

Article



<https://doi.org/10.52696/KBIY2928>

Reprints and permission:

The Malaysian English Language Teaching Association

✉ Joemar T. Minoza joemar.minoza@ctu.edu.ph

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6707-7593>

Integrating Guided ChatGPT Intervention on the Writing Efficiency of Grade 11 HUMSS Students

Jamaica Isabel C. Gian

Cebu Technological University-Consolacion Campus
Cebu, Philippines

Mary Jane G. Java

Cebu Technological University-Consolacion Campus
Cebu, Philippines

Karol Z. Tundag

Cebu Technological University-Consolacion Campus
Cebu, Philippines

Joemar T. Minoza

Cebu Technological University-Consolacion Campus
Cebu, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Writing proficiency remains a persistent challenge among Filipino learners, particularly in expressing ideas with clarity, organization, and coherence. This study investigated the effectiveness of a guided ChatGPT intervention in improving the writing efficiency of thirty (30) Grade 11 HUMSS students at Tubongan National High School. Employing a mixed-methods design, the study utilized a one-group pretest–posttest approach for the quantitative phase and semi-structured interviews for the qualitative phase. Quantitative data were analyzed to determine differences in students’ writing performance across organization, voice and tone, and word choice and creativity, while qualitative data explored learners’ perceptions of ChatGPT integration. Findings indicated statistically significant improvements in students’ writing performance after the intervention, particularly in organization ($< .00001$), voice and tone (0.00174), and word choice and creativity ($< .00001$). Qualitative results revealed that students perceived ChatGPT as a beneficial tool that provided immediate feedback, enhanced vocabulary, and improved grammatical accuracy and idea development. However, some participants raised concerns about overreliance on the tool and its potential impact on critical thinking and originality. Overall, the findings suggest that ChatGPT can serve as an effective supplementary tool to enhance writing efficiency when used with proper guidance. Its success, however, depends on structured teacher facilitation to ensure that it supports, rather than replaces, students’ independent writing skills.

KEYWORDS: ChatGPT, guided intervention, writing efficiency, academic writing, HUMSS students

INTRODUCTION

Writing proficiency remained a persistent challenge among Filipino learners, especially among senior high school students (Langga & Alico, 2020). Writing efficiency, defined as the ability to produce quality written output within a given time, is a crucial aspect of academic performance and is closely linked to students' writing proficiency. Despite the implementation of the K–12 curriculum, which included specialized subjects such as Creative Writing and Practical Research, many students in Grades 11 and 12 continued to struggle to express their ideas clearly and coherently in writing. Common issues included weak grammar, poor sentence structure, limited vocabulary, and poor organization in writing (Budjalemba & Listyani, 2020). A study by Quijano and Legaspi (2020) revealed that, while students could sequence events in a narrative, they had difficulty constructing grammatically correct sentences, indicating a gap in grammar proficiency despite adequate sequencing skills. In response to this problem, the emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) had a significant impact. Artificial intelligence refers to computer systems designed to perform tasks that typically require human intelligence, such as learning, reasoning, and language processing (Russell & Norvig, 2021). In education, AI became increasingly prevalent, and one of its most significant contributions was its ability to enhance and improve writing. These tools significantly transformed the way students approached their writing tasks by offering functionalities that corrected grammatical errors, refined writing style, and elevated the overall quality of written work (Wu, 2024).

A prominent example of an AI writing tool frequently used by students is ChatGPT. ChatGPT was an AI chatbot that assisted with writing by generating text or ideas, correcting grammar, restructuring sentences, and providing instant feedback (Li, 2025). Firat (2023), Teel et al. (2023), and Mhlanga (2023) explored ChatGPT's role in education, highlighting its widespread use among students. Firat (2023) examined how students used ChatGPT to support academic tasks, particularly to improve the quality and coherence of written outputs. Teel et al. (2023) explored the pedagogical implications of ChatGPT in higher education, revealing that educators were both intrigued and cautious about integrating AI into instruction. Mhlanga (2023) focused on the ethical and educational dimensions of AI use in classrooms, showing that while ChatGPT offered learning support, it also raised concerns about overreliance and students' reduced ability to think and write independently. Supporting this, Cuban (2024) explained that AI-powered tools like ChatGPT could provide immediate feedback, allowing students to identify and correct errors in real time, which enhanced their writing skills more efficiently than traditional methods.

While many studies acknowledged the immediate benefits of AI writing tools like ChatGPT—such as improving grammar, expanding vocabulary, providing instant feedback, and enhancing coherence and organization—researchers also raised ethical concerns. One major concern was academic dishonesty, as students might have submitted content created by AI as their own, making it hard to determine which parts were truly written by them (Lund & Wang, 2023). Another issue was overreliance, in which students relied too heavily on ChatGPT's suggestions rather than thinking and writing on their own (Mhlanga, 2023). There was also concern about the loss of authorship and voice, as using AI too often could affect a student's personal writing style and critical thinking (Firat, 2023).

In addition, most existing research focused on the short-term effectiveness of AI in writing, leaving a gap in understanding its long-term effect on students' independent writing abilities. For instance, a study from Indonesia found that AI-assisted writing significantly improved students' coherence and grammatical accuracy. In the Philippine context, Bulante et al. (2024) and Soriano et al. (2024) confirmed that AI tools helped improve students' written outputs, particularly in structure and clarity. Furthermore, Dingal et al. (2024) investigated the use of AI tools in students' academic writing and found improvements in grammar and organization, demonstrating AI's potential to enhance writing performance. However, these studies did not center on a specific AI tool like ChatGPT, nor did they explore potential drawbacks such as diminished critical thinking, overreliance on AI-generated content, and reduced capacity for independent writing. This highlighted a key research gap: the need to evaluate how integrating accessible AI tools like ChatGPT affects students' independent writing efficiency and skill development over prolonged integration.

To address this gap, the limited research examining the effects of prolonged ChatGPT use on students' independent writing efficiency, this study focused on Grade 11 students from the Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS) strand who were enrolled in the course 21st Century Literature from the Philippines and the World, a specialized subject mandated by the Department of Education (DepEd). The study assessed students' writing performance across key aspects such as organization, voice and tone, word choice, and creativity to gain a comprehensive understanding of their writing proficiency. By observing their performance across multiple sessions, it sought to determine whether continuous guided integration of ChatGPT fostered genuine improvement in writing skills or contributed to dependency, thereby affecting students' ability to write independently and think critically.

This study aimed to explore how integrating a guided ChatGPT intervention enhances the writing efficiency of 30 Grade 11 HUMSS students at Tugbongan National High School. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the pre-post-test scores of the respondents in terms of:
 - 1.1. organization;
 - 1.2. voice and tone; and
 - 1.3. word choice and creativity?
2. Is there a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the respondents?
3. What are the experiences and challenges of students in using ChatGPT for writing tasks?

LITERATURE REVIEW

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in education, particularly through tools such as ChatGPT, has introduced new possibilities for writing instruction and academic support. ChatGPT, a language model developed by OpenAI, engages users through conversational interactions and assists in generating written content (Halaweh, 2023). It is primarily designed to answer questions and assist in generating written content, making it a useful tool for learning and academic writing. According to Kostka and Toncelli (2023) and Kalla and Smith (2023), ChatGPT and similar AI technologies are

transforming the landscape of digital education as they enhance students' ability to organize ideas and refine.

From the perspective of writing process theory, writing is viewed as a recursive and dynamic process involving planning, drafting, revising, and editing rather than a linear sequence (Flower & Hayes, 1981). ChatGPT can support these stages by generating ideas, structuring drafts, and suggesting revisions (Kasneji et al., 2023). It also draws on Vygotsky's (1978) where learning occurs through scaffolding within the Zone of Proximal Development which emphasizes learning through guided support. ChatGPT can act as a digital scaffold by providing prompts, feedback, and language models. However, unlike human scaffolding, it lacks pedagogical judgment, so improper use may lead to passive learning and may reduce learners' independent thinking and writing development (Kasneji et al., 2023).

Writing Pedagogy Beyond AI

Writing instruction in the modern educational landscape is increasingly influenced by technological advancements; however, the development of effective writing skills remains fundamentally rooted in established pedagogical practices that extend beyond the use of artificial intelligence. In this regard, writing improvement is not merely the result of AI-generated feedback, but rather the outcome of structured feedback processes and scaffolded instruction that actively engage learners in revision and meaning-making (Rad & Mirzaei, 2024). Supporting this, L2 writing research shows that teacher scaffolding improves grammar accuracy, argument structure, and language use (Li & Zhang, 2021). These findings highlight that writing development is strongest when learners receive guided human instruction. Further evidence also indicates that sustained scaffolded teacher–student interaction significantly enhances writing quality and complexity, leading to progressive gains in grammatical and rhetorical performance (Li et al., 2024). Overall, these findings highlight that writing development is most effective when supported by continuous teacher mediation rather than relying solely on automated or AI-based feedback.

Studies grounded in sociocultural theory show that peer feedback enhances revision quality, critical thinking, and writing performance by engaging students in meaningful feedback exchange (Yan, Zhu, & Ye, 2024). Collectively, these findings show that writing development cannot be reduced to AI-driven tools. While AI may support learning, it cannot replace the depth of structured teaching, scaffolding, and human interaction needed for meaningful writing development. Thus, writing pedagogy must remain fundamentally human-centered, with AI serving only as a supplementary aid rather than a substitute for teacher-led instruction and collaborative learning.

The Role of ChatGPT in Education

Recent studies show that ChatGPT positively impacts education by improving teaching, supporting self-regulated learning, and enhancing writing and problem-solving skills (Kalla & Smith, 2023; Deng, 2025, Hapsari & Rizky, 2025). Both students and teachers find it useful for summarizing information, organizing ideas, and creating written content, while also helping manage large amounts of information in schools and libraries (Firat, 2023; Lund & Wang, 2023). It further supports writing by encouraging creativity, offering instant feedback, and improving the quality and openness of student work in some colleges (Cuban, 2024).

At the same time, scholars caution against risks such as overreliance, reduced independent thinking, and academic dishonesty (Mhlanga, 2023; Firat, 2023; Lund & Wang, 2023). AI-generated texts may also contain grammar or accuracy issues requiring human editing, while misuse often stems from limited understanding of proper application (Deng, 2025; Bulante et al., 2024). Educators emphasize that ChatGPT should complement, not replace, teachers in fostering authentic writing skills (Cuban, 2024). Overall, these studies highlight ChatGPT's strong potential to support education by providing accessible academic assistance, but stress the importance of guidance and clear rules to ensure responsible use that preserves critical thinking, writing, and problem-solving skills.

The Impact of ChatGPT on Writing Efficiency

Studies show that ChatGPT improves students' writing efficiency by fixing grammar mistakes, generating ideas, and supporting different writing styles (Bibi & Atta, 2024; Huang & Tan, 2023; Sumakul et al., 2022). In high school settings, it helps with word choice, sentence structure, grammar, and organization, boosting confidence among struggling writers, though many students, especially in the Philippines, misuse it due to limited digital literacy (Bulante et al., 2024; Soriano et al., 2024). These findings are supported by research showing that students usually accept AI feedback on grammar, vocabulary, and language accuracy because it directly improves their writing quality, but are more cautious about suggestions that affect their personal voice and ideas (Schug, 2025).

While useful, ChatGPT has clear limits, as advanced or technical writing often requires human review to avoid errors and plagiarism, and misuse can hinder responsible academic work (Huang & Tan, 2023; Bulante et al., 2024). The long-term impact remains debated, with concerns that frequent reliance may lead to overdependence and limit authentic skill development (Jelson et al., 2026). Overall, ChatGPT can enhance writing efficiency through grammar, organization, and idea generation, but proper guidance, digital literacy, and clear academic rules are essential to ensure it supports learning rather than replacing it.

METHODOLOGY

Design

This study used a mixed-method design, combining quantitative and qualitative approaches, to evaluate the integration of a guided ChatGPT intervention on the writing efficiency of thirty (30) Grade 11 HUMSS students. The quantitative method analyzed students' pre-test and post-test scores to measure changes in organization, voice and tone, and word choice and creativity. The study involved a single group of participants. It employed a quasi-experimental design without a control group, focusing on measuring changes within the same learners before and after the intervention. The qualitative method explored students' perceptions and experiences through one-on-one, semi-structured interviews. Combining both approaches provided a comprehensive understanding of how the guided ChatGPT intervention influenced their writing.

Participants

There were thirty (30) selected participants who were Grade 11 students from the Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS) strand, enrolled in the course 21st Century Literature from the Philippines and the World, drawn from two (2) sections, namely Grade 11 Benevolence and Grade 11 Compassion. Purposive sampling, specifically homogeneous sampling, was used to ensure that all participants shared similar characteristics such as grade level, academic strand, subject enrollment, and most

importantly, a comparable level of writing proficiency. To qualify, participants were required to have obtained scores not lower than six (6) out of a perfect fifteen (15) in the pretest writing task. These participants were selected from the middle-performance group based on the pretest results. This group provided a fair and neutral starting point, as they typically possessed foundational writing skills while still having room for improvement. With this group, the effects of ChatGPT integration were more observable and measurable.

In addition, one-on-one semi-structured interviews were conducted with the same group of participants; however, only six (6) participants were selected for this part. These interviews aimed to explore students' experiences and perceptions of using ChatGPT in their writing tasks. The qualitative data gathered provided deeper insights into how students perceived ChatGPT's effectiveness in enhancing their writing skills over time, particularly in independent writing tasks focusing on organization, voice and tone, and word choice and creativity.

Instrument

Two instruments were used in this study: one (1) for quantitative and one (1) for qualitative data. The quantitative instrument was the Creative Writing Rubric retrieved from Loyola Marymount University, which was adopted and used to evaluate the participants' outputs in terms of organization, voice and tone, and word choice and creativity during the pretest and posttest. The rubric followed the Rubric Scoring Scale, which is as follows: 5 = Excellent, 4 = Very Satisfactory, 3 = Satisfactory, 2 = Poor, and 1 = Needs Improvement. The rubric demonstrates content validity by measuring key components of creative writing aligned with the study's objectives. In this study, scoring consistency was ensured by using a single rater, but no formal inter-rater reliability testing was conducted. Despite this limitation, the rubric remains appropriate for assessment due to its clear performance descriptors and well-structured scoring criteria.

The qualitative instrument was the Students' Perceptions of Using ChatGPT for Writing (Interview Questions). The interview protocol was developed based on the research objectives and guided by the study's research questions. It was content-validated by an expert in the field to ensure clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study objectives. This tool was used during the one-on-one semi-structured interviews to gather insights into students' experiences and challenges of using ChatGPT to support writing tasks, particularly in enhancing their independent writing skills over time. A session guide was also used during the intervention phase to ensure consistent delivery of writing activities involving ChatGPT. Although not a data-gathering tool, it supported the structure of the intervention process.

Data Gathering Procedure

The data-gathering process was conducted in three phases: pre-data gathering, data collection, and post-data gathering. Pre-data gathering included securing approval from the Dean of the College of Teacher Education at Cebu Technological University–Consolacion Campus and permission from the principal of Tugbongan National High School. Parental consent and student assent forms were distributed to ensure voluntary and ethical participation. All required documents were properly filed.

Data collection started with an orientation to inform participants about the study's purpose, procedures, and their rights. A pre-assessment writing task was given to measure students' baseline writing skills. This was followed by five guided intervention sessions using ChatGPT, where students were

systematically guided by the researchers on how to use the tool at specific stages of the writing process, such as brainstorming, grammar checking, and improving sentence structure and vocabulary, ensuring that their use of AI was structured and actively involved in the writing process rather than relying on it purely for answers. Each intervention session lasted approximately 45 minutes and was conducted consecutively within the overall data-gathering period, which took place from September 16 to 26, spanning a total of seven days. Afterward, a post-assessment writing task was conducted to evaluate improvement. Lastly, participants took part in individual semi-structured interviews to share their experiences and perceptions about using ChatGPT.

As for the session overview, the intervention spanned six sessions. Session 1 served as the pre-test and orientation, during which students completed a baseline timed writing task without ChatGPT and received orientation on the study's objectives and the ethical use of the tool. Sessions 2 through 5 were the guided intervention phase, each lasting 45 minutes: students used ChatGPT for brainstorming, grammar checking, sentence restructuring, vocabulary enhancement, and writing revision under researcher-provided prompts. These sessions coincided with lesson-based activities (e.g., haiku analysis, topic-based writing for Section A and B) to integrate writing tasks meaningfully. Finally, Session 6 comprised a post-test (a timed writing task without ChatGPT) and semi-structured interviews, allowing evaluation of writing improvement and the collection of qualitative data on students' experiences with ChatGPT as a writing aid.

Throughout the intervention sessions, the researchers provided “user-created prompts” to standardize and scaffold ChatGPT use. These prompts directed students to focus on grammar, structure, word choice, and clarity while encouraging them to retain their ideas. The prompts served as a pedagogical mediator, ensuring that ChatGPT functioned not as an automatic generator but as a writing assistant. See Appendix K to see the specific prompt used during the sessions. Post-data-gathering involved collecting all written outputs, interview responses, and consent forms. All data were used solely for this study and kept confidential. Research materials were securely stored and properly disposed of after analysis.

Data Analysis

To analyze the quantitative data collected from the participants, a Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used to compare the pre-test and post-test writing scores. This statistical method determined whether there was a significant difference in students' writing performance before and after the integration of ChatGPT in instructional sessions. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test results provided empirical evidence of AI's effectiveness as a support tool for enhancing students' independent writing skills.

In addition, the qualitative data were analyzed using Thematic Analysis, which was well-suited to the one-on-one, semi-structured interviews conducted with the participants. This method involved identifying, coding, and categorizing recurring ideas and patterns in the students' responses, enabling the extraction of meaningful themes that captured their experiences and challenges with ChatGPT. By exploring students' personal insights into AI-assisted writing, the qualitative findings enriched the quantitative results. They provided a more comprehensive understanding of ChatGPT's effectiveness in enhancing students' writing proficiency, particularly in independent writing tasks.

Ethical Considerations

The study strictly followed ethical standards to ensure credibility, transparency, and integrity. Researchers explained the purpose—integrating ChatGPT to enhance students' writing efficiency—

and secured both parental and student consent for voluntary participation. Privacy was protected through confidentiality, anonymity, and secure data storage, with pseudonyms used instead of real names. Participants faced no risk of harm, could withdraw at any time, and were treated respectfully. Data collection and analysis were conducted with honesty and objectivity, ensuring findings were reported truthfully and responsibly.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents and interprets the findings of the study on integrating a guided ChatGPT intervention to enhance the writing efficiency of Grade 11 HUMSS students. It discusses both the quantitative and qualitative results, highlighting how ChatGPT influenced students' writing performance in terms of organization, voice and tone, as well as word choice and creativity.

Table 1
Pre Test Scores

Organization	f	%
<i>Excellent</i>	0	0.00
<i>Very Satisfactory</i>	1	3.33
<i>Satisfactory</i>	22	73.33
<i>Poor</i>	7	23.33
<i>Need Improvement</i>	0	0.00
Total	30	100.00
Voice and Tone		
<i>Excellent</i>	0	0.00
<i>Very Satisfactory</i>	7	23.33
<i>Satisfactory</i>	15	50.00
<i>Poor</i>	8	26.67
<i>Need Improvement</i>	0	0.00
Total	30	100.00
Word Choice and Creativity		
<i>Excellent</i>	0	0.00
<i>Very Satisfactory</i>	5	16.67
<i>Satisfactory</i>	20	66.67
<i>Poor</i>	5	16.67
<i>Need Improvement</i>	0	0.00
Total	30	100.00

Legend: 5 = Excellent, 4 = Very Satisfactory, 3 = Satisfactory, 2 = Poor, 1 = Needs Improvement

Table 1 presents the pre-test results of students in three writing components: organization, voice and tone, and word choice and creativity. In the area of organization, most students (73.33%) performed at a Satisfactory level, while 23.33% were rated Poor, and only one student (3.33%) reached the Very Satisfactory level. For voice and tone, half of the students (50%) scored Satisfactory, 23.33% were

Very Satisfactory, and 26.67% were rated Poor. Meanwhile, for word choice and creativity, a majority of the students (66.67%) were Satisfactory, 16.67% Very Satisfactory, and 16.67% Poor. No students reached the Excellent level in any of the three writing elements.

The results show that students generally perform at an average level in key writing skills, with Satisfactory being the most common rating across all categories. The high number of Satisfactory scores in organization and word choice suggests that students have basic writing competence, yet still lack the sophistication and strong cohesion expected of higher-level writing performance. The substantial number of Poor ratings in organization (23.33%) and voice and tone (26.67%) indicates that many students struggle with creating smooth transitions, maintaining clarity, and establishing an appropriate writing voice. Additionally, the absence of Excellent ratings reflects that students need further enhancement in crafting well-structured, expressive, and creative written outputs.

Several studies support these observations. For example, Ada and Funa (2025) found that many Filipino junior high students struggled with the coherence and logical sequencing of their essays, indicating that writing difficulties extend beyond basic grammar to higher-order organizational skills. Patty (2024) identified similar pervasive challenges in writing, such as limited vocabulary knowledge, syntactic complexity, and writing anxiety, all of which can impede clarity, tone, and idea development. Likewise, Amarga and Quirap (2024) emphasized that students commonly face challenges in grammar usage, vocabulary selection, and organizing written ideas, which contribute to simplistic or fragmented writing. In the Philippine context, Martinez (2025) revealed that learners often produce surface-level written work due to difficulties with sentence structure, grammar, and vocabulary, underscoring the need for targeted instructional support to develop richer, more coherent writing skills.

These findings imply that although students demonstrate foundational writing abilities, they still require more guided practice to move beyond basic proficiency. The notable number of Poor ratings highlights the need for targeted instructional strategies that strengthen organization, enhance voice, and encourage more expressive vocabulary use. Overall, the pre-test results show that students have the potential to improve but need structured support, focused feedback, and regular writing activities to develop more advanced and effective writing skills.

Table 2
Post Test Scores

Organization	f	%
<i>Excellent</i>	10	33.33
<i>Very Satisfactory</i>	11	36.67
<i>Satisfactory</i>	9	30.00
<i>Poor</i>	0	0.00
<i>Need Improvement</i>	0	0.00
Total	30	100.00
Voice and Tone		
<i>Excellent</i>	5	16.67
<i>Very Satisfactory</i>	14	46.67
<i>Satisfactory</i>	10	33.33

<i>Poor</i>	1	3.33
<i>Need Improvement</i>	0	0.00
Total	30	100.00
Word Choice and Creativity		
<i>Excellent</i>	12	40.00
<i>Very Satisfactory</i>	16	53.33
<i>Satisfactory</i>	2	6.67
<i>Poor</i>	0	0.00
<i>Need Improvement</i>	0	0.00
Total	30	100.00

Legend: 5 = Excellent, 4 = Very Satisfactory, 3 = Satisfactory, 2 = Poor, 1 = Needs Improvement

Table 2 shows the post-test performance of students in the areas of organization, voice and tone, and word choice and creativity. For organization, most students scored Very Satisfactory (36.67%) or Excellent (33.33%), while the remaining 30% performed at a Satisfactory level. In voice and tone, the majority scored Very Satisfactory (46.67%), followed by Satisfactory (33.33%) and Excellent (16.67%), with only one student (3.33%) rated Poor. In terms of word choice and creativity, more than half of the students (53.33%) scored Very Satisfactory, and 40% achieved an Excellent rating. Only two students (6.67%) remained at the Satisfactory level, and none scored Poor or Need Improvement.

The post-test results reveal a clear improvement in students' writing performance across all three elements. A significant shift from Satisfactory and Poor ratings in the pre-test to Very Satisfactory and Excellent in the post-test suggests that students developed stronger control over organization, became more confident and expressive in their writing voice, and produced more creative and vivid word choices. The absence of Poor and Needs Improvement ratings in nearly all categories indicates that students have progressed from basic writing competence to more advanced and refined writing skills. The high scores in word choice and creativity also reflect enhanced imagination, clearer descriptions, and a more purposeful use of language in their written outputs.

These results align with several recent studies. According to Razmi and Ghane (2024), guided writing instruction combined with structured written feedback significantly improves students' writing quality, particularly in terms of clarity, organization, and revision practices. Similarly, Mahapatra (2024) found that consistent exposure to feedback, supported by ChatGPT-assisted instruction, helps learners enhance their writing structure, tone, and vocabulary use. In addition, the findings of Kartika (2024) emphasized that students demonstrate stronger engagement and improved writing performance when instructional strategies promote independent learning, active participation, and ongoing revision. Collectively, these studies support the noticeable improvement in students' post-test writing scores.

However, some studies present concerns regarding the use of AI in writing development. Deep and Chen (2025) emphasized that while AI-assisted writing tools offer benefits, they also raise important issues related to the accuracy of generated feedback, students' actual engagement in the writing process, and questions of originality and authenticity. Similarly, Baek et al. (2024) found that students themselves express concerns about the use of ChatGPT, particularly regarding the possible loss of creativity, weakening of personal voice, and uncertainty about the accuracy of its responses. Students also recognized that AI-generated content may reflect biases in its training data, potentially affecting

the reliability and fairness of the output. In addition, Rahman et al. (2025) reported that while AI tools can improve surface-level aspects of writing, such as fluency and structure, they may limit the development of independent reasoning if not used carefully.

Therefore, the post-test results indicate substantial development in students' writing abilities. The increase in Excellent and Very Satisfactory ratings shows that the interventions implemented before the post-test were effective in sharpening students' organization, strengthening their writing voice, and enhancing creativity. Despite concerns raised in previous studies about overreliance, reduced originality, and limitations in critical thinking, this study's findings demonstrate that these challenges can be addressed through structured instruction, guided feedback, and reflective writing activities. This suggests that ChatGPT's effectiveness in improving writing performance depends not only on the tool itself but also on how it is integrated into the learning process. Overall, the results confirm that students can achieve higher levels of writing proficiency when provided with appropriate guidance and opportunities to engage actively in the writing process.

Table 3

Mean Difference of Pre-Post-Test Scores

	Pretest	Posttest	W-value	Z-value	p-value	Interpretation
<i>Organization</i>	2.80	4.03	0	-4.2857	< .00001	Significant
<i>Voice and Tone</i>	2.97	3.77	35	-3.1327	0.00174	Significant
<i>Word Choice and Creativity</i>	3.00	4.33	0	-4.5407	< .00001	Significant

* Significant at $p < .05$

Table 3 presents the mean difference of pre-test and post-test in the areas of organization, voice and tone, and word choice and creativity. The results show considerable increases in the post-test means for all three elements. Organization increased from 2.80 to 4.03, voice and tone improved from 2.97 to 3.77, and word choice and creativity rose from 3.00 to 4.33. The Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test further indicates that all improvements are statistically significant, with p-values less than .05. This confirms that the changes observed from pre-test to post-test are not due to chance.

The mean difference across all writing components indicates that students showed meaningful progress in their writing performance after the intervention. Before using ChatGPT, the researchers conducted a short reflection session to discuss common errors identified in students' initial writing outputs. This reflection helped learners recognize their weaknesses and guided them in applying corrective strategies during the AI-assisted writing tasks. The increase in organization suggests that learners became more capable of arranging ideas logically and constructing well-structured paragraphs. According to an existing study, structured feedback and guided reflection improve students' organizational control and coherence in writing (Peungcharoenkun and Waluyo, 2024).

The improvement in voice and tone reflects the students' growing confidence in expressing ideas clearly and appropriately for their intended audience. This improvement may be attributed to the reflective session, during which the researchers discussed common errors in the students' initial writing and guided them to think critically about ways to enhance clarity, style, and tone before using ChatGPT to refine their work. Studies have shown that reflective activities and feedback on common errors can significantly improve students' ability to communicate effectively in writing. For instance, a quasi-experimental study revealed that reflection-supported learning of writing positively influenced

students' writing attitudes and goal orientations by helping them set clearer goals and develop greater confidence in expressing ideas (Deti et al., 2023).

Meanwhile, the substantial gain in word choice and creativity demonstrates enhanced vocabulary use, stronger imagery, and more thoughtful language selection. Empirical research on AI-assisted writing feedback indicates that students who receive immediate, technology-mediated feedback, including AI tools, show significantly greater improvements in vocabulary use, clarity, and coherence compared to those who rely solely on traditional feedback (Ekizoğlu & Demir, 2025).

These findings are supported by several recent studies. Wu et al. (2022) showed that structured feedback, including reflections on common errors, contributed to improvements in paragraph organization and genre awareness. Gerlich (2025) emphasized that feedback perception and reflective activities enhance self-regulated writing, which positively affects organization, voice, and word choice. According to Mahapatra (2024), students who receive targeted writing support and feedback show significant improvements in clarity, structure, and overall writing quality. Likewise, Razmi and Ghane (2024) emphasized that structured writing activities and repeated practice contribute to noticeable gains in creativity, coherence, and language control in students' written outputs. Kartika (2024) also found that when learners are given more opportunities for guided revision and independent writing practice, their performance improves significantly from initial assessments to final evaluations. These studies support statistical evidence showing a clear and meaningful increase in students' writing skills.

The significant mean gains in all three writing elements demonstrate that the intervention had a strong positive impact on students' writing proficiency. The consistent improvement from pre-test to post-test suggests that structured guidance, regular practice, and constructive feedback strengthened the learners' organization, voice and tone, and creative expression. These gains may also be explained by the learning processes that occurred during the intervention, particularly the development of students' awareness of their writing weaknesses and the consistent support provided during writing tasks. The discussion of common errors helped students identify specific areas for improvement, while the guided sessions allowed them to apply feedback, revise their work, and practice more effective writing strategies. Over time, this cycle of awareness, application, and revision contributed to improved control over organization, language use, and overall expression.

These improvements can be further explained through established writing development theories. Writing process theory views writing as a recursive process involving planning, drafting, revising, and editing (Flower & Hayes, 1981), which aligns with the observed improvements as students engaged more actively in revising and refining their work. In addition, Vygotsky's (1978) concept of scaffolding helps explain how guided support facilitated learning, as ChatGPT provided prompts and feedback that enabled students to perform beyond their initial ability. This support contributed to the development of both lower-order skills, such as grammar and vocabulary, and higher-order skills, such as organization and expression.

Table 4*Experiences and Challenges of Students in Using ChatGPT for Writing Tasks*

Theme 1:	ChatGPT as a Writing and Learning Aid
Theme 2:	Convenience and Accessibility of ChatGPT
Theme 3:	Dependence and Critical Thinking Concerns
Theme 4:	Awareness and Responsible Use of AI

The thematic analysis of the participants' interview responses resulted in four (4) major themes that highlight their experiences and challenges in using ChatGPT for writing tasks. These themes include: ChatGPT as a Writing and Learning Aid; Convenience and Accessibility of ChatGPT; Dependence and Critical Thinking Concerns; and Awareness and Responsible Use of AI. Collectively, these themes provide a comprehensive understanding of how students perceive the role of ChatGPT in their writing practices, emphasizing both its advantages in enhancing writing efficiency and learning engagement, as well as the emerging concerns regarding overreliance and ethical usage. The results serve as an essential basis for evaluating the overall effectiveness of ChatGPT integration in the development of students' writing proficiency.

Theme 1: ChatGPT as a Writing and Learning Aid

Most informants expressed that the use of ChatGPT has significantly enhanced their writing abilities and overall learning experience. They shared that the tool helped them improve their grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure while guiding them in organizing their ideas more effectively. ChatGPT functioned as an accessible and responsive writing companion that provided instant corrections and constructive feedback, enabling students to produce clearer, more organized, and grammatically accurate written outputs. Through its interactive and corrective features, learners developed greater confidence and motivation to write, recognizing ChatGPT as a valuable support tool for enhancing their writing proficiency and accuracy. As mentioned by the informants:

"I noticed improvements in my grammar and how I organize my sentences. I also observed small improvements in my use of punctuation."

"My writing has improved, especially in grammar, punctuation, and the proper use of capital letters. My overall writing has really gotten better."

"I learned new words and also became more familiar with the basic grammar rules."

This observation aligns with the findings of Mahapatra (2024) and Anggeraja et al. (2024), who found that integrating ChatGPT as a feedback tool enhances students' grammatical accuracy, vocabulary use, sentence formation, and overall writing quality, with instant corrective feedback strengthening linguistic awareness and self-editing skills. Wang et al. (2024) similarly emphasized its role in refining sentence structure, coherence, and logical organization, while cautioning that creativity and authenticity must be preserved. Likewise, Ding et al. (2025) observed that AI-powered writing tools support learner autonomy by encouraging self-directed revision, independent decision-making, and increased confidence in managing writing tasks with reduced reliance on teacher intervention.

This implies that ChatGPT can effectively enhance students' writing proficiency by fostering independent learning and encouraging continuous self-improvement in written communication. Moreover, it demonstrates that AI-based writing tools, when used appropriately, can complement

traditional instruction by providing immediate, individualized feedback that supports both language development and academic growth.

Theme 2: Convenience and Accessibility of ChatGPT

The informants conveyed that ChatGPT serves as a convenient and accessible tool that assists them in managing their writing and learning tasks more efficiently. They explained that the platform provides instant access to information, enabling them to complete projects under time constraints or with limited preparation. ChatGPT was seen as a helpful resource for generating ideas, organizing thoughts, and overcoming difficulties in complex writing tasks. However, participants also mentioned several challenges, such as unstable internet connectivity, restricted access, receiving irrelevant or incorrect responses, misunderstanding ChatGPT's explanations, and experiencing difficulty in expressing their ideas clearly. Despite these issues, they acknowledged that ChatGPT remains a practical and easily accessible aid that supports their academic productivity and learning independence. As expressed by the informants:

“It makes things easier and helps me finish my assignments more quickly.”

“I use it to research words that I don't understand so I can answer the questions properly.”

Recent scholarly evidence supports these observations. Shahzad et al. (2024) and Jo (2024) found that students' trust in ChatGPT is shaped by its ease of use, accessibility, immediacy, and responsiveness, which encourage integration into academic routines, though concerns about over-reliance, privacy, reliability, and misunderstandings persist. Similarly, Imran and Almusharraf (2023) reported that learners often depend on ChatGPT for grammar refinement, vocabulary enhancement, and sentence organization but emphasized the need for critical and responsible use due to inaccuracies in responses.

Therefore, these studies reinforce that ChatGPT serves as a beneficial and accessible support tool that enhances student efficiency and autonomy in academic work. However, they also underscore the necessity for users to engage with the platform thoughtfully, verify information, and apply critical judgment to ensure that the tool contributes meaningfully to their learning and writing development.

Theme 3: Dependence and Critical Thinking Concerns

The informants expressed growing concerns regarding their dependence on ChatGPT, noting that frequent reliance on the tool sometimes reduces their critical thinking, independent reasoning, and self-reliance in writing tasks. Several participants admitted that they often depend on ChatGPT to generate ideas, construct sentences, or complete assignments, which limits their initiative to think critically or analyze information on their own. Some students also observed that this dependence is forming unhealthy habits, such as immediately turning to AI for answers instead of attempting to solve academic tasks independently. While they acknowledged the usefulness of ChatGPT, the informants emphasized the need to balance its use to avoid negatively affecting their learning processes and cognitive development. As stated by the informants:

“I can no longer think on my own because even for my own opinions, I tend to rely on ChatGPT to express them.”

“It has really become a bad habit. It affects the way I think because I tend to rely on it once I get used to using it.”

Zhai et al. (2024) and Qian (2025) cautioned that excessive reliance on AI dialogue systems can weaken analytical reasoning, decision-making, and critical thinking, especially when students treat AI as a primary knowledge source without evaluation. Elsayed (2023) similarly noted that unregulated ChatGPT fosters surface-level learning and reduced cognitive engagement, underscoring the need for structured prompts and higher-order questioning. Supporting these concerns, Zhou et al. (2024) and Wang et al. (2024) found that learners lacking self-regulation often offload cognitive tasks to AI, leading to diminished problem-solving and analytical engagement. Likewise, Gerlich (2025) reported that heavy dependence on AI for decision-making reduces cognitive effort and independent judgment, reinforcing the importance of mindful and intentional use to preserve critical thinking skills.

Thus, these studies affirm that excessive reliance on ChatGPT can diminish students' capacity for independent thinking and critical analysis. They also underscore the importance of guided, intentional, and well-regulated use to protect the development of foundational cognitive skills and to promote deeper and more meaningful learning.

Theme 4: Awareness and Responsible Use of AI

The informants highlighted that while ChatGPT offers valuable support for writing and learning tasks, they remain aware of the need for responsible and cautious use. Several participants shared that they were initially unfamiliar with the platform and only discovered its usefulness after training sessions and exposure to free-access features. Despite recognizing the convenience ChatGPT provides, the informants emphasized the importance of not becoming overly dependent on the tool and instead seeking help from teachers, peers, or other human sources when needed. They also expressed awareness of the platform's limitations, noting that ChatGPT can occasionally produce inaccurate information or misunderstand instructions, which requires users to verify responses and refine their prompts to achieve clarity and accuracy. As shared by the informants:

“Not everything from ChatGPT is helpful because its answers are not fully human-like and can sometimes be inaccurate”

“Sometimes ChatGPT doesn't understand what I want it to do, so I need to correct the way I phrase my message.”

Recent studies affirm these findings, highlighting both the benefits and cautions of ChatGPT use. Gruenhagen et al. (2024) stressed that students' perceptions of academic integrity influence their use of generative AI and that inadequate evaluation of AI outputs may result in misuse without clear ethical guidance. Similarly, Bećirović et al. (2025) and Dwivedi et al. (2023) found that students with higher AI literacy were more capable of critically appraising AI-generated content, which in turn was associated with better academic performance and reduced risk of over-reliance. Al-Abdullatif and Alsubaie (2024) showed that AI literacy plays a key role in shaping students' purposeful use and perceived value of ChatGPT, supporting responsible integration in learning. In line with this, Kohnke et al. (2023) noted that students who develop AI literacy through prompt formulation, output evaluation, and verification strategies are better prepared to use ChatGPT responsibly without compromising academic integrity.

These studies imply that responsible and informed use of ChatGPT requires students to maintain critical awareness, verify AI-generated outputs, and avoid excessive dependence on the tool. They further demonstrate that when learners recognize the limitations of AI and actively seek human

guidance when necessary, ChatGPT becomes a more effective and safer support tool that enhances academic learning without compromising independent thinking.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study investigated a guided ChatGPT intervention to improve Grade 11 HUMSS students' writing efficiency in Organization, Voice and Tone, and Word Choice and Creativity. Both quantitative and qualitative analyses showed significant improvement in overall writing performance, with pre-test and post-test results confirming notable progress across all aspects. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test validated these gains, indicating that ChatGPT effectively enhanced students' ability to structure ideas, express creativity, and use language with greater accuracy and coherence.

The qualitative data reinforced the findings, with thematic analysis revealing recurring themes such as ChatGPT as a writing and learning aid, improved grammar and organization, vocabulary growth, convenience, and concerns about dependence and critical thinking. Students highlighted its value in refining grammar, expanding vocabulary, structuring compositions, organizing ideas, and applying correct punctuation, while its accessibility and instant feedback made writing more engaging and motivating. Challenges included overreliance, reduced independent thinking, technical issues, and occasional inaccuracies, yet most students agreed that ChatGPT's benefits outweighed its limitations when used responsibly with proper guidance.

Overall, the findings confirm that ChatGPT integration meaningfully contributes to students' writing efficiency by combining technology with guided instruction. The tool's interactive features and language modelling capabilities fostered both linguistic accuracy and creative expression, making it an effective supplement to classroom writing instruction. Yet, its success largely depends on the teacher's role in promoting critical engagement, ensuring that learners use ChatGPT not as a shortcut but as a collaborative partner in the writing process.

For future researchers, it is recommended to extend the duration of the research sessions to allow for a more comprehensive assessment of participants' writing proficiency and to gather more in-depth data. The present study was limited to six sessions due to time constraints, which may have influenced the scope of the findings. Moreover, future studies are encouraged to involve a larger and more diverse group of participants to enhance the reliability and generalizability of the results, as this research included only 30 purposively selected participants. It is also suggested that future researchers expand the study area to include multiple schools or different locations to obtain broader perspectives and a more representative understanding of the research topic.

In addition to these research-related recommendations, the findings also provide implications for educational practice and policy. Educators are encouraged to adopt structured and guided AI integration in writing instruction, organizing its use across stages such as brainstorming, drafting, revising, and editing, while ensuring that students critically engage with and refine AI-generated outputs. Furthermore, schools and curriculum developers are recommended to establish clear guidelines on ethical AI use, including transparency in AI-assisted work and alignment with learning objectives. Lastly, institutions are encouraged to provide professional development programs that equip teachers with skills in AI integration, prompt design, and strategies for maintaining academic integrity in AI-supported writing tasks.

REFERENCES

- Ada, H. C., & Funa, A. A. (2025). Struggling for coherence: Analyzing essay writing difficulties among Filipino junior high school students. *Journal of Research in Education and Pedagogy*, 2(4), 541–554. <https://doi.org/10.70232/jrep.v2i4.83>
- Al-Abdullatif, A. M., & Alsubaie, M. A. (2024). ChatGPT in learning: Assessing students' use intentions through the lens of perceived value and the influence of AI literacy. *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(9), 845. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14090845>
- Amarga, L. V., & Quirap, E. A. (2024). Challenges and attitude in academic writing: Basis for an intervention plan. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 7(6). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i06-14>
- Anggeraja, M. F. A., Samtidar, S., & Aeni, N. (2024). The Use of ChatGPT in Enhancing Students' Writing Ability. *Journal of Excellence in English Language Education*, 3(3), 396-413. <https://ojs.unm.ac.id/JoELEE/article/view/65713>
- Baek, C., Tate, T., & Warschauer, M. (2024). "ChatGPT seems too good to be true": College students' use and perceptions of generative AI. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 100294. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100294>
- Bećirović, S., Polz, E., & Tinkel, I. (2025). Exploring students' AI literacy and its effects on their AI output quality, self-efficacy, and academic performance. *Smart Learning Environments*, 12(1), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-025-00384-3>
- Bibi, Z., & Atta, A. (2024). The role of CHATGPT as AI English Writing Assistant: A study of student's perceptions, experiences, and satisfaction. (2024). *Annals of Human and Social Sciences*, 5(1). 433-443. [https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2024\(5-i\)39](https://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2024(5-i)39)
- Budjalemba, A. S., & Listyani, L. (2020). Factors Contributing to Students Difficulties in Academic Writing Class: Students' Perceptions. *UC Journal ELT Linguistics and Literature Journal*, 1(2), 135–149. <https://doi.org/10.24071/uc.v1i2.2966>
- Bulante, K. M., Morris Jr., D., Balagan, A., & Torres, M. A. (2024). AI-assisted and non-AI-assisted writing performances of Grade 10 students. *Azal Arts and Humanities*, 1(1), 65–94. <https://doi.org/10.55687/aah.v1i1.74>
- Cuban, L. (2024, September 27). Using artificial intelligence in teaching writing: A missed opportunity? *HP. Larry Cuban on School Reform and Classroom Practice*. <https://larrycuban.wordpress.com/2024/09/27/using-artificial-intelligence-in-teaching-writing-a-missed-opportunity-hp/>
- Daniel Schug. (2025). EFL Students' Use of AI Chatbots in Academic Writing. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, 22(1), 1-17. <https://meltajournals.com/index.php/majer/article/view/739>
- Deep, P. D., & Chen, Y. (2025). The role of AI in Academic Writing: Impacts on writing skills, critical thinking, and integrity in higher education. *Societies*, 15(9), 247. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15090247>
- Deng, X. (2025). An empirical study on the application of ChatGPT in writing learning for English major students. *Journal of Educational Research and Policies*, 7(1), 37–41. [https://doi.org/10.53469/jerp.2025.07\(01\).08](https://doi.org/10.53469/jerp.2025.07(01).08)
- Deti, T., Ferede, T., & Tiruneh, D. (2023). The effect of reflection supported learning of writing on students' writing attitude and writing achievement goal orientations. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 8(1), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-023-00202-8>

- Ding, L., Zou, D., & Kohnke, L. (2025). ChatGPT as an automated writing evaluation tool: how students perceive it and how it affects their writing. *Education and Information Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13775-3>
- Dingal, S. M. L., Balbin, C. J. P., Buenafe, S. G. L., Buenavista, Philip, E. M., Cabrera, C. A., Lorica, V. M. T., Olalo, Arnie, M., Pataganao, L. A. A., Wahing, M. R. A., Krystal, J. M. C. & Anna, M. O. P. (2024). Artificial Intelligence (AI) Usage and Its Influence to the Students' Academic Writing: A Quantitative – Correlation Investigation. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(4), 1621-1627. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.804216>
- 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>
- Elsayed, S. (2023). Towards Mitigating ChatGPT. *2023 IEEE Region 10 Symposium (TENSYP)*, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tensymp55890.2023.10223662>
- Ekizoğlu, M., & Demir, A. N. (2025). The role of AI assisted writing feedback in developing secondary students' writing skills. *Discover Education*, 4(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00919-3>
- Firat, M. (2023). The role of ChatGPT in education: Opportunities and challenges. *Firat University Journal of Social Science*, 33(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.18069/firatsbed.1299700>
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A Cognitive Process Theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365. <https://doi.org/10.2307/356600>
- Gerlich, M. (2025). AI Tools in Society: Impacts on cognitive offloading and the future of critical thinking. *Societies*, 15(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15010006>
- Gruenhagen, J. H., Sinclair, P. M., Carroll, J.-A., Baker, P. R. A., Wilson, A., & Demant, D. (2024). The rapid rise of generative AI and its implications for academic integrity: Students' perceptions and use of chatbots for assistance with assessments. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 100273. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100273>
- Halaweh, M. (2023). ChatGPT in education: Strategies for responsible implementation. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13036>
- Hapsari, A., & Rizky, E. A. (2025). Indonesian EFL students' perception of the use of artificial intelligence applications to support self-regulated learning in academic reading and writing. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, 22(2), 94-111. <https://meltajournals.com/index.php/majer/article/view/750>
- Huang, J., & Tan, M. (2023). The role of ChatGPT in scientific communication: writing better scientific review articles. *American Journal of Cancer Research*, 13(4), 1148-1154. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10164801/>
- 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>
- Jelson, A., Manesh, D., Jang, A., Dunlap, D., Kim, Y.-H., & Lee, S. W. (2026). An Empirical Study to Understand How Students Use ChatGPT for Writing Essays. *Proceedings of the 2026 CHI*

- Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3772318.3791056>
- Jo, H. (2024). From concerns to benefits: A comprehensive study of ChatGPT usage in education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00471-4>
- Kalla, D., & Smith, N. (2023). Study and analysis of Chat GPT and its impact on different fields of study. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 8(3), 827-833. <https://zenodo.org/records/7767675>
- Kartika, S. (2024). Engagement to Excellence: Exploring the correlation between student participation and writing proficiency. *Lexeme Journal of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 225–232. <https://doi.org/10.32493/ljal.v6i2.42857>
- Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., Kasneci, G. (2023b). 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>
- Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023). ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. *RELC Journal*, 54(2), 537–550. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868>
- Kostka, I., & Toncelli, R. (2023). Exploring Applications of ChatGPT to English Language Teaching: Opportunities, Challenges, and Recommendations. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language--TESL-EJ*, 27(3), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.27107int>
- Langga, P. M. M., & Alico, J. C. (2020). Students' proficiency and challenges in Filipino-to-English translation: The case of Filipino senior high school students in a private institution. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 3(4), 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2020.3.4.7>
- Li, D., & Zhang, L. (2021). Contextualizing feedback in L2 writing: the role of teacher scaffolding. *Language Awareness*, 31(3), 328–350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2021.1931261>
- Li, M. (2025). The Impact of ChatGPT on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Challenges, Opportunities, and Future Scope. In M. Khosrow-Pour, D.B.A. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology*, Sixth Edition. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-7366-5.ch079>
- Mahapatra, S. (2024). Impact of ChatGPT on ESL students' academic writing skills: a mixed methods intervention study. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00295-9>
- Mhlanga, D. (2023). Open AI in Education, the Responsible and Ethical Use of ChatGPT Towards Lifelong Learning. In: *FinTech and Artificial Intelligence for Sustainable Development. Sustainable Development Goals Series*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-37776-1_17
- Martinez, V. (2025). Challenges in formal Filipino writing among ninth-grade students in special programs in the Philippines. *Journal of Education, Learning, and Management*, 2(2), 61–73. <https://doi.org/10.69739/jelm.v2i2.863>
- Patty, J. (2024). Addressing student writing challenges: A review of difficulties and effective strategies. *Educational Research and Development*, 8(2), 369–392. <https://doi.org/10.31537/ej.v8i2.1938>

- Peungcharoenkun, T., & Waluyo, B. (2024). Writing pedagogy in higher education: The efficacy of mediating feedback with technology. *Reading & Writing, 15*(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.4102/rw.v15i1.487>
- Qian, Y. (2025). Pedagogical applications of generative AI in higher education: A systematic review of the field. *TechTrends, 69*(5), 1105–1120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-025-01100-1>
- Quijano, L. J. T., & Legaspi, M. J. B. (2020). English proficiency and sequencing skills in narrative writing of public high school students. *Philippine Social Science Journal, 3*(3), 129–141. <https://doi.org/10.52006/main.v3i3.249>
- Rad, H. S., & Mirzaei, A. (2024). Developing feedback literacy, scaffolded writing, and resilience through intervention on feedback processes for L2 writing students. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 81*, 101354. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.101354>
- Rahman, G., Mudhsh, B. A., Almutairi, E. a. A., & Kouki, M. (2025). AI-generated text in academic writing: Balancing structural proficiency and intellectual autonomy. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Scientific Studies, 8*(4), 819–831. <https://doi.org/10.53894/ijirss.v8i4.7953>
- Razmi, M. H., & Ghane, M. H. (2024). The impact of written corrective feedback on students' writing performance, self-efficacy, and anxiety. *Journal of Writing Research, 16*(2). <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2024.16.02.04>
- Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2021). *Artificial intelligence: A modern approach* (4th ed.). Pearson. <https://aima.cs.berkeley.edu/>
- Shahzad, M. F., Xu, S., & Javed, I. (2024). ChatGPT awareness, acceptance, and adoption in higher education: The role of trust as a cornerstone. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21*(1), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00478-x>
- Soriano, S. R., Martinez Jr., R. A., Pabalan III, J. L., Dulay, M. J. B., Fangon, M. R., Rosales, R. S. T., Nabor-Ferrer, C., & Mathur, A. (2024). Effectiveness of Meta AI in enhancing academic writing proficiency: The case of Filipino ESL learners. *Library Progress International, 44*(3), 18929-18939. <https://doi.org/10.48165/bapas.2024.44.2.1>
- Sumakul, D. T. Y., Hamied, F. A., & Sukyadi, D. (2022, February). Students' Perceptions of the Use of AI in a Writing Class. In *67th TEFLIN International Virtual Conference & the 9th ICOELT 2021 (TEFLIN ICOELT 2021)* (pp. 52-57). Atlantis Press.
- Teel, Z. A., Wang, T., & Lund, B. (2023). ChatGPT conundrums: Probing plagiarism and parroting problems in higher education practices. *College & Research Libraries News, 84*(6), 205-208. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5860/crln.84.6.205>
- Wang, C., Aguilar, S. J., Bankard, J. S., Bui, E., & Nye, B. (2024). Writing with AI: What College Students Learned from Utilizing ChatGPT for a Writing Assignment. *Education Sciences, 14*(9), 976. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14090976>
- Wu, L. (2024). AI-based Writing Tools: Empowering Students to Achieve Writing Success. *Advances in Educational Technology and Psychology, 8*, 40-44. <https://doi.org/10.23977/aetp.2024.080206>
- Wu, H., Zhu, H., & Yang, X. (2022). The effects of providing peer feedback on learners' genre awareness in English as a foreign language business letter writing. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 1059555. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1059555>
- Yan, J., Zhu, Y., & Ye, X. (2024). The Impact of Peer feedback on L2 Literature Review Writing: A Mixed Methods study. *SAGE Open, 14*(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241288737>

- Zhai, C., Wibowo, S., & Li, L. D. (2024). The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: A systematic review. *Smart Learning Environments*, *11*, 28. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7>
- Zhou, X., Teng, D., & Al-Samarraie, H. (2024). The mediating role of generative AI self-regulation on students' critical thinking and problem-solving. *Education Sciences*, *14*(12), 1302. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14121302>

APPENDIX

Session Guide

SESSION	DURATION	ACTIVITIES	DETAILS/NOTES
Session 1 Pre-Test + Orientation September 16, 2025 – Section A September 17, 2025 - Section B	45 mins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-Test writing task (no ChatGPT) <i>“This is who I am”</i> Orientation of Research objectives Conduct purposive sampling (based on rubric evaluation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline writing task (15 mins, timed) ChatGPT Overview (Steps on how to use ChatGPT, Access Options, Key Features, Limitations, and Ethical and responsible use) (10 mins) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research objectives Selection of participants based on the result <p>[PRE-ASSESSMENT]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Researchers collected write-ups for initial checking of common errors.
Session 2 Lesson Integration (Topic 1) September 19, 2025	45 mins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction to ChatGPT Students complete writing revision using ChatGPT <i>“This is who I am”</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflection on common errors in class. Activity: <i>“This is who I am”</i> Researchers gave user-created prompts to guide responsible ChatGPT use. <p><i>“Please check my analect/haiku explanation for grammar, organization, and word choice. Suggest improvements but keep my original meaning.”</i></p>
Session 3 Application Activity (Topic 1) September 22 , 2025	45 mins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lesson Discussion: Japan and China Lesson Delivery Section A – Japan Section B – China 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students delivered the topic in class. Researchers prepared the class activity to integrate ChatGPT use according to the topic discussion.

<p>Session 4 Lesson Integration (Topic 2)</p> <p>September 23, 2025</p>	<p>45 mins</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application Activity <p>Section A (Japan) - Haiku Interpretation</p> <p>Section B (China) - Analect Interpretation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researchers gave user-created prompts to guide responsible ChatGPT use. <p><i>“Please check my analect/haiku explanation for grammar, organization, and word choice. Suggest improvements but keep my original meaning.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Researchers collected write-ups for checking common errors.
<p>Session 5 Application Activity (Topic 2)</p> <p>September 24, 2025</p>	<p>45 mins <i>Section A</i> (Morning)</p> <p>45 mins <i>Section B</i> (Afternoon)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflection of common errors • ChatGPT use for writing revision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application Activity
<p>Session 6 Post-Test One-on-one, semi-structured interviews</p> <p>September 26, 2025</p>	<p>45 mins</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timed writing task without ChatGPT (For specific participants only) <p>(Purposive Sampling result)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect final outputs for evaluation. • Answer research questionnaire (The role of ChatGPT as AI English writing assistant) 	<p>Section A (Japan) - Haiku Interpretation</p> <p>Section B (China) - Analect Interpretation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing task (20 mins) • Interviews (25 mins)