LECTURERS' PERCEPTIONS OF ETHICAL ISSUES RELATED TO THE INTEGRATION OF AI TOOLS INTO WRITING ACTIVITIES: A MULTIPLE CASE STUDY

By:

Annisa Astrid[1], Deta Desvitasari[2], Muhamad Chalik Chairuman[3], M. Raditya Ramadhani Dirgantara[4], Fatimah Azzahra[5]

Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang, South Sumtra, Indonesia[1,2,3,4,5]

annisaastrid_uin@radenfatah.ac.id[1], detadesvitasari_uin@radenfatah.ac.id[2], chalikchairuman@gmail.com[3], dirgantararama35@gmail.com[4], fatimahazzhra0312@gmail.com[5]

Abstract: This study explores English writing lecturers' perspectives on ethical concerns related to the incorporation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in writing activities for English Department students. A qualitative multiple-case study approach was utilized. The instrument used was semi-structured interviews. The subjects of the study were 12 academics from four colleges with differing accreditation levels who were drawn using purposive sampling. Thematic analysis identified six principal ethical concerns: (1) The imperative to have an ethical attitude; 2) The concerns about privacy and data security threats; 3) The emergence of potential gaps among students; 4) The degradation of academic integrity; 5) The obligation of academic responsibility; and 6) The need for regulations and guidelines for AI use. Lecturers typically endorse AI integration to facilitate idea development and pre-writing tasks; however, they emphasize the necessity of restricting its use to maintain originality, critical thinking, and student accountability. The results underscore the pressing necessity for explicit institutional policies, ethical AI literacy, equitable access, and strategies that reconcile technology advantages with the development of autonomous writing skills. This research provides insights for the development of AI-enhanced writing education that conforms to ethical, pedagogical, and institutional concerns.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, data security, ethical issues, privacy, writing activities

INTRODUCTION

In today's era of globalization, the ability to write in English has become increasingly important because English serves as an international communication tool in various fields such as business, education, and digital content (Moses & Mohamad, 2019; Nguyen & Phan, 2023). However, to achieve this

mastery of writing skills, students are required to master grammar, vocabulary, and the ability to organize ideas coherently (Jefferson et al., 2020; Putri et al., 2022). Although writing is highly necessary, the process of teaching and learning remains the most challenging (Adam et al., 2021; Mustafa et al., 2022; Tran & Ngo, 2024).

In the context of learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL), students face various difficulties, particularly in meeting academic requirements that require advanced writing skills. Most EFL students have difficulty mastering complex grammatical structures, academic vocabulary, and rhetorical writing conventions that differ from their native language. Learning to write in English as a Foreign Language becomes even more difficult due to limited access to authentic English-language materials and the pressure to meet high academic standards. Writing in an academic environment is not just about constructing sentences, but also requires students to convey ideas coherently. Therefore, the ability to produce coherent academic writing is an important requirement for students.

The rapid development of digital technology has also influenced educational practices, including writing instruction. Digital tools, platforms, and software are now an integral part of the learning process and have been utilized to support interaction and learning effectiveness (Klimenko, 2024; Pérez et al., 2023). However, due to the highly complex nature of writing and its involvement of numerous aspects, not all existing technologies are capable of effectively

addressing all challenges in writing instruction, especially in classrooms with students from diverse backgrounds (Antipolo et al., 2024). Therefore, educators are required to seek innovative approaches that can bridge the gap between conventional methods and contemporary educational needs.

Of the four main areas of language acquisition, writing is the one on which AI is having the greatest effect. This is because AI can assist with many of the linguistic, cognitive, and evaluative processes involved in writing, such as improving coherence, building sentences, selecting vocabulary, and correcting grammar (Pryma et al., 2025). Writing demands that students construct significant, well-reasoned, and ethically sound arguments and encompasses critical thinking, creativity, originality, and academic accountability (Chidiac & Ajaka, 2018). Therefore, compared to other areas of language learning, the pedagogical and ethical concerns surrounding the use of AI tools for teaching writing are more significant.

Recently, the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in writing classes has begun to be seen as a promising alternative solution. Applications such as *Grammarly*, *ChatGPT*, and *QuillBot* can provide real-time feedback on grammar, sentence structure, and word choice, which directly helps students improve their writing quality (Chen et al., 2020). For writing lecturers, this AI technology is highly beneficial in simplifying the evaluation process, providing instructional materials, and monitoring students' skill development (Bimpong et al., 2024). These tools can even identify common errors,

suggest editorial improvements, and provide writing style recommendations. With automation in the technical aspects of writing, instructors can focus more on developing strategic aspects such as creativity, critical thinking, and more complex academic communication styles (Gligorea et al., 2023).

Although offering various advantages, the use of AI in writing instruction is not without its drawbacks. On the one hand, AI tools provide instant feedback, enhance student engagement through interactive interfaces, and support personalized learning tailored to individual needs (Rahayu et al., 2024; Song & Song, 2023). These tools can also reduce instructors' workload by automating the correction and evaluation processes (Cardon et al., 2023; (Wale & Kassahun, 2024).

However, there are concerns about over-reliance on technology, which could potentially hinder students' critical thinking skills (Rahayu et al., 2024). In addition, ethical issues such as plagiarism and the originality of writing are becoming increasingly relevant to consider. AI also still has limitations in understanding cultural context and implied meaning in texts written by humans (Cardon et al., 2023). Many AI tools operate as black boxes, meaning that the decision-making processes carried out by the system are not always understandable to users (Stornaiuolo et al., 2023).

Previous research on the role of AI in writing instruction has revealed various benefits and limitations. Some studies report that AI can improve grammatical accuracy and reduce errors in writing, as well as provide

practical automatic feedback (Jamshed et al., 2024; Selvi & Vaishnavi, 2024). On the other hand, Song and Song (2023) show that AI tools can enhance writing motivation among students who initially lack confidence. Research by Lawasi et al. (2024) and Silva et al. (2024) reveals that AI also has the potential to foster critical thinking and personalized learning. Most of these studies emphasize the importance of oversight and a balanced approach to ensure that AI utilization does not replace the actual learning process but rather reinforces it.

Other research by Song and Song (2023) highlights the importance of AI in helping non-native speakers understand and produce academically relevant writing that is linguistically and culturally appropriate. AI not only assists with grammar correction but also suggests improvements to paragraph structure and helps tailor content to the cultural context of the reader (Dong, 2023). Research on collaboration between humans and AI indicates that repeated and reflective interaction with AI tools can improve the quality of doctoral students' writing (Nguyen & Phan, 2023). Overall, these studies emphasize that AI has great potential to revolutionize writing instruction, especially when used collaboratively and tailored to the linguistic and cultural needs of learners.

Although interest in the use of AI in writing education is growing, there are a number of gaps in its implementation and the evaluation of its impact. Previous research has highlighted practical benefits such as improved language accuracy and learning motivation, but lacks

emphasis on the need to address ethical issues such as data security, access equity, and plagiarism. Therefore, in an effort to fill this gap, the writers were interested in conducting research that aimed at exploring the writing lecturers' perceptions of ethical issues related to the integration of AI tools in writing activities.

The viewpoints of lecturers are vital because they are in a prime position to shape students' academic ideals, ensure the responsible use of technology in the classroom, and plan writing curricula. Lecturers have a pivotal role to play in determining the regulation, adoption, and integration of AI technologies into writing instruction because of their position as guardians of academic integrity and ethical norms. Whether students' growth of originality, accountability, and independent thought is supported or undermined by AI use depends on their awareness and ethical position.

The novelty of this research is its emphasis on writing lecturers' ethical consciousness and pedagogical position. This aspect has not been discussed in previous studies, but it is crucial for promoting responsible and sustainable practices of AI-assisted learning.

METHODOLOGY

A qualitative method was utilized to discover the writing lecturers' perceptions on ethical issues related to the integration of AI tools in writing activities (Creswell & Poth, 2018) state that qualitative research methods can obtain details regarding people's subjective experiences, views, and opinions.

Meanwhile, a multiple-case study approach was employed in this investigation. It incorporates numerous issues or instances into a single study. Researchers can offer access to, or ample opportunity for, in-depth, detailed, intense, and full examination of the instances under investigation through these various case studies.

This study was conducted at four universities, specifically in English Education study programs. Two of these English Education study programs are accredited as "excellent", while the other two are accredited as "very good". This difference in accreditation was taken into consideration as the data were heterogeneous, ensuring that the data obtained were sufficiently representative. The four universities were selected because they have a writing curriculum as a required course, and the writing lecturers have incorporated AI into the writing learning process.

The research participants were drawn purposively. They are writing lecturers who have experience using AI tools during teaching and learning activities. Each university has three lecturers who are accustomed to teaching writing and also introducing AI as a tool to aid in the writing process. Thus, the total number of lecturers involved as interview respondents was 12 people to obtain a variety of experiences and perspectives regarding ethical issues related to the integration of AI tools in the writing learning process.

A semi-structured interview guide was developed to facilitate in-depth discussions with lecturers. The interview guide contains open-ended

questions aimed at exploring their views on the ethical aspects of using AI in writing instruction (Çela et al., 2024; Celik et al., 2024; Perkins, 2023; Williams, 2024). To explore lecturers' perceptions of ethical issues in the use of AI in writing, interview items were developed as interview guidelines with the following dimensions and interview items:

Table 1
Interview Instrument

No	Dimension	Interview Questions
1	Privacy and Data Security	a. What is your opinion on the issue of student data privacy when they use AI tools such as ChatGPT or Grammarly for writing? b. Do you think the AI platforms used by students are sufficiently transparent in terms of user data management and protection?
2	Fairness and equality of access	a. In your opinion, does the use of AI in the writing process create inequality or unfairness among students? Why? b. How do you respond to differences in students' access to or digital literacy regarding AI tools?
3	Originality and Plagiarism	a. How do you distinguish between ethical AI assistance and plagiarism in student academic writing? b. Have you ever encountered students who used AI unethically? How did you handle the situation?
4	Academic responsibility	a. In your opinion, to what extent should students be responsible for content produced with the help of AI? b. Do you feel that students become less reflective or critical because they rely too much on AI when writing?
5	Requirements and Regulatory Guidelines	a. Does the institution where you teach have official guidelines regarding the use of AI in academic writing? If not, what do you think would be the ideal guidelines for students' use of AI in an academic context?

To make the qualitative data trustworthy, member checking was used in this study (Creswell & Poth, 2018). After each research participant was interviewed, they were asked to respond to the transcript of the interview to reach an agreement that what had been written was indeed in accordance with what had been discussed.

For qualitative data obtained from interviews, thematic analysis is used to identify and analyze patterns within the data (Creswell & Poth, 2018). This process consists of several steps: first, audio recordings of

interviews are transcribed. Next, the transcripts are read several times to gain a deep understanding of their content. Initial coding is performed to categorize the responses of interview participants. Once the initial coding is complete, similar codes are classified into themes, allowing for a more organized representation of the data. This thematic framework will help in interpreting the findings and connecting what the participants felt with the research objectives.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of thematic analysis identified six principal ethical concerns: (1) The imperative to have an ethical attitude; 2) The concerns about privacy and data security threats; 3) The emergence of potential gaps among students; 4) The degradation of academic integrity; 5) The obligation of academic responsibility; and 6) The need for regulations and guidelines for AI use. Each of theme is described as follows

The Imperative to Have an Ethical Attitude

From the interview results, it was found that all lecturers introduced AI that was suitable in helping them with writing. The lecturers were aware that AI was freely available and legal, and that anyone, including the students they taught, could use it anytime and anywhere.

Lecturers generally believed that the use of AI in writing instruction is acceptable, but it must be limited. Lecturers should guide students to use AI solely as a tool to support the writing learning process effectively, not to obtain AI-generated writing that appears good and is directly copied and claimed as their own work. This is

in line with what a lecturer named W said: “AI can be used to find ideas or frameworks, but it should not be copied in its entirety” (W, personal communication, 2025). This statement underlines the principle that students must continue to produce texts using their own abilities, even if they are aided by references or inspiration from AI. For example, AI is permitted to assist in selecting topics or providing an overview, but the creation of complete paragraphs and the development of arguments remain the full responsibility of the students.

In addition, some lecturers said that the use of AI is allowed but with ethical restrictions, including learning how to interact with AI through the creation of appropriate prompts, so that students can use AI to sharpen their critical and creative thinking skills. As another lecturer stated,

> At the beginning of a meeting, in the absence of instructional materials, I may seek examples from AI prior to students composing their texts. However, during the writing process, students must rely solely on their own minds and may only utilize the examples I have previously supplied. It involves seeking instances, such as paragraphs generated by AI, or searching for writing prompts (A, personal communication, 2025).

Another lecturer said, “I teach how to create prompts for ideas, not for writing the entire text” (W, personal communication, 2025). Other lecturers also revealed:

> The permissibility of the prompt is dependent upon the manner in which students formulate it. The purpose of AI is to develop ideas rather than execute tasks. The constraint is that students perform their work with the assistance of AI, rather than having their tasks executed by AI. The prompt is their responsibility. (HR, personal communication, 2025).

Thus, lecturers also realized that open access to AI can trigger “shortcut” behavior among students. The availability of auto-generate features tempts students to directly copy AI-generated results, thereby

reducing their cognitive engagement in the writing process. This encourages the lecturers to prioritize a process-based learning approach, where AI is used only in the initial stages of writing to support ideas, not to replace the entire creative process.

It can be concluded that the integration of AI into the writing process must not overlook the security dimension. AI may provide quick access to information and ideas, but without proper understanding and risk management, these benefits may be overshadowed by threats to data confidentiality and intellectual property.

The Concerns about Privacy and Data Security Threats

From the interview results, most lecturers expressed concerns about potential risks to privacy and data security when students use AI tools in the writing process. The lecturers believed that behind the ease of access to AI, there are vulnerabilities that can be exploited by third parties, especially since most AI platforms are cloud-based and require logging in with personal or institutional accounts. These concerns are not only related to user identity data but also encompass intellectual property rights over ideas or content uploaded to AI.

A lecturer emphasized: "The data the student's input may be stored or analyzed by the service provider. This can be a cause for concern if the data includes personal information that should be confidential and not shared with other parties" (NL, personal communication 2025). This statement reflects an awareness that AI algorithms work by collecting user input data to train and improve their models. As a result, original ideas

uploaded by students such as research drafts or writing outlines may be stored and reused by AI systems in the future.

Therefore, lecturers must also be aware of the possibility that AI can store their personal data, and remind students not to enter personal data into AI, such as when logging in with email, to avoid using institutional email and only use other emails that do not use personal data. As emphasized by one of the lecturers, as follows:

> During registration, it is imperative to use caution when entering personal information. Nonetheless, certain individuals input data into the prompt while utilizing GPT, and this information will be retained in the AI's memory. Therefore, avoid revealing excessive personal information. (H, personal communication, 2025).

The Emergence of Potential Gaps among Students

From the interviews, the majority of lecturers stated that the integration of AI in writing instruction could potentially lead to inequality in terms of students' abilities and equitable access to AI. The lecturers revealed that the use of AI tends to benefit students with high digital literacy skills and adequate technological facilities, such as capable computers and stable internet connections. This aligns with what one lecturer stated: “Students who are tech-savvy are more advantaged than those who do not understand AI” (NL, personal communication, 2025). Another lecturer also shared a similar opinion as follows: “Those who are tech-savvy will use tools such as Chat GPT to assist in the writing process. However, those who are less tech-savvy are not motivated to develop themselves” (W, personal communication, 2025).

This phenomenon shows that the presence of AI does not automatically

improve the quality of learning for all students equally. Students who are not yet familiar with AI technology often feel left behind, both in terms of technical ability to use the platform and understanding of its ethical use. As a result, AI integration that is not balanced with guidance can widen the achievement gap among students.

To minimize inequality, some lecturers implement a strategy of allowing students to use AI, but only during writing practice sessions. Lecturers are required to continuously monitor what students are doing when they use AI in class. However, when it comes to assessment, students are required to write without any help from AI. This is in line with what one lecturer said as follows: “I will continue to supervise them, and after they write with the help of AI, I will ask them to paraphrase manually” (RI, personal communication, 2025).

Even when lecturers have assigned homework tasks, they also require students to document each prompt they write along with the output. This is in line with what one of the lecturers said as follows:

> The requirement is that regardless of the AI employed, from the initial prompt until the completion of the intended writing outcomes, they are required to capture screenshots of the entire discussion with the AI. The prompt's content determines the usability of the AI-generated outcomes (H, personal communication, 2025).

This approach serves a dual purpose; it ensures that AI is used in accordance with learning objectives, while also providing support to students who are less skilled in using it. As a result, AI can be accessed and used by all students, not just certain groups with technological advantages.

Lecturers' awareness of the issue of potential inequality reflects the principle that technology-based

learning innovation must be accompanied by strategies to ensure equal access. Without this, AI risks becoming a tool that reinforces academic disparities.

The Degradation of Academic Integrity

From the interview results, lecturers reported a worrying trend in which students increasingly rely on AI to produce written work instantly, often without making any effort to understand or modify the content provided. This was expressed by one of the lecturers: “Students can now request AI to generate comprehensive paragraphs that include main sentences, supporting facts, and citations. The results are technically flawless, yet when I inquire about the substance, they are unresponsive” (HA, personal communication, 2025).

Maintaining the originality of students' written work is a major concern for lecturers in the context of AI use. The lecturers stated that they can identify signs of AI-generated writing. These characteristics include the use of language that is too perfect, vocabulary choices that are rarely used by students at a certain level, and sentence structures that are too ideal. This is in line with one of the lecturers' statements as follows: “I can tell which of my students' papers have been copied directly from AI and which have not. One of the characteristics is the use of very sophisticated vocabulary that is not appropriate for their level of ability” (HA, personal communication, 2025).

This suspicion is not only based on intuition, but also on teaching experience that allows lecturers to compare students' writing styles over

time. The discrepancy between students' writing abilities in class and the quality of their submitted work is often an indicator of excessive AI intervention. As a preventive measure, the lecturers implement manual paraphrasing techniques. The goal is to ensure students continue to practice processing ideas and information using their own language, rather than relying on AI-provided automatic paraphrasing. This aligns with what the lecturer stated: "I teach manual paraphrasing to maintain originality" (D, personal communication, 2025).

To conclude, the integration of AI in writing instruction must maintain originality as the core of academic work. AI can help enrich vocabulary or provide idea references, but students are still required to process, organize, and present their writing with their own unique style and characteristics.

The Obligation of Academic Responsibility

The lecturers emphasized that the use of AI in writing must be accompanied by the ability of students to understand and take responsibility for the content of their work. This principle emphasizes that AI is only a tool, while full academic responsibility remains in the hands of the writer. This is in line with the opinion of one of the lecturers as follows: "Students must be able to explain the content of their writing. If they cannot, it means they did not actually write it themselves" (HA, personal communication, 2025). Other lecturers also emphasized the importance of students taking full responsibility for what they write: "Students remain fully responsible. Regardless of the technical assistance

used, they must understand, evaluate, and be able to account for the content of their writing, including in discussions or exams" (NL, personal communication, 2025).

Active student involvement is an important indicator for distinguishing healthy AI use from excessive use. In practice, the lecturers used various strategies to ensure this involvement. One of them is verification, where students are asked to present or explain the process of writing their papers. A lecturer stated, "Alternatively, we can request that they show their written work to ascertain their comprehension of the material" (D, personal communication, 2025).

This approach is also accompanied by academic sanctions when papers are found to have been almost entirely generated by AI without significant modification. This is in line with what one lecturer said: "Minimal scores will be awarded for just replication and pasting from AI without any attempt at modification." (Ai, personal communication, 2025).

Moreover, there is an awareness among lecturers that over-reliance on AI can reduce students' language skills in the long term. Therefore, some lecturers encourage the use of AI as a trigger for thinking, not as the main writer. This is in line with what one lecturer said: "If everything comes from AI, they will not develop. My job is to make sure they keep thinking" (AP, Personal communication, 2025).

The Need for Regulations and Guidelines on The Use of AI

All lecturers acknowledge that currently there are no regulations or official guidelines from the university that specifically regulate the use of AI in writing instruction. This regulatory

vacuum has confused both lecturers and students in determining the ethical boundaries of AI use. This has led all lecturers to agree that the university leadership should initiate the development of guidelines for AI use. One lecturer expressed his opinion: "As a lecturer, if I were to provide guidance, I would say that they can use AI tools during the pre-writing stage only. However, during the writing stage or post-writing stage, they need to think critically to elaborate on the content of their writing and ideas." (HA, personal communication, 2025).

Another lecturer also revealed the importance of including provisions for manual paraphrasing: "I only obligate one thing when it comes to writing, and that is paraphrasing. No matter how good the writing is, if it does not involve paraphrasing, it is still a lie; the machine language will definitely be noticeable" (RI, personal communication, 2025).

In addition, the lecturers agreed to establish guidelines that emphasize the prohibition of uploading full documents to AI platforms in order to protect student privacy and copyright. As one lecturer said, "I am worried that if they upload their thesis or articles, the data will be used by other people." (A, personal communication, 2025).

Some lecturers also encouraged ongoing training or workshops, rather than one-off events. The aim is to ensure that lecturers and students understand the rapid developments in AI technology, including aspects of security and ethical use. This is as stated by one lecturer: "Workshops are important so that we know what is and is not allowed when using AI, and they must be held regularly because AI is

constantly changing." (S, personal communication, 2025).

It can be concluded that regulations and guidelines are not only about restrictions, but also about facilitating safe, ethical, and productive AI literacy. Without a clear policy framework, AI integration has the potential to cause ethical uncertainty, confusion among lecturers and students, and disparities in the application of rules between classes or study programs.

The results of this study indicated that lecturers teaching writing courses tend to accept the integration of AI tools in writing instruction, but with the stipulation that their use must be limited ethically. The lecturers emphasized that AI can be utilized in the early stages of the writing process, such as brainstorming ideas, creating outlines, or obtaining sample paragraphs, but it is not permissible to use AI to generate complete writings that are then claimed as the work of students. This perspective aligns with the principles of ethical AI use outlined by Floridi and Cowls (2019), which emphasize the importance of fairness, accountability, and integrity in the use of technology. Previous research by Zawacki-Richter et al., (2019), also supports this finding by showing that instructors who integrate digital technology into learning tend to set boundaries to prevent the technology from replacing students' critical thinking roles. In this context, this study provides evidence that limiting the stages of AI use can help maintain students' creative processes.

Additionally, concerns about privacy and data security emerged as important issues raised by the

lecturers. They recognized that most AI platforms are cloud-based and require login, meaning that identity data and even uploaded academic content could potentially be stored and reused by third parties. This is in line with the warning from Leong and Bing (2025) regarding data security risks in user interactions with AI. However, the findings of this study introduce a new perspective: the lecturers are taking proactive steps by teaching students to use non-institutional email accounts and avoid entering sensitive information into prompts. This indicates that ethical discussions extend beyond plagiarism to include digital security literacy.

Lecturers recognized a skills gap between students proficient in technology and those lacking digital skills or sufficient access to devices. This is consistent with the digital divide theory Nguyen (2025) which highlights that disparities in digital access and skills might widen the achievement gap. To solve the problems, lecturers should implement equity strategies, including AI usage exercises in class with direct guidance and mandatory documentation of AI prompts and outputs. This is in accordance with the recommendations of Alam and Forhad (2023) to mitigate academic disparities resulting from technology.

The issue of academic integrity degradation is also a major concern. Lecturers revealed that they can recognize signs of AI-generated text, such as overly perfect diction or sentence structures that exceed the abilities of students at a certain level. This finding reinforces the results of research, which states that AI can facilitate shortcut learning, but this

study goes further by identifying the linguistic indicators that lecturers use for detection (Cotton et al., 2024). In response, they teach manual paraphrasing techniques to maintain originality and ensure that students continue to process ideas in their own words.

In terms of academic responsibility, the lecturers required their students to understand and be able to account for the content of their writing, whether through discussions, presentations, or exams. This aligns with the responsible AI use recommended by Nguyen and Phan (2023), which emphasizes user accountability as a key factor in integrating technology into education. The imposition of low grades on works proven to be entirely generated by AI without modification demonstrates lecturers' commitment to maintaining the quality of writing instruction.

Furthermore, the lecturers of writing recognized deficiencies in formal campus regulations about AI utilisation. They offered written guidelines that limit usage restrictions and offer continuous AI literacy training. These recommendations align with Dwivedi et al., (2023) who underscore the necessity for adaptive policy to match the swift advancements in technology.

Overall, the novelty of this research lies in the disclosure of practical strategies used by lecturers to limit and direct the use of AI, which not only focuses on plagiarism but also includes data security literacy, digital skills equity, linguistic feature-based detection, and concrete accountability mechanisms. An approach that positions AI solely at the pre-writing

stage, accompanied by training in ethical prompt creation and manual paraphrasing techniques, provides a balanced model for AI integration that balances technological utilization with the preservation of manual writing skills.

The implications of these findings are quite broad. First, the integration of AI in writing instruction requires clear institutional policies to ensure consistent and fair practices for all parties. Second, AI ethics literacy must be incorporated into the curriculum, encompassing technical skills, privacy awareness, and academic responsibility. Third, strategies for limiting the stages of AI use can serve as best practices for other educational institutions seeking to avoid the degradation of writing skills. Fourth, equitable access to technology and digital literacy training must be pursued to avoid academic disparities. Thus, this research contributes both practically and conceptually to the development of policies and practices for teaching writing in the era of artificial intelligence.

This research provides significant insights into lecturers' perspectives of ethical difficulties with the integration of AI tools in writing teaching, although certain limitations must be recognized. The study was conducted exclusively at four universities within a particular national context, perhaps constraining the generalizability of the findings to other cultural or institutional environments. Secondly, the data was exclusively derived from self-reported judgments of lecturers obtained through interviews hence the findings may represent subjective viewpoints

and be swayed by personal biases or previous encounters with AI, rather than objective classroom results. Third, the study lacked direct observation of AI utilization in real teaching–learning processes, which may have offered enhanced triangulation and a more thorough comprehension of practical implementation. Finally, the views of students were not analyzed, resulting in a deficiency in comprehending how ethical concerns are perceived and experienced from the learners' viewpoint.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study, six themes of lecturer perspectives were identified regarding ethical issues related to the integration of AI tools in writing activities: 1) The imperative to have an ethical attitude; 2) The concerns about privacy and data security threats; 3) The emergence of potential gaps among students; 4) The degradation of academic integrity; 5) The obligation of academic responsibility; and 6) The need for regulations and guidelines for AI use.

It can be inferred that lecturers view the integration of AI in writing instruction as a strategic opportunity to enrich the learning process, provided that ethical use is a top priority. Lecturers believe that AI should be used to support students' thinking processes, not to replace their intellectual work. Concerns regarding the risks of plagiarism, excessive reliance, and loss of originality highlight the importance of implementing usage restrictions, clear ethical guidelines, and oversight in the

implementation of AI in the classroom.

This study recommends that lecturers incorporating AI into writing instruction establish explicit ethical policies, encompassing usage restrictions, monitoring systems, and documented guidelines that underscore AI's role as an aid in the cognitive process rather than a replacement for intellectual effort. Educational institutions can promote the collaborative formulation of these rules among academics, technology developers, and administration, assuring uniform application throughout all academic programs.

REFERENCES

Adam, N., Abid, A., & Bantulu, Y. (2021). Challenges in teaching English writing skills: Lessons learnt from Indonesian high school English language teachers. *Jambura Journal of English Teaching and Literature*, *2*(1), 12–21. https://doi.org/10.37905/jetl.v2i1.10632

Alam, G. M., & Forhad, Md. A. R. (2023). The impact of accessing education via smartphone technology on education disparity—A sustainable education perspective. *Sustainability*, *15*(14), 10979. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151410979

Antipolo, A. M. R., Paz, J. E. C., David, M. A., & Ferrer, A. (2024). The impact of technological advancements on the academic performance of senior high school students. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Multidisciplinary Education*, *03*(05). https://doi.org/10.58806/ijirme.2024.v3i5n14

Bimpong, B. W., Atsise, P., & Owusu, F. (2024). Exploring the implementation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) writing tools in teaching and learning: faculty and students' perspectives in higher education. *East African Journal of Information Technology*, *7*(1), 380–393. https://doi.org/10.37284/eajit.7.1.2286

Bing, Z. J., & Leong, W. Y. (2025). Ethical design of AI for education and learning systems. *ASM Science Journal*, *20*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.32802/asmscj.2025.1917

Cardon, P., Fleischmann, C., Aritz, J., Logemann, M., & Heidewald, J. (2023). The challenges and opportunities of AI-assisted writing: Developing AI literacy for the AI age. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, *86*(3), 257–295. https://doi.org/10.1177/23294906231176517.

Çela, E., Fonkam, M. M., & Potluri, R. M. (2024). Risks of AI-assisted learning on student critical thinking. *International Journal of Risk and Contingency Management*, *12*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJRCM.350185

Celik, I., Gedrimiene, E., Siklander, S., & Muukkonen, H. (2024). The affordances of artificial intelligence-based tools for supporting 21st-century skills: *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.9069.

Chen, L., Chen, P., & Lin, Z. (2020). Artificial intelligence in education: A review. *IEEE Access*, *8*, 75264–75278. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988510

Chidiac, R. S., & Ajaka, L. (2018). Writing Through the 4Cs in the Content Areas – Integrating Creativity, Critical Thinking, Collaboration and Communication. *European Scientific Journal*. https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2018.c4p8

Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *61*(2), 228–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design choosing among five approaches.* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks.

Dong, Y. (2023). Revolutionizing academic English writing through AI-powered pedagogy: Practical exploration of teaching process and assessment. *Journal of Higher Education Research*, *4*(2), 52. https://doi.org/10.32629/jher.v4i2.1188

Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., Baabdullah, A. M., Koohang, 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). 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

Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review*. https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1

Gligorea, I., Cioca, M., Oancea, R., Gorski, A.-T., Gorski, H., & Tudorache, P. (2023). Adaptive learning using artificial intelligence in e-learning: A literature review. *Education Sciences*, *13*(12), 1216. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13121216

Jamshed, M., Ahmed, A. S. M. M., Sarfaraj, MD., & Warda, W. U. (2024). The impact of ChatGPT on English language learners' writing skills. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (IJIM)*, *18*(19), 18–36. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v18i19.50361

Jefferson K, Ramya R, & Radhakrishnan V. (2020). An exploration on issues and challenges in teaching writing skills to tertiary-level learners. *Innovations and Technologies for Soft Skill Development and Learning*, 98-107. 10.4018/978-1-7998-3464-9.ch012

Klimenko, A. Y. (2024). Technological change and its effect on education. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Research*, *6*(1), 01–18. https://doi.org/10.33140/JEPR.06.01.04

Lawasi, M. C., Rohman, V. A., & Shoreamanis, M. (2024). The use of AI in improving student's critical thinking skills. *Proceedings Series on Social Sciences & Humanities*, *18*, 366–370. https://doi.org/10.30595/pssh.v18i.1279

Moses, R. N., & Mohamad, M. (2019). Challenges faced by students and teachers on writing skills in ESL contexts: A literature review. *Creative Education*, *10*(13), 3385–3391. https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2019.1013260

Mustafa, A., Noor Arbab, A., & Ahmed El Sayed, A. (2022). Difficulties in academic writing in English as a second/foreign language from the perspective of undergraduate students in higher education institutions in Oman. *Arab World English Journal*, *13*(3), 41–53. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no3.3

Nguyen, L. D. (2025). Digital divide in science education: the role of technology access and skills in supporting underserved students. *Data and Metadata*, *4*, 865. https://doi.org/10.56294/dm2025865.

Nguyen, N. H. T., & Phan, U. T. M. (2023). Some difficulties in writing skills of English

majored sophomores at Tay Do University in Viet Nam. *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies*, *4*(1), 68–86. https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.0100

Pérez, R. S. M., Pérez, T. E. L., Pérez, R. J. M., & López, M. V. P. (2023). Technological innovation and education: a brief review of the literature. *Ibero-American Journal of Education & Society Research*, *3*(1), 25–30. https://doi.org/10.56183/iberoeds.v3i1.596

Perkins, M. (2023). Academic integrity considerations of AI large language models in the post-pandemic era: ChatGPT and beyond. *Academic Integrity Considerations of AI Large Language Models in the Post-Pandemic Era: ChatGPT and Beyond*, *20*(2). https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.02.07

Pryma, V., Pelivan, O., Teletska, T., Tsobenko, O., & Zagrebelna, N. (2025). AI writing assistants and student competence: A linguistic aspect. *Arab World English Journal*, *1*, 319–329. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/AI.18

Putri, A. L. D., Tambusai, A., & Hasibuan, A. L. (2022). Students' difficulties in acquiring English writing. *International Journal of Educational Research Excellence (IJERE)*, *1*(1), 19–26. https://doi.org/10.55299/ijere.v1i1.21

Rahayu, Weda, S., Muliati, & De Vega, N. (2024). Artificial intelligence in writing instruction: A self-determination theory perspective. *XLinguae*, *17*(1), 234–244. https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2024.17.01.16

Selvi, V. T., & Vaishnavi, B. (2024). Comparison on applications and impact of AI in English grammar learning. *Recent Research Reviews Journal*, *3*(2), 357-369. https://doi.org/10.36548/rrrj.2024.2.004

Silva, G., Godwin, G., & Jayanagara, O. (2024). The impact of AI on personalized learning and educational analytics. *International Transactions on Education Technology (ITEE)*, *3*(1), 36–46. https://doi.org/10.33050/itee.v3i1.669

Song, C., & Song, Y. (2023). Enhancing academic writing skills and motivation: assessing the efficacy of ChatGPT in AI-assisted language learning for EFL students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1260843

Stornaiuolo, A., Higgs, J., Nichols, T. P., Leblanc, R. J., & de Roock,

R. S. (2023). The platformization of writing instruction: Considering educational equity in new learning ecologies. *Review of Research in Education*, *47*(1), 311–359. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X241227431

Tran, T. P., & Ngo, N. P. Q. (2024, August). Challenges encountered by the first-year students in English writing paragraphs. In *ICTE Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 5, pp. 64-74). https://doi.org/10.54855/ictep.2456

Wale, B. D., & Kassahun, Y. F. (2024). The transformative power of AI writing technologies: Enhancing EFL writing instruction through the integrative use of writerly and google docs. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, *2024*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1155/2024/9221377

Williams, R. T. (2024). The ethical implications of using generative chatbots in higher education. *Frontiers in Education*, *8*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1331607

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education – where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *16*(1), 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0