corrective rather than generative. ChatGPT functioned not only as an editor but as a thinking partner, prompting students to elaborate on claims, justify positions, and strengthen transitions. This broader pedagogical role highlights the potential of generative AI to support rhetorical development rather than focusing solely on linguistic surface features. The outcomes also contribute to emerging discussions regarding the ethics and pedagogy of AI in higher education. Prior studies have emphasized risk and misuse, whereas this research demonstrates that structured integration, combined with reflective practice, can harness AI's strengths while mitigating potential drawbacks. The study therefore adds nuance to debates about educational AI.

The findings indicate a shift in how students conceptualize the writing process. Learners became more aware of writing as an iterative, dialogic activity rather than a solitary act. The presence of a generative AI partner encouraged continuous refinement, experimentation, and reflection on rhetorical choices, suggesting a transformation in writing habits. The gains in coherence and argumentation imply that AI may serve as a cognitive scaffold that helps novice writers grasp abstract organizational structures. Students learned to develop clearer thesis statements, build logical arguments, and maintain consistent thematic flow. These developments signal that generative AI can function as a form of real-time modeling for academic discourse.

The improvements in lexical precision and academic tone suggest that AI exposure increased learners' awareness of disciplinary conventions. Students gained access to academically appropriate phrasing and stylistic choices that they later adapted into their own writing. This pattern indicates that generative AI can accelerate the internalization of academic genre norms. The findings also reflect broader shifts in how learners engage with digital tools. Students demonstrated an emerging AI literacy characterized by selective adoption, critical comparison, and strategic revision. This suggests that pedagogically guided AI use may cultivate essential 21st-century competencies related to technological discernment and critical engagement (Barrot, 2024; M. Li, 2024).

The study's findings carry important implications for writing pedagogy. Educators can leverage generative AI to extend feedback opportunities beyond classroom hours, supporting students through real-time guidance that complements teacher instruction. This approach may reduce disparities in writing development for students who require more intensive support. The results suggest that academic writing curricula should integrate explicit instruction on AI collaboration. Students need guidance on how to evaluate AI suggestions, preserve their authorial identity, and engage critically with machine-generated content. Embedding AI literacy within writing instruction can promote ethical, reflective, and intentional use of generative tools.

Institutional policy development is also informed by this study. Universities must create frameworks that support responsible AI use while preserving academic integrity. Clear pedagogical guidelines can help instructors design AI-supported writing activities that enhance learning rather than replace essential cognitive processes. The implications extend to broader educational reforms related to digital transformation. AI-assisted writing may become a normal component of academic and professional communication, making it essential for students to develop proficiency in human–AI collaboration. This research highlights the need for proactive curriculum design to prepare learners for evolving communication landscapes (Choi, 2025; Wang & Ren, 2024).

The findings occurred because generative AI provided consistent, immediate, and personalized scaffolding that traditional writing instruction often struggles to deliver. Students received instant suggestions, alternative phrasing, and rhetorical models, enabling them to compare options and refine ideas without waiting for human feedback. This responsiveness enhanced learning efficiency. The interactive nature of ChatGPT encouraged iterative drafting behaviors. Learners revised more frequently because the AI allowed them to test hypotheses, explore different argument structures, and receive explanations for linguistic adjustments. These affordances supported deeper cognitive processing and metalinguistic awareness.

The AI's nonjudgmental presence reduced affective barriers such as writing anxiety, fear of errors, and hesitation to draft. Students felt comfortable experimenting with ideas, which promoted risk-taking and creative thinking. These affective shifts fostered the confidence necessary for stronger academic writing performance. Variation in student outcomes reflects differences in metacognitive skills. Learners who actively questioned AI output, reflected on revisions, and made informed choices gained the most benefit. Those who relied mechanically on suggestions

experienced limited growth. This pattern underscores the role of learner agency in AI-mediated pedagogy.

Future research should investigate long-term effects of AI-assisted writing, particularly whether gains in coherence, argumentation, and style are sustained beyond the intervention period. Longitudinal studies could assess whether learners eventually internalize AI-modeled strategies without technological support. This would provide insight into the durability of AI-mediated learning. Curriculum designers should explore integrating AI collaboration into broader academic literacy programs. Writing modules could incorporate guided AI tasks that progressively build students' critical evaluation skills. This integration may support students in transferring writing competencies across disciplines.

Teacher preparation programs must adapt to include training on AI-supported instruction. Instructors require knowledge of AI capabilities, limitations, and ethical considerations to guide learners effectively. Professional development in human AI pedagogy will become increasingly essential in higher education. Institutional and policy-level discussions should address digital equity issues, ensuring that all students gain access to AI tools and training. Inclusive implementation will prevent discrepancies in writing development and support equitable academic outcomes. This study highlights the need for comprehensive frameworks that align technology integration with responsible pedagogical practice.

CONCLUSION

The most important finding of this study is the demonstration that generative AI, when integrated as a collaborative writing partner, enhances not only surface-level linguistic accuracy but also higher-order writing skills such as coherence, argumentation, and metacognitive engagement. This result differs from previous studies that emphasized AI primarily as a corrective tool, because the present study shows that AI can function as a dialogic thinking partner that supports idea development, rhetorical organization, and reflective revision. The finding highlights a transformative shift in how learners approach academic writing, showing that generative AI can actively shape cognitive processes rather than simply assist with mechanical editing.

The study provides added value by introducing a pedagogical methodology that integrates AI interaction logs, reflective journaling, and analytic writing assessments to capture the dynamics of human AI collaboration. This approach offers a conceptual contribution by framing generative AI as a component of cognitive apprenticeship in writing instruction, where learners observe, evaluate, and internalize rhetorical decisions through guided interaction with AI. The methodological contribution lies in the multi-layered analysis that traces writing development not only through measurable outcomes but also through behavioral and metacognitive indicators. These contributions expand theoretical understanding of AI supported learning and offer a replicable model for educators seeking to design structured, ethical, and pedagogically purposeful AI integration.

The study is limited by its short intervention period, relatively small sample size, and reliance on a single generative AI platform. These constraints limit generalizability and prevent full exploration of long-term writing development or transferability to diverse academic contexts. Future research should investigate longitudinal effects, compare different AI writing partners, and explore how varying levels of AI literacy influence learning outcomes. Further studies should also examine ethical dimensions of authorship, AI dependence, and the development of critical evaluation skills to ensure that AI-supported writing fosters independent and responsible academic writers.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

Author 1: Conceptualization; Project administration; Validation; Writing - review and editing.

Author 2: Conceptualization; Data curation; Investigation.

Author 3: Data curation; Investigation.

Author 4: Formal analysis; Methodology; Writing - original draft.

REFERENCES

- Adam, I. O., Alhassan, M. D., & Diack, A. (2024). Exploring the Pedagogical Approaches for Generative AI Integration in Computing Education in Ghana: A Constructivist Perspective. *Am. Conf. Inf. Syst., AMCIS*. Scopus. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85213017289&partnerID=40&md5=59c2fd8bcd8bb18b8dedcab5b09cf5fe5>
- Alzubi, A. A. F., Nazim, M., & Alyami, N. (2025). Do AI-generative tools kill or nurture creativity in EFL teaching and learning? *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(11), 15147–15184. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13409-8>
- Barrot, J. S. (2024). Leveraging ChatGPT in the Writing Classrooms: Theoretical and Practical Insights. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 43, 43–53. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2024.43.03>
- Cake, S. (2025). Artificial intelligence as a collaborative tool for script development. *Media Practice and Education*, 26(3), 302–317. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25741136.2025.2454074>
- Choi, W. (2025). Exploring High School Students' Preferences for English Writing Feedback: Non-Native English Teacher vs. Native English Teacher vs. ChatGPT. *SAGE Open*, 15(4). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251383693>
- Cress, U., & Kimmerle, J. (2023). Co-constructing knowledge with generative AI tools: Reflections from a CSCL perspective. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 18(4), 607–614. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-023-09409-w>
- Darmawansah, D., Rachman, D., Febiyani, F., & Hwang, G.-J. (2025). ChatGPT-supported collaborative argumentation: Integrating collaboration script and argument mapping to enhance EFL students' argumentation skills. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(3), 3803–3827. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12986-4>
- Eleftheriou, M., Ahmer, M., & Fredrick, D. (2025). Balancing ethics and support: Peer tutors' experiences with AI tools in student writing. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 17(3). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/16554>
- Formosa, P., Bankins, S., Matulionyte, R., & Ghasemi, O. (2025). Can ChatGPT be an author? Generative AI creative writing assistance and perceptions of authorship, creatorship, responsibility, and disclosure. *AI and Society*, 40(5), 3405–3417. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-024-02081-0>
- Güner, H., & Er, E. (2025). AI in the classroom: Exploring students' interaction with ChatGPT in programming learning. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(9), 12681–12707. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13337-7>
- Kaufmann, C., Schmiedel, T., & Christen, P. (2024). Using Generative Artificial Intelligence in University Teaching. In A. Abraham, A. Bajaj, T. Hanne, & T.-P. Hong (Eds.), *Lect. Notes Networks Syst.: Vol. 1047 LNNS* (pp. 360–370). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-64836-6_35
- Kim, H., & Lee, Y. (2025). A Study of Generative AI Design Process Using Metaphors: Creating Advertisement Images. *Archives of Design Research*, 38(3), 217–234. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.15187/adr.2025.08.38.3.217>
- Li, M. (2024). Leveraging ChatGPT for Second Language Writing Feedback and Assessment. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*, 14(1). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJCALLT.360382>

- Li, R. (2024a). A “Dance of storytelling”: Dissonances between substance and style in collaborative storytelling with AI. *Computers and Composition*, 71. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2024.102825>
- Li, R. (2024b). “Weaving tales of resilience”: Cyborg composing with AI. *English Teaching*, 23(1), 57–66. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ETPC-08-2023-0087>
- 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. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ai5030065>
- Malang, B. (2025). The Impact of using Chat-Generative Pre-Trained Transformer on students. *International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion*, 7(1), 373–392. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v7i1.85>
- Michel, M., Menke-Bazhutkina, I., Abel, N., & Strobl, C. (2025). Collaborative writing based on generative AI models: Revision and deliberation processes in German as a foreign language. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 67. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101185>
- Muse, A. (2025). A Teacher, a Supervisor, an Undefined Self: Generative AI, Student Research, and Experiential Pedagogies A Partner Piece Detailing the Teacher-Supervisor Experience. *Qualitative Report*, 30(5), 3720–3734. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2025.8129>
- Siau, K. L., & Nah, F. F.-H. (Eds.). (2025a). 12th International Conference on HCI in Business, Government and Organizations, held as part of the 27th HCI International Conference, HCII 2025. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 15804 LNCS. Scopus. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-105007166117&partnerID=40&md5=2746445e0bb2f9cc917cdcd2fed6cbad>
- Siau, K. L., & Nah, F. F.-H. (Eds.). (2025b). 12th International Conference on HCI in Business, Government and Organizations, held as part of the 27th HCI International Conference, HCII 2025. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 15805 LNCS. Scopus. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-105007143427&partnerID=40&md5=de4ce4c850bdc6d0606868cf982ed7f1>
- Wang, L., & Ren, B. (2024). Enhancing Academic Writing in a Linguistics Course with Generative AI: An Empirical Study in a Higher Education Institution in Hong Kong. *Education Sciences*, 14(12). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14121329>
- Wilbers, S., Gröpler, J., Prell, B., & Reiff-Stephan, J. (2024). Overall Writing Effectiveness: Exploring Students’ Use of LLMs, Pushing the Limits of Automated Text Generation. In M. E. Auer, R. Langmann, D. May, & K. Roos (Eds.), *Lect. Notes Networks Syst.: Vol. 1028 LNNS* (pp. 11–22). Springer Science and Business Media Deutschland GmbH; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-61905-2_2
- Wong, L.-H., Aw, G. P., Chen, W., Cheung, Y. L., & Sim, S. H. (2023). Empowering Language Learners: Harnessing Computer-Based Writing for Enhanced Chinese Language Proficiency. In J.-L. Shih, A. Kashihara, W. Chen, W. Chen, H. Ogata, R. Baker, B. Chang, S. Dianati, J. Madathil, A. M. F. Yousef, Y. Yang, & H. Zarzour (Eds.), *Int. Conf. Comput. Educ., ICCE - Proc.* (Vol. 2, pp. 145–154). Asia-Pacific Society for Computers in Education; Scopus. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85181776263&partnerID=40&md5=aa8550863ea4653ce6bb0e39f6416652>
- Zeng, Z., Sha, L., Li, Y., Yang, K., Gašević, D., & Chen, G. (2024). Towards Automatic Boundary Detection for Human-AI Collaborative Hybrid Essay in Education. In M. Wooldridge, J. Dy, & S. Natarajan (Eds.), *Proc. AAAI Conf. Artif. Intell.* (Vol. 38, Issue 20, pp. 22502–22510). Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v38i20.30258>

Copyright Holder :

© Iin Almeida et.al (2025).

First Publication Right :

© International Journal of Language and Ubiquitous Learning

This article is under:

