# Ethical AI in EFL Writing Instruction: A Case Study of Lecturers' Communication and Pedagogical Strategies

**\*¹Farida Noor Rohmah, ¹Setya Putri Rahayu**
¹Universitas 'Aisyiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia

**\*Correspondence:**
faridanoor88@unisayogya.co.id

## Abstract

The rapid integration of large language models such as ChatGPT into higher education creates new opportunities for EFL writing instruction but also raises complex ethical and pedagogical challenges. While existing research has largely focused on students' use of AI, comparatively little is known about how lecturers themselves navigate its ethical implications in writing classes. This qualitative case study investigates the experiences of two EFL academic writing lecturers at a private university in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Data were generated through semi-structured interviews and document analysis of course syllabi and Learning Management System (LMS) materials, and were examined using thematic analysis. Three interrelated themes emerged: communication approaches, pedagogical strategies, and challenges identified. The lecturers used open dialogue, explicit ethical framing, and reflective discussion to position ChatGPT as a supplementary tool rather than a substitute for students' thinking. They also designed guided exploration and scaffolded integration tasks, such as AI–human text comparison and critical evaluation of AI outputs, to foster AI literacy and metacognitive awareness. However, they reported significant obstacles, including students' overreliance on AI-generated text, uneven AI literacy, and limited institutional guidance, with formal documents treating ChatGPT mainly as a percentage-based rubric rather than a pedagogical resource. The findings underscore the need for intentional, ethics-informed instructional design and coherent institutional policies. The study concludes that ongoing professional development and clearer AI-related regulations are essential for enabling EFL lecturers to cultivate responsible AI use and sustain academic integrity in AI-augmented writing environments.

**Keywords**: EFL writing instruction, AI literacy, ethical AI use, ChatGPT, LMS.

## INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of large language models such as ChatGPT has accelerated the integration of artificial intelligence into higher education and reshaped how students access, process, and produce information (Peláez-Sánchez et al., 2024; Kasneci et al., 2023; Yadav, 2024; Laato et al., 2023; Prasetya & Syarif, 2023; Rudolph et al., 2023). These tools can

generate fluent, contextually appropriate texts, answer questions, summarise readings, and simulate dialogic interaction, which makes them attractive as on-demand learning companions and writing assistants (Young & Shishido, 2023; Bansal et al., 2024; Javaid et al., 2023; Steiss et al., 2024). Universities are beginning to use AI for automated feedback, content support, and personalised learning, while, as argued by Yeo (2023), Wise et al. (2024), and Chan (2023), they are also facing new questions about assessment, authorship, and academic integrity. In this situation, AI is no longer a marginal or optional tool; it has become part of students' everyday study practices and therefore demands a considered response from educators and institutions (Nguyen et al., 2024; Özçelik & Ekşi, 2024). In the field of language education, particularly in EFL, ChatGPT can assist learners in generating ideas, reformulating sentences, expanding vocabulary, and modelling target-language discourse, which may support self-directed learning and reduce anxiety when composing in a foreign language (Dizon, 2024; Song & Song, 2023; Mahapatra, 2024; Polakova & Ivenz, 2024; Teng, 2024; Jamshed et al., 2024). At the same time, the ease with which it produces coherent texts intensifies long-standing concerns about plagiarism (Guleria et al., 2023), overreliance on external help (Alsaedi, 2024), and the erosion of learners' independent writing and critical thinking (Yuan et al., 2024; Janković & Kulić, 2025).

In this context, ethical AI use is especially sensitive in EFL writing classes. Because ChatGPT can produce complete, polished texts in English, the boundary between legitimate support and outsourcing the core writing task can easily become blurred (Yang et al., 2024; Algaraady & Mahyoob, 2023; Bok & Cho, 2023; Revell et al., 2024). Moreover, not all students possess the same level of AI literacy. Those who can craft precise prompts, check the reliability of information, and critically evaluate AI outputs gain a clear advantage over peers who accept suggestions uncritically or are unsure how to use the tool effectively (Darwin et al., 2023; Huang, 2023; Woo et al., 2024; Zhao, 2024), and this disparity can deepen existing inequalities in language proficiency and digital skills (Amin, 2023; Truonga, 2024). Against this backdrop, ethical AI use in EFL writing instruction is not simply a matter of allowing or banning tools (Neff et al., 2024; Roe et al., 2023; Hossain et al., 2025). It depends on how lecturers explain the role of ChatGPT, set clear boundaries around acceptable use, and design pedagogical strategies that harness its benefits while safeguarding academic integrity and ensuring that students still engage meaningfully in the cognitive work of writing. Such strategies can include activities that position ChatGPT as a starting point for brainstorming (Werdiningsih et al., 2024), outlining and language refinement (Faiz et al., 2025; Alsaedi, 2024), structured comparisons between AI-generated texts and student texts that invite critical evaluation (Darwin et al., 2023), and reflective tasks in which students analyse how they have used ChatGPT, what they chose to keep or change, and how this affected their learning (Loos et al., 2023; Tseng & Lin, 2024; Mun, 2024).

Recent studies indicate that ChatGPT can meaningfully support EFL students' academic writing while simultaneously creating important ethical and pedagogical challenges. Tsai et al. (2024) showed that ChatGPT-assisted revisions significantly improved students' scores in vocabulary, grammar, organisation, and content, with the most significant gains among lower-achieving writers. However, they cautioned that these gains do not represent students' actual writing competence and may undermine the fairness of assessment. Xu and Jumaat (2024) found that ChatGPT helps students apply writing strategies more effectively by generating outlines, enriching content, synthesising literature,

and refining language. Werdiningsih et al. (2024) reported that students appreciate ChatGPT for reducing uncertainty, clarifying vocabulary, and offering content suggestions that allow them to focus more on creative aspects of writing. At the same time, this body of work highlights serious concerns about plagiarism, inaccurate or improperly cited output, overreliance on AI, and threats to the authenticity of students' work when AI-generated language overshadows learners' own voices. Dong (2024) argues that existing feedback engagement models are not sufficient for AI-mediated feedback and calls for a ChatGPT feedback engagement framework that integrates ethical, cognitive, and emotional dimensions. Complementary research on AI in academic contexts adds that EFL students' AI literacy tends to be only moderate and often restricted to translation and grammar checking (Hossain et al., 2025), while ChatGPT-assisted scientific writing may introduce inaccuracies, plagiarism risks, and privacy concerns that require clear regulations and critical awareness (Guleria et al., 2023).

Existing studies on ChatGPT in EFL writing have mainly focused on students, showing how the tool can raise scores, support planning and revising, and increase confidence, while also highlighting risks related to plagiarism, authenticity, and limited AI literacy. In these accounts, teachers often appear only as background figures who are expected to apply general guidelines rather than as active professionals who interpret, negotiate, and respond to AI in their own classrooms. Little is known about how EFL lecturers actually talk to students about ChatGPT, how they explain the boundary between legitimate support and academic misconduct, how they design writing tasks so that AI assistance does not replace the cognitive work of composing, or how they handle tensions between institutional expectations, emerging policies, and students' diverse levels of AI literacy. As a result, there is a clear gap in understanding how lecturers themselves experience and navigate the ethical implications of ChatGPT in writing instruction. This study addresses that gap by examining the experiences of EFL lecturers in they navigate the ethical implications of ChatGPT in writing classes, focusing on how they introduce and frame the tool, the pedagogical strategies they use to foster critical and responsible use, and the challenges they encounter in practice.

## METHOD

This study employed a qualitative case study design, which is particularly suitable for an in-depth examination of specific, contextualised teaching practices (Baskarada, 2014; Hamilton & Corbett-Whittier, 2012). A case study approach allows a detailed exploration of how a small group of EFL lecturers guides university students in the responsible use of ChatGPT in writing classes, with attention to processes, meanings, and context rather than to statistical comparison across variables. According to Harrison et al. (2016), a case study involves investigating an issue through one or more cases within a bounded system over time, using rich, in-depth data collected from multiple sources. In this study, the bounded system comprised EFL academic writing classes at a private Indonesian university. The case study design was therefore appropriate for generating nuanced insights into lecturers' strategies and views within their specific educational context (Grauer, 2012; Duff, 2012), thereby contributing to a deeper understanding of how ethical AI use is negotiated in EFL writing instruction.

The participants in this case study were two EFL lecturers who taught academic writing at a private university in Yogyakarta, Indonesia, and were purposefully selected for their experience with ChatGPT and other AI tools in writing instruction, consistent with purposive sampling strategies that prioritise information-rich cases in qualitative research (Schreier, 2014). The first was a female lecturer aged 35–40 with ten years of teaching experience and a Master's degree in Education, who had integrated ChatGPT into her courses for two academic years. The second was a male lecturer in the same age range with eight years of teaching experience and a Master's degree in Linguistics, who had used ChatGPT in his teaching for one academic year. Both had an established record of incorporating technology into their lessons, which positioned them as particularly valuable cases for exploring how lecturers navigate the ethical implications of ChatGPT in writing classes.

Data were collected through in-depth interviews and document analysis, with a focus on course syllabi and Learning Management System (LMS) materials as naturally occurring institutional documents. In-depth interviews served as the primary data collection method because they allow participants to describe their experiences and practices in detail while still enabling the researcher to maintain a comparable structure across interviews (Mears, 2017; Alshenqeeti, 2014). The interview protocol was designed to elicit information on lecturers' strategies for discussing ethical guidelines, their communication approaches (explicit or implicit), and how they incorporated ChatGPT into their courses in a responsible manner, following standard recommendations for semi-structured interview guides in qualitative research. Each interview was conducted individually and face-to-face, lasted approximately 60 minutes, and was audio-recorded with participants' consent, in line with good practice for capturing rich, accurate accounts in qualitative studies (Wilson et al., 2016).

All recordings were transcribed verbatim to ensure accuracy and to facilitate systematic analysis (Rowlands, 2021). To enhance the credibility of the findings and provide a fuller picture of teaching practices, document analysis was conducted on the syllabi and LMS content associated with the lecturers' academic writing courses. The researchers examined these documents to identify how ethical considerations were embedded in course design, learning objectives, assessment tasks, and supplementary materials, paying particular attention to academic integrity statements, references to AI tools, and pedagogical cues indicating how students were expected to engage with generative technologies. This process enabled the researchers to situate the lecturers' reported practices within the formal structure of their teaching materials and to triangulate the interview data, thereby strengthening the study's credibility and depth of interpretation (Patton, 2015).

The qualitative data were analysed using a thematic case study approach, which facilitated a systematic examination of the content (Naeem et al., 2023). First, the researchers familiarised themselves with the data by reading and rereading the interview transcripts to gain a comprehensive understanding of the participants' perspectives. Second, initial codes were generated manually by identifying key excerpts that reflected recurring issues related to the ethical use of ChatGPT in writing classes. Third, these codes were grouped into broader themes that captured patterns across the data and incorporated relevant subthemes. Fourth, the themes were reviewed and refined to ensure internal coherence and accurate representation of the data, with particular attention to clarity and consistency (Xu & Zammit, 2020). Fifth, each theme was clearly defined and described, and

the final thematic structure was organised into a narrative account supported by direct quotations from the participants, in line with qualitative reporting conventions (Miles et al., 2014). The use of multiple data sources, namely interviews and document analysis, strengthened the credibility of the findings through triangulation (Meydan & Akkaş, 2024). This integration of sources ensured that the conclusions were grounded in converging evidence, providing a more robust and nuanced understanding of how EFL lecturers guide students' responsible use of ChatGPT in academic writing classes.

## FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This study's findings, derived from thematic analysis of interviews with two EFL academic writing lecturers, highlight key approaches and obstacles in their discussions with students about the use of ChatGPT. The analysis generated three main themes related to lecturers' experiences: communication approaches, pedagogical strategies, and challenges encountered.

### *Communication Approach*

Both lecturers reported using open, explicit communication to position ChatGPT as a supportive, yet ethically bounded tool for academic writing at the beginning of the semester. They introduced their benefits for idea generation, clarification, and short summaries, but consistently paired these explanations with warnings about factual inaccuracies, shallow arguments, and the danger of overreliance. In their view, ChatGPT should function as a scaffold that helps students think and write more clearly, not as a substitute for the cognitive work of composing. To reinforce this stance, both lecturers foregrounded ethical conduct and academic integrity whenever ChatGPT was discussed. They reminded students that unacknowledged use of AI-generated text constitutes plagiarism, urged them to cite or acknowledge ChatGPT when it influenced their wording or ideas, and used classroom discussions to clarify grey areas around authorship and ownership of texts. These interactive conversations also created space for students to raise concerns and questions about what counted as acceptable assistance in academic writing. Respondent A explained that she deliberately framed ChatGPT as a tool that must remain under the writer's control:

> *"I made it quite evident to my students when I presented ChatGPT that this is not something you can rely on every time. I went over its capabilities, how it operates, and its shortcomings. For example, I showed them that although it can inspire ideas or drafts, it does not always grasp academic writing rules. You are the one who chooses what to ignore and what to use, I told them. I wanted them to view it as a tool rather than as a substitute for their own judgment."*

Respondent B adopted a similarly explicit but more dialogic approach, starting from students' prior experiences and moving toward ethical reflection:

> *"I always begin by finding out from students what they know about ChatGPT. Many of them have already experimented with it, but they are unaware of the dangers, including factual mistakes or plagiarism. So I guide them toward understanding the ethical limits in a conversational style that lets them express their opinions. For example, I remind them that using ChatGPT without referencing is still plagiarism, the same as copying a source without acknowledging it."*

Both lecturers stressed the need for clear, context-specific guidance on when and how to incorporate ChatGPT into academic writing. Respondent A encouraged students to use ChatGPT at early stages, such as brainstorming or checking grammar, while insisting that the final text must reflect their own ideas and language:

*"I do not completely ban ChatGPT because I see how useful it could be. However, I want them to know that it should not take the place of their thought or writing. I might say, you can use it for brainstorming or to understand complex ideas, but the final output must be your own."*

Respondent B similarly specified acceptable and unacceptable uses, linking them directly to transparency and responsibility:

*"I have always been clear that ChatGPT can be used, but only in certain situations. For example, I tell them they can use it to come up with ideas or organise their thoughts, but they have to give credit if it changes the way they do their work. The key is that they are open about how they use it."*

These accounts show that the lecturers did not frame ChatGPT simply as a technical aid. Instead, they treated it as an ethical and pedagogical issue, explicitly teaching students how to use the tool in ways that support learning while respecting academic integrity and the central role of their own thinking in the writing process.

### *Pedagogical Strategy*

The interviews showed that both lecturers deliberately adapted their teaching strategies to position ChatGPT as a guided learning aid rather than a forbidden shortcut. Their approaches aimed to balance the affordances of the tool with the development of core academic writing skills, and two main pedagogical patterns emerged: guided exploration and scaffolded integration. In guided exploration, ChatGPT was presented as an object of critical inquiry. Under the lecturers' supervision, students were asked to enter prompts, examine the responses, and evaluate them for relevance, coherence, and alignment with academic conventions. This design encouraged students to view ChatGPT as something to be interrogated rather than blindly trusted. Respondent A described using whole-class activities to make the tool's limitations visible:

*"I told them, 'Let us check out what ChatGPT can and cannot do.' We went through a practice prompt together that asked us to write an argumentative paragraph. They were asked to provide feedback on what works, what does not, and how it could be improved. Many students said the arguments were flat and lacked personal depth. This led to a great discussion about how writing is more than just putting together facts; it is also about giving a unique point of view."*

Respondent B used a similar strategy but focused on direct comparison between AI and student writing:

*"I often ask my students to compare an essay that ChatGPT wrote for them to one that they wrote themselves. I will say something like, 'Look at the beginning. How and why does one make a better case?' They start to see where ChatGPT's text lacks depth or creativity this way, and they learn how important it is to think critically. They saw right*

*away that it was missing proper sources and context. This activity made them understand both the good and bad sides of AI."*

Scaffolded integration was used to ensure that the most important cognitive and creative work in writing remained student-centred. Respondent A encouraged students to use ChatGPT at early stages, such as brainstorming or generating possible angles, while clearly reserving drafting, revising, and editing as tasks that had to be done independently:

*"I tell my students that ChatGPT is just a tool to help them come up with ideas for their essays; it is not the result. I might say, 'If you cannot think of a topic, use ChatGPT to come up with a list of possible arguments.' Then pick one and use it to make your own sketch. They like having this much freedom, but they also learn when to step in and take charge."*

These strategies show that the lecturers did not simply integrate ChatGPT as a convenience tool. Instead, they structured activities so that students critically evaluated AI-generated text, recognised its limitations in terms of argumentative depth and sourcing, and used it only at stages where it could support rather than replace the intellectual work of academic writing.

### *Challenge Identified*

The lecturers also reported significant challenges in fostering a critical and responsible use of ChatGPT in writing. A significant difficulty concerned students' uneven levels of digital and AI literacy, which directly affected their ability to evaluate AI-generated output. Some students struggled to formulate clear prompts, resulting in irrelevant or low-quality responses, while others copied ChatGPT's suggestions wholesale into their essays without attempting to revise or integrate them. One lecturer described students submitting poorly organised, AI-generated essays because they did not know how to edit the text or combine it with their own ideas. This skills gap placed additional pressure on lecturers to teach not only writing but also the basic competencies required to work productively with AI tools.

A second set of challenges related more explicitly to ethics and academic integrity. Both lecturers observed that some students treated ChatGPT as a shortcut rather than a support, assuming that permission to use the tool meant that they could submit unedited AI output as their own work. This overreliance weakened independent writing and critical thinking and raised institutional concerns about honesty and authorship. Respondent A illustrated this problem:

*"One big problem I have had is that students depend too much on ChatGPT. For example, I had a student turn in an entire essay that was definitely generated by the tool, with no major changes. When I asked them why, they said, 'Because you told us we can use it.' They thought that using it properly meant adding their own critical thinking and ensuring their own opinion came through. This too much trust not only hurts their learning but also makes people worry about the honesty of the institution."*

Differences in AI knowledge also created inequities within the class. Respondent B noted that some students could use ChatGPT strategically, while others had difficulty even with basic operations, which widened the learning gap and complicated assessment:

*"Students' different levels of AI knowledge are a problem. Some people are very good at using ChatGPT, but others struggle with simple tasks like crafting clear prompts, which leads to unhelpful results and a learning gap that needs extra help. Many students also do not know how to use ChatGPT properly and end up copying and pasting material without revising or thinking critically. To deal with this, I encourage them to think about what they are doing by giving them tasks like marking up material made by AI and explaining their choices about what to edit in order to understand responsible use better."*

## DISCUSSION

The findings of this study show that the two EFL lecturers experienced ChatGPT not as a neutral writing aid, but as a tool that immediately raises ethical questions about authorship, academic integrity, and the purpose of writing in their academic writing classes. In response, both lecturers positioned ChatGPT within a clear ethical frame from the outset of the semester. They presented it as a valuable resource for generating ideas, clarifying language, and producing short summaries. However, they consistently stressed that it must remain a support for students' thinking rather than a replacement for it. This stance echoes broader concerns in the literature that, although ChatGPT can enhance writing fluency and motivation, it can also obscure who is actually doing the cognitive work of writing and complicate judgments about authorship and responsibility (Alsaedi, 2024; Revell et al., 2024; Wise et al., 2024; Yuan et al., 2024). In the context of an Indonesian private university, where institutional policies on AI are still emerging, the lecturers' proactive framing of ChatGPT as an ethically bounded tool indicates that much of the practical work of regulating AI use currently happens at the classroom level rather than through formal policy (Chan, 2023; Yeo, 2023).

The lecturers' communication approaches further illustrate how ethical AI use in EFL writing is negotiated socially. Both used open, dialogic discussions to probe students' prior knowledge of ChatGPT, surface misconceptions, and build shared understandings of acceptable and unacceptable practices. They not only warned students against plagiarism; they explicitly linked unacknowledged AI-generated text to questions of honesty, voice, and the goals of academic writing. This is consistent with studies showing that both teachers and students see the ethical use of AI tools as a matter of ongoing negotiation rather than simple rule following, and that clear classroom dialogue is essential for developing shared norms (Neff et al., 2024; Roe et al., 2023; Loos et al., 2023). By repeatedly reminding students that using ChatGPT without acknowledgement is equivalent to copying a source, and by inviting students to ask questions about grey areas, the lecturers translated abstract concerns about academic integrity into concrete classroom practices. Their experiences suggest that in EFL settings where students may be less familiar with academic conventions in English, explicit ethical talk around ChatGPT is a crucial part of writing instruction, not an optional add-on.

Pedagogically, the lecturers' strategies show an effort to integrate ChatGPT in ways that stimulate critical engagement with language rather than replace it. Guided exploration activities asked students to test what ChatGPT "can and cannot do," critique AI-generated paragraphs, and compare AI essays with their own. These designs encouraged students to notice where AI texts lacked depth, personal stance, or adequate support and sourcing. Such practices resonate with research that treats ChatGPT as a trigger for higher-order writing

strategies such as planning, revising, and synthesising sources rather than as an automatic producer of finished texts (Tsai et al., 2024; Xu & Jumaat, 2024; Tseng & Lin, 2024). The lecturers' scaffolded integration approach, in which students could use ChatGPT for brainstorming or outlining but had to take full responsibility for drafting, revising, and editing, also reflects the call in recent work to balance assistance and skill development so that learners do not lose ownership of the writing process (Faiz et al., 2025; Dizon, 2024; Teng, 2024). In this study, ChatGPT was framed as "the companion, not the writer," which aligns with arguments that AI can be productive when it is harnessed to promote critical reflection and metacognition rather than to produce ready-made answers (Mahapatra, 2024; Dong, 2024).

At the same time, the challenges described by the lecturers highlight how fragile this balance can be in practice. Uneven levels of AI literacy meant that some students could craft effective prompts and evaluate AI output, while others struggled with basic operations or copied responses with minimal editing. This pattern mirrors findings that EFL students often use AI tools mainly for translation and grammar checking, and that many lack a deeper understanding of how these tools work or how to verify their accuracy (Hossain et al., 2025; Huang, 2023; Zhao, 2024). It also resonates with concerns about a growing gap between students who can engineer prompts strategically and those who interact with ChatGPT superficially or uncritically (Woo et al., 2024; Darwin et al., 2023). In the lecturers' accounts, this skills gap created both pedagogical and ethical pressures: they had to spend time teaching basic AI literacy and responsible use alongside academic writing, and they faced situations in which students submitted almost entirely AI-generated essays while assuming this was acceptable because "the teacher said we can use ChatGPT."

These experiences connect directly to broader debates about academic integrity and fairness in AI-supported writing. The lecturers' reports of overreliance and wholesale copying echo studies that document misuse of ChatGPT for entire assignments, as well as concerns that ChatGPT-assisted writing can inflate scores without reflecting underlying competence (Tsai et al., 2024; Janković & Kulić, 2025; Guleria et al., 2023; Revell et al., 2024). In the present study, the lecturers perceived this overreliance as harmful not only to individual learning but also to the trustworthiness of assessment and the institution's reputation. Their experiences reinforce arguments that AI use in writing education cannot be managed simply by banning tools or relying on detection technologies; instead, institutions and teachers must jointly develop clear principles and assessment practices that recognise the realities of AI-supported writing while still rewarding genuine learning (Roe et al., 2023; Wise et al., 2024; Kasneci et al., 2023).

Situated within the Indonesian EFL context, these findings suggest several implications. First, lecturers' experiences indicate that ethical AI literacy should be treated as an explicit learning outcome in academic writing courses. Students need structured opportunities to practise designing prompts, critiquing AI output, and deciding when and how to acknowledge AI assistance, rather than learning these skills informally and unevenly (Amin, 2023; Truonga, 2024; Neff et al., 2024). Second, there is a need for institutional support through professional development and guidelines that are sensitive to local realities. Studies in Indonesian and regional higher education show that while students are already using ChatGPT to support language development and self-evaluation, clear frameworks for ethical and pedagogically sound use are still in progress (Prasetya & Syarif, 2023; Nguyen et

al., 2024; Özçelik & Ekşi, 2024). The lecturers in this study were effectively improvising their own classroom policies and practices; their efforts could be strengthened and made more consistent if they were backed by institutional policies and training informed by emerging scholarship on AI in language education.

This study shows that EFL lecturers' experiences of navigating the ethical implications of ChatGPT in writing classes are characterised by ongoing negotiation across three interrelated domains: communication, pedagogy, and classroom challenges. The lecturers actively frame ChatGPT as a powerful but constrained tool, design activities that demand critical engagement with AI-generated text, and struggle with uneven AI literacy and temptations to outsource writing. Their experiences confirm many of the opportunities and risks identified in the literature on ChatGPT and EFL writing, but from the underexplored perspective of teachers who must translate abstract debates into concrete classroom practice. In doing so, they illustrate that ethical AI use in EFL writing is not a static rule but a situated practice continually shaped by teacher judgment, student behaviour, and the evolving institutional and technological landscape.

## CONCLUSION

This study set out to explore how EFL lecturers navigate the ethical implications of ChatGPT in academic writing classes at an Indonesian university. The findings show that the two lecturers did not experience ChatGPT as a neutral, technical tool, but as something that immediately raised questions about authorship, integrity, and the nature of learning. In response, they adopted explicit, dialogic communication strategies to frame ChatGPT as a support for idea generation, clarification, and language refinement, while consistently emphasising that it must not replace students' own thinking and writing. They designed activities that required students to critique, compare, and selectively adapt AI-generated texts. They restricted ChatGPT to the early stages of the writing process so that core cognitive and creative work remained student-led. At the same time, they faced persistent challenges, including uneven AI literacy, overreliance on AI output, and student misunderstandings about what counts as legitimate use, which placed additional pressure on them to teach both ethical reasoning and technical skills alongside academic writing.

These experiences suggest that ethical use of AI in EFL writing instruction is not simply a matter of allowing or banning tools. However, an ongoing process of negotiation in which lecturers frame ChatGPT's role, model critical engagement, and respond to students' diverse practices and expectations. In the Indonesian private university context, where institutional policies and AI training are still developing, much of the actual work of regulating ChatGPT currently occurs at the classroom level through lecturers' communication and pedagogical decisions. The study therefore underscores the need to recognise ethical AI literacy as an explicit learning objective in writing courses and to support lecturers through clear, context-sensitive guidelines and professional development focused on AI-supported writing. It also underscores the importance of assessment designs and course policies that acknowledge the inevitability of AI use while protecting academic integrity and the central role of learners' own reasoning and expression.

This research is limited by its small, single-site sample and its focus on two lecturers' experiences within one institutional context, which means the findings cannot be generalised to all EFL settings. However, the in-depth case study offers a detailed picture of

how ethical AI use is being negotiated on the ground and can inform further work in similar contexts. Future research could extend this study by including a larger and more diverse group of lecturers, incorporating students' perspectives more systematically, and examining how institutional policies and training initiatives shape classroom practice over time. Longitudinal and comparative studies across institutions and countries would deepen understanding of how AI tools like ChatGPT can be integrated into EFL writing in ways that genuinely enhance learning while preserving academic integrity and students' development as independent writers.

## REFERENCES

Algaraady, J., & Mahyoob, M. (2023). ChatGPT's capabilities in spotting and analyzing writing errors experienced by EFL learners. *Arab World English Journal*, *9*, 3–17. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/call9.1

Alsaedi, N. (2024). ChatGPT and EFL/ESL Writing: A systematic review of advantages and challenges. *English Language Teaching*, *17*(5), 41. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v17n5p41

Alshenqeeti, H. (2014). Interviewing as a data collection method: A critical review. *English Linguistics Research*, *3*(1). https://doi.org/10.5430/elr.v3n1p39

Amin, M. Y. M. (2023). AI and Chat GPT in language teaching: Enhancing EFL classroom support and transforming assessment techniques. *International Journal of Higher Education Pedagogies*, *4*(4), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.33422/ijhep.v4i4.554

Bansal, G., Chamola, V., Hussain, A., Guizani, M., & Niyato, D. (2024). Transforming conversations with AI—a comprehensive study of ChatGPT. *Cognitive Computation*, *16*(5), 2487–2510. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12559-023-10236-2

Baskarada, S. (2014). Qualitative case study guidelines. *The Qualitative Report*. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2014.1008

Bok, E., & Cho, Y. (2023). Examining Korean EFL college students' experiences and perceptions of using ChatGPT as a writing revision tool. *STEM Journal*, *24*(4), 15–27. https://doi.org/10.16875/stem.2023.24.4.15

Chan, C. K. Y. (2023). A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3

Darwin, N., Rusdin, D., Mukminatien, N., Suryati, N., Laksmi, E. D., & Marzuki, N. (2023). Critical thinking in the AI era: An exploration of EFL students' perceptions, benefits, and limitations. *Cogent Education*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2023.2290342

Dizon, G. (2024). ChatGPT as a tool for self-directed foreign language learning. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2024.2413406

Dong, L. (2024). ChatGPT in language writing education: Reflections and a research agenda for a ChatGPT feedback engagement framework. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, *43*, 121–131. https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2024.43.07

Duff P. (2012). Case study research. In Chapelle C. (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* (pp. 1–8). Wiley-Blackwell.

Faiz, R., Bilal, H. A., Asghar, I., & Safdar, A. (2025). Optimizing ChatGPT as a writing aid for EFL learners: balancing assistance and skill development in writing proficiency. *Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research)*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14756539

Grauer, K. (2012). A case for case study research in education. In: Klein, S.R. (eds) *Action research methods*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137046635_4

Guleria, A., Krishan, K., Sharma, V., & Kanchan, T. (2023). ChatGPT: ethical concerns and challenges in academics and research. *The Journal of Infection in Developing Countries*, *17*(09), 1292–1299. https://doi.org/10.3855/jidc.18738

Hamilton, L., & Corbett-Whittier, C. (2012). *Using case studies in education research*. Sage.

Harrison, H., Birks, M., Franklin, R., & Mills, J. (2017). Case study research: Foundations and methodological orientations. In Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 18(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-18.1.2655

Hossain, Z., Çelik, Ö., & Hınız, G. (2025). Exploring EFL students' ai literacy in academic writing: Insights into familiarity, knowledge and ethical perceptions. *Kuramsal Eğitimbilim*, *18*(1), 157–181. https://doi.org/10.30831/akukeg.1538011

Huang, J. (2023). Engineering ChatGPT prompts for EFL writing classes. *International Journal of TESOL Studies*. https://doi.org/10.58304/ijts.20230405

Jamshed, M., Ahmed, N. a. S. M. M., Sarfaraj, N. M., & Warda, N. 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

Janković, A., & Kulić, D. (2025). Use and misuse of ChatGPT in academic writing among the English language students. *Information Technologies and Learning Tools*, *105*(1), 178–188. https://doi.org/10.33407/itlt.v105i1.5955

Javaid, M., Haleem, A., Singh, R. P., Khan, S., & Khan, I. H. (2023). Unlocking the opportunities through ChatGPT tool towards ameliorating the education system. *BenchCouncil Transactions on Benchmarks, Standards and Evaluations*, *3*(2), 100115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tbench.2023.100115

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., . . . Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *103*, 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Laato, S., Morschheuser, B., Hamari, J., and Björne, J. (2023). "AI-assisted learning with ChatGPT and large language models: implications for higher education" in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies (ICALT)*. 226–230.

Loos, E., Gröpler, J., & Goudeau, M. S. (2023). Using ChatGPT in education: Human reflection on ChatGPT's self-reflection. *Societies*, *13*(8), 196. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc13080196

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

Mears, C. L. (2017). In-depth interviews. In R. Coe, M. Waring, L. Hedges, & J. Arthur (Eds.), *Research methods and methodologies in education* (2nd ed., pp 183–189). London: Sage

Meydan, C. H., and H. Akkaş. (2024). The role of triangulation in qualitative research: Converging Perspectives." In *Principles of conducting qualitative research in multicultural settings*, 98–129. IGI Global.

Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M. and Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Sage, London.

Mun, C. (2024). EFL learners' English writing feedback and their perception of using ChatGPT. *STEM Journal*, *25*(2), 26–39. https://doi.org/10.16875/stem.2024.25.2.26

Naeem, M., Ozuem, W., Howell, K., & Ranfagni, S. (2023). A Step-by-Step process of thematic analysis to develop a conceptual model in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *22*. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231205789

Neff, J., Arciaga, K., & Burri, M. (2024). EFL students' and teachers' perceptions of the ethical uses of AI tools. *Technology in Language Teaching & Learning*, *6*(3), 1714. https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v6n3.1714

Nguyen, T. N. T., Van Lai, N., & Nguyen, Q. T. (2024). Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education: A case study on ChatGPT's influence on student learning behaviors. *Educational Process International Journal*, *13*(2). https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2024.132.7

Özçelik, N. P., & Ekşi, G. Y. (2024). Cultivating writing skills: the role of ChatGPT as a learning assistant—a case study. *Smart Learning Environments*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00296-8

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Peláez-Sánchez, I. C., Velarde-Camaqui, D., & Glasserman-Morales, L. D. (2024). The impact of large language models on higher education: exploring the connection between AI and Education 4.0. *Frontiers in Education*, *9*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1392091

Polakova, P., & Ivenz, P. (2024). The impact of ChatGPT feedback on the development of EFL students' writing skills. *Cogent Education*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2024.2410101

Prasetya, R. E., & Syarif, A. (2023). ChatGPT as a tool for language development: Investigating its impact on proficiency and self-evaluation accuracy in Indonesian higher education. *Voices of English Language Education Society*, *7*(3), 402–415. https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v7i3.19303

Revell, T., Yeadon, W., Cahilly-Bretzin, G., Clarke, I., Manning, G., Jones, J., Mulley, C., Pascual, R. J., Bradley, N., Thomas, D., & Leneghan, F. (2024). ChatGPT versus human essayists: an exploration of the impact of artificial intelligence for authorship and academic integrity in the humanities. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-024-00161-8

Roe, J., Renandya, W. A., & Jacobs, G. M. (2023). A review of AI-Powered Writing Tools and their implications for academic Integrity in the language classroom. *Journal of English and Applied Linguistics*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.59588/2961-3094.1035

Rowlands, J. (2021). Interviewee transcript review as a tool to improve data quality and participant confidence in sensitive research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *20*. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069211066170

Rudolph, J., Tan, S., & Tan, S. (2023). War of the chatbots: Bard, Bing Chat, ChatGPT, Ernie and beyond. The new AI gold rush and its impact on higher education. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.23

Schreier, M. (2014). Sampling and generalization. In U. Flick (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis issue December* (pp. 49–63). SAGE Publications Ltd.

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*, 1260843. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1260843

Steiss, J., Tate, T., Graham, S., Cruz, J., Hebert, M., Wang, J., Moon, Y., Tseng, W., Warschauer, M., & Olson, C. B. (2024). Comparing the quality of human and ChatGPT feedback of students' writing. *Learning and Instruction*, *91*, 101894. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2024.101894

Teng, M. F. (2024). "ChatGPT is the companion, not enemies": EFL learners' perceptions and experiences in using ChatGPT for feedback in writing. *Computers and Education Artificial Intelligence*, *7*, 100270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100270

Truonga, T. V. (2024). Using ChatGPT in EFL writing classrooms: A literature review. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, *5*(12), 2207–2211. https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.5.1224.3527

Tsai, C., Lin, Y., & Brown, I. K. (2024). Impacts of ChatGPT-assisted writing for EFL English majors: Feasibility and challenges. *Education and Information Technologies*, *29*(17), 22427–22445. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12722-y

Tseng, Y., & Lin, Y. (2024). Enhancing English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners' writing with ChatGPT: A university-level course design. *The Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, *22*(2), 78–97. https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.21.5.3329

Werdiningsih, I., Marzuki, N., & Rusdin, D. (2024). Balancing AI and authenticity: EFL students' experiences with ChatGPT in academic writing. *Cogent Arts and Humanities*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2024.2392388

Wilson, A. D., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Manning, L. P. (2016). Using paired depth interviews to collect qualitative data. *The Qualitative Report*, *21*(9), 1549-1573.

Wise, B., Emerson, L., Van Luyn, A., Dyson, B., Bjork, C., & Thomas, S. E. (2024). A scholarly dialogue: writing scholarship, authorship, academic integrity and the challenges of AI. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *43*(3), 578–590. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2023.2280195

Woo, D. J., Guo, K., & Susanto, H. (2024). Exploring EFL students' prompt engineering in human–AI story writing: an activity theory perspective. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *33*(1), 863–882. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2024.2361381

Xu, T., & Jumaat, N. F. (2024). ChatGPT-empowered writing strategies in EFL students' academic writing: Calibre, challenges and chances. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (iJIM)*, *18*(15), 95–114. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v18i15.49219

Xu, W., & Zammit, K. (2020). Applying Thematic Analysis to Education: A hybrid approach to interpreting data in practitioner research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *19*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406920918810

Yadav, S. (2024). Artificial Intelligence (AI) Integration in Higher Education: Navigating Opportunities and Ethical Frontiers in Education with Advanced Technologies. In S.

Tripathi and J. Rosak-Szyrocka (Eds.), *Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Society* (pp. 43–59). Chapman and Hall/CRC. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781032644509-4

Yang, L., Jiang, F., & Li, H. (2024). Is ChatGPT involved in texts? Measure the polish ratio to detect ChatGPT-Generated text. *APSIPA Transactions on Signal and Information Processing*, *13*(2). https://doi.org/10.1561/116.00000250

Yeo, M. A. (2023). Academic integrity in the age of Artificial Intelligence (AI) authoring apps. *TESOL Journal*, *14*(3). https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.716

Young, J. C., & Shishido, M. (2023). Investigating OpenAI's ChatGPT potentials in generating Chatbot's dialogue for English as a foreign language learning. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, *14*(6). https://doi.org/10.14569/ijacsa.2023.0140607

Yuan, Y., Li, H., & Sawaengdist, A. (2024). The impact of ChatGPT on learners in English academic writing: opportunities and challenges in education. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, *14*(1), 41–56. https://doi.org/10.1515/cercles-2023-0006

Zhao, D. (2024). The impact of AI-enhanced natural language processing tools on writing proficiency: an analysis of language precision, content summarization, and creative writing facilitation. *Education and Information Technologies*, *30*(6), 8055–8086. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13145-5