



EFL Students' Perceptions of AI-Powered Feedback in Academic Writing: A Qualitative NVivo Study

Ridha Fadillah¹, Saadillah²

Universitas Islam Negeri Antasari Banjarmasin, Indonesia^{1,2}

email: ¹ridhafadillah@uin-antasari.ac.id; ²saadillahelhady302@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly integrated into English as a Foreign Language (EFL) pedagogy, yet little is known about how learners in Southeast Asia perceive its feedback. This study explored Indonesian undergraduates' perceptions of AI-powered feedback in academic writing. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with seven students and analyzed thematically using NVivo 12. Four themes emerged: (1) AI was valued for grammar and vocabulary support, though suggestions for coherence and organization were often contested; (2) students reported ambivalent emotions—confidence and motivation alongside anxiety about dependency; (3) a trust hierarchy was evident, with AI trusted for surface-level corrections but distrusted for content-level changes; and (4) learners selectively blended AI and teacher feedback, positioning instructors as the final authority. These findings extend feedback literacy to AI contexts and refine the Technology Acceptance Model, suggesting the need for critical feedback literacy training and institutional policies on ethical AI use.

Keywords: AI Feedback, EFL Writing, Feedback Literacy, Student Perceptions

First Received:

5 October 2025

Revised:

30 October 2025

Accepted:

7 November 2025

Final Proof Received:

17 November 2025

Published:

15 December 2025

How to cite (in APA style):

Fadillah, R. & Saadillah, (2025). EFL Students' Perceptions of AI-Powered Feedback in Academic Writing: A Qualitative NVivo Study. *ELITE Journal*, 7 (2), 125-136.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, artificial intelligence (AI) has become increasingly embedded in higher education, transforming how students access information, practice language, and receive feedback. In the field of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), AI-powered applications such as Grammarly, ChatGPT, and QuillBot are widely adopted to support writing development. These tools provide instant feedback on grammar, vocabulary, cohesion, and even stylistic features, offering learners unprecedented autonomy in revising their texts (Chen et al., 2025; Li & Hegelheimer, 2013). The rapid diffusion of such tools aligns with broader educational trends toward technology-enhanced learning and personalized feedback (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019).

AI feedback is often praised for its accessibility, speed, and scalability. For EFL learners—especially those with limited opportunities for teacher feedback—AI offers an appealing alternative that supplements human instruction. This shift raises fundamental questions: How do learners interpret and act upon AI feedback? Do they trust it? And how does it shape their writing process? These questions are particularly urgent given the

growing integration of AI into academic settings and the global debate about its pedagogical and ethical implications (Kohnke & Zou, 2023).

Feedback is a cornerstone of writing pedagogy. It helps learners notice gaps between their current performance and target competence, guiding revision and long-term development (Hyland & Hyland, 2019). Traditionally, feedback has been provided by teachers, with peer and self-feedback emerging as complementary practices. However, teacher feedback is often constrained by large class sizes, workload, and time limitations, particularly in EFL contexts with resource constraints (Carless & Boud, 2018).

Research highlights that effective feedback requires not only accuracy but also learner engagement, uptake, and trust. Carless and Boud (2018) introduced the concept of student feedback literacy, emphasizing learners' ability to interpret, value, and use feedback productively. While substantial work has examined teacher and peer feedback, relatively little is known about how students engage with machine-generated feedback, and how this aligns—or conflicts—with their existing feedback literacy.

AI-based writing assistants are not entirely new. Early tools such as Criterion and Grammarly focused primarily on grammar and style checking (Li & Hegelheimer, 2013). The recent wave of generative AI, however, introduces new affordances: context-sensitive explanations, paraphrasing, content suggestions, and real-time conversation about writing choices (Kasneci et al., 2023). These developments blur the line between feedback and collaboration, raising both opportunities and concerns.

On one hand, AI feedback may empower learners by providing immediate suggestions and opportunities for iterative revision. On the other hand, it risks fostering dependency, superficial revisions, or misplaced trust in machine authority (Kohnke & Zou, 2023). The educational value of AI feedback therefore depends not only on its technical accuracy but also on how learners perceive, evaluate, and use it in authentic writing tasks.

Although AI tools are rapidly gaining popularity, empirical research on EFL students' perceptions of AI-powered feedback remains limited. Existing studies tend to be experimental or survey-based, focusing on performance outcomes rather than learners' lived experiences. For example, Kasneci et al. (2023) explored the potential of ChatGPT in higher education but emphasized more on affordances than on learner perspectives. Chen et al. (2025) investigated teacher and learner beliefs about written feedback but did not specifically address AI feedback.

Qualitative insights are particularly scarce. Little is known about how learners make sense of AI feedback in relation to their trust in teacher feedback, their motivation, and their long-term development as academic writers. As Al Adawi (2023) noted in his NVivo-based study of EFL teachers' beliefs, qualitative inquiry is essential for unpacking the nuanced, contextual, and often contradictory ways that educators and learners experience pedagogical change. By extension, exploring EFL learners' perceptions of AI feedback through qualitative methods can enrich current debates by foregrounding the voices of students themselves.

The issue is particularly salient in the Southeast Asian EFL context. In countries such as Indonesia, Malaysia, and Vietnam, English academic writing is a compulsory skill for university students, yet many struggle with limited exposure to English outside the classroom (Lubis et al., 2023). Teacher workload is high, with classes often exceeding 30–40 students, limiting the depth and frequency of individualized feedback. Students therefore increasingly turn to digital tools to supplement feedback gaps.

In Indonesia specifically, the government has encouraged digitalization in higher education, yet pedagogical integration of AI remains contested (Majid et al., 2025). Students' uptake of AI feedback is thus shaped by cultural attitudes toward teacher

authority, exam-oriented curricula, and varying levels of digital literacy. These contextual dynamics make Indonesia an important site for examining how learners perceive and negotiate AI-powered feedback in academic writing.

This study draws on two theoretical perspectives:

1. Feedback Literacy (Carless & Boud, 2018) → highlights how learners' capacity to interpret and use feedback shapes learning outcomes.
2. Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989) → provides a lens for understanding how perceived usefulness and ease of use influence learners' trust and uptake of AI feedback.

Combining these frameworks allows us to examine both the pedagogical and psychological dimensions of learner engagement with AI. Specifically, the study investigates not only whether learners find AI feedback helpful, but also how they negotiate issues of trust, authority, and self-efficacy in the writing process.

Given the rapid rise of AI-powered writing feedback, the scarcity of qualitative studies in EFL contexts, and the pressing need to understand learner experiences, this study aims to explore Indonesian EFL students' perceptions of AI feedback in academic writing. Using NVivo to conduct systematic thematic analysis, the study focuses on a small but information-rich sample of seven undergraduates with prior experience using AI feedback.

Research Questions:

1. How do EFL students perceive the usefulness and limitations of AI-powered feedback in academic writing?
2. What factors shape their trust or distrust in AI-generated feedback?
3. How do they negotiate AI feedback in relation to teacher feedback and their own revision practices?

This study contributes to the growing body of research on AI in language education in several ways:

- Empirical contribution: Provides qualitative, in-depth insights into learner perceptions—an underexplored area.
- Theoretical contribution: Extends the concept of feedback literacy into the domain of AI-mediated writing feedback, integrating perspectives from technology acceptance.
- Practical contribution: Offers guidance for teachers and institutions on how to integrate AI feedback in ways that support, rather than replace, pedagogical feedback.

By amplifying student voices, the study highlights both the promise and the pitfalls of AI-powered feedback in EFL writing pedagogy, contributing to ongoing international debates about the future of language education in the digital era.

METHOD

Research Design

This study adopted a qualitative exploratory design to investigate Indonesian EFL undergraduates' perceptions of AI-powered feedback in academic writing. Qualitative research is appropriate when the aim is to capture participants' lived experiences, perceptions, and meaning-making processes (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Given the novelty of AI feedback in EFL pedagogy, an exploratory orientation allowed the researchers to remain open to unexpected themes while maintaining systematic rigor. NVivo 12 was employed to assist with data management, coding, and thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006, 2019, 2021) reflexive approach, enabling the identification of both semantic and latent patterns across the dataset.

Qualitative inquiry values depth rather than breadth, and small samples are acceptable when saturation is achieved (Guest et al., 2020). In this study, the sample size of

seven students was deemed sufficient, as data collection and analysis reached both code saturation and meaning saturation by the sixth interview, with the seventh confirming adequacy of thematic coverage (Guest et al., 2020).

Participants

Participants consisted of seven undergraduate students enrolled in an English education program at a public university in Indonesia. A purposive sampling strategy was used to select individuals who had relevant experience with AI-powered feedback. The inclusion criteria were: (a) currently enrolled in an academic writing course, (b) had used AI tools (e.g., Grammarly, ChatGPT, QuillBot) at least three times for their writing tasks, and (c) willing to provide writing samples and participate in an interview.

To enhance variation and credibility, participants were drawn from different semesters and balanced in gender representation. Such purposive strategies are common in qualitative research to ensure maximum information richness (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

Data Collection

Data were gathered through semi-structured interviews, each lasting 45–60 minutes. The interviews focused on participants' experiences with AI feedback, their perceptions of usefulness and limitations, trust or distrust in AI-generated suggestions, and strategies for integrating AI feedback into their revisions. Interview questions were piloted with two students before the main study to ensure clarity and relevance.

In addition to interviews, participants were asked to share one writing sample with its AI-generated feedback (screenshot or text log). This served as a form of data triangulation, enhancing credibility and dependability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Where possible, participants were also invited to write a short reflective journal after using AI feedback, though this was optional. All interviews were audio-recorded with participants' consent and transcribed verbatim.

Data Analysis

Data analysis followed Braun and Clarke's (2006, 2019, 2021) reflexive thematic analysis, supported by NVivo 12. The process involved five iterative steps:

1. Familiarization: Reading and re-reading transcripts and documents to identify initial impressions.
2. Initial Coding: Conducting open coding in NVivo, attaching data segments to descriptive nodes. Two researchers independently coded two transcripts to develop an initial codebook.
3. Theme Development: Codes were clustered into broader categories through axial coding (e.g., perceived usefulness, affective responses, trust, and strategy uptake). Themes were refined through iterative discussion and memo writing (Nowell et al., 2017).
4. Reviewing Themes: Thematic maps and coding matrices in NVivo were used to ensure internal consistency and distinctiveness across themes (Braun & Clarke, 2021).
5. Defining and Naming Themes: Themes were clearly defined and supported with illustrative quotes, ensuring thick description (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

A saturation grid was maintained in NVivo to monitor theme emergence across participants (P1–P7). By the sixth interview, no new codes emerged, and the seventh confirmed meaning saturation (Guest et al., 2020).

Trustworthiness

Several strategies were employed to ensure trustworthiness:

- Credibility: Member checking was conducted by sharing a summary of themes with participants for feedback. Peer debriefing with a colleague ensured interpretive rigor (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

- Dependability: An audit trail was maintained in NVivo, including memos, codebook iterations, and decision logs (Nowell et al., 2017).
- Confirmability: Reflexive memos documented the researchers' assumptions and reflections during analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2019).
- Transferability: Thick description of context and extended quotations from participants allow readers to assess applicability to other settings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

FINDING

The qualitative dataset comprised seven semi-structured interviews, each lasting between 45 and 60 minutes. NVivo-assisted thematic analysis produced 35 initial codes, which were clustered into four overarching themes. A summary of the coding tree is presented in Table 1, while a detailed cross-case matrix is provided in Appendix A.

Table 1. Coding Tree Derived from NVivo Analysis

Theme	Sub-themes
Perceived Usefulness of AI Feedback	- Grammar & Vocabulary Support - Clarity & Organization
Affective Responses to AI Feedback	- Increased Confidence & Motivation - Feelings of Dependency & Doubt
Trust and Distrust in AI Feedback	- Trust in Technical Corrections - Distrust in Content Suggestions
Negotiating AI and Teacher Feedback	- Complementary Roles - Selective Uptake Strategies

The themes outlined in Table 1 are elaborated below with supporting quotations from participants (P1–P7). These themes capture how EFL students perceived the benefits and challenges of AI-powered feedback, as well as how they negotiated its use alongside teacher input.

Theme 1: Perceived Usefulness of AI Feedback

All participants highlighted the usefulness of AI-powered feedback, but the degree and domain of usefulness varied.

1.1 Grammar and Vocabulary Support

Universally, AI was valued for its ability to identify grammatical errors, spelling mistakes, and word-level improvements. Participants described AI as a “safety net” that caught mistakes often overlooked by students themselves.

- P2 explained: “I always make mistakes with articles and prepositions, and Grammarly shows me the error immediately. Before, my teacher would underline those mistakes, but now I can correct them before the teacher even sees my draft.”
- P5 emphasized vocabulary benefits: “When I struggle with academic vocabulary, ChatGPT sometimes gives me three or four alternative words, and I can choose the one that fits. It feels like having a dictionary with explanations.”

The consensus across all seven participants confirms that AI feedback is most trusted and appreciated at the surface level, particularly grammar and vocabulary.

1.2 Clarity and Organization

Beyond grammar, some students reported that AI also helped improve coherence and organization. ChatGPT was specifically mentioned as capable of suggesting transition sentences, rephrasing awkward expressions, or recommending structural adjustments.

- P7 noted: “I asked ChatGPT how to connect two paragraphs, and it gave me transition options like ‘Moreover’ or ‘In addition.’ It even suggested a full sentence. That was something Grammarly never did.”

- P3 added: “Sometimes the tool suggested reorganizing sentences. I did not always agree, but it gave me ideas I had not considered.”

However, this usefulness was not uniform. Three participants felt AI suggestions for organization disrupted their intended flow. P6 reflected: “It told me to merge sentences, but then my argument became unclear. I decided to ignore it.”

Students see AI feedback as a mechanical and linguistic aid rather than a reliable rhetorical or argumentative guide. This distinction shaped how they engaged with feedback at different levels of their writing.

Theme 2: Affective Responses to AI Feedback

AI feedback influenced students’ emotions and self-perceptions as writers, generating both positive and negative affective responses.

2.1 Increased Confidence and Motivation

Four participants explicitly stated that AI feedback boosted their confidence. They felt reassured knowing that their grammar and vocabulary had been checked by a tool before submission.

- P1 shared: “I felt more confident submitting my paper because at least the grammar was okay. Even if the teacher finds something else, I know I already corrected many mistakes.”

- P3 explained how motivation increased: “Because I could immediately see corrections, I wanted to revise more drafts. Before, I only wrote once or twice. Now, I sometimes make three or four drafts because AI makes revision faster.”

The affective benefit was twofold: confidence in language accuracy and motivation to practice iterative drafting.

2.2 Feelings of Dependency and Doubt

Conversely, three participants expressed anxiety about over-reliance on AI.

- P6 admitted: “Sometimes I just accepted everything without thinking. Later, when the teacher checked, some changes were not correct. I realized I was depending too much on AI.”

- P4 worried about long-term consequences: “If I always use AI, maybe my grammar will not improve. I become lazy to think about the rules.”

These voices highlight a tension between empowerment and dependency. While AI feedback scaffolds learning, it can also discourage critical engagement if used unreflectively.

The affective dimension reveals that AI feedback is emotionally ambivalent: it raises confidence and motivation but simultaneously creates concerns about dependency and reduced self-reliance.

Theme 3: Trust and Distrust in AI Feedback

Students’ perceptions were shaped by a trust hierarchy: strong trust in surface-level corrections but skepticism toward content-level or stylistic suggestions.

3.1 Trust in Technical Corrections

Six of the seven participants reported high confidence in AI’s ability to correct grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

- P5 stated: “For grammar, I always follow AI, because 90 percent is correct. It’s like a grammar teacher who never gets tired.”

- P2 added: “Even if I don’t understand the rule, I just apply it because it always looks correct when I read again.”

This trust reflects the perception of AI as an objective authority for mechanics.

3.2 Distrust in Content Suggestions

When AI attempted to suggest synonyms, rephrase ideas, or reorganize arguments, participants became cautious.

- P3 emphasized: “I trust AI for grammar, but not when it changes my meaning. I want to keep my own voice.”
- P4 noted: “It suggested very academic words, like ‘ameliorate’ instead of ‘improve.’ It sounded unnatural for my essay.”
- P7 described balancing trust: “I like when AI gives synonyms, but I usually check with my teacher before using them.”

Students position AI as a reliable mechanic but an unreliable co-author. This cautious stance highlights learners’ critical awareness of AI’s limits.

Theme 4: Negotiating AI and Teacher Feedback

Rather than choosing between AI and teacher feedback, students described blended strategies.

4.1 Complementary Roles

Five participants viewed AI as a complement to teacher input.

- P7: “I run my draft through AI before class, so the teacher does not need to correct small grammar mistakes. Then the teacher focuses on content.”
- P2: “AI saves time. The teacher is still important, but AI helps me prepare a cleaner draft.”

This complementary role aligns with the idea that AI can reduce teacher workload on surface-level corrections while empowering students to focus on higher-order issues.

4.2 Selective Uptake Strategies

Students described actively filtering AI feedback.

- P6: “If AI and teacher give different advice, I always follow the teacher. But if it is only grammar, I use AI.”
- P5: “Sometimes I check AI corrections in Google or ask a friend. I don’t accept everything automatically.”

Far from being passive users, students demonstrate feedback literacy by selectively engaging with AI and teacher input, depending on context and perceived reliability.

Cross-Case Patterns

A cross-case matrix revealed convergences and divergences:

- Universal agreement (7/7): Grammar support is the most valuable function of AI.
- Common but varied (5/7): Distrust in content-level suggestions.
- Split affective responses: Four students reported increased confidence, while three described dependency and doubt.
- Blended strategies: Five described complementary use of AI and teacher feedback, while two used AI more independently.

This variation underscores the nuanced and context-dependent nature of learner engagement with AI feedback.

The findings illustrate four key insights:

1. AI as a technical assistant: Students universally valued AI for grammar and vocabulary, freeing cognitive resources for idea development.
 2. Emotional ambivalence: While AI raised confidence and motivation, it also risked dependency and uncritical reliance.
 3. Trust hierarchy: Students trusted AI for surface-level corrections but distrusted it for content, nuance, and rhetorical appropriateness.
 4. Blended feedback practices: Learners actively negotiated AI and teacher feedback, adopting selective uptake strategies that reflected both pragmatism and critical awareness.
- Collectively, these findings demonstrate that AI feedback is not perceived as a replacement for human feedback but as a supplementary scaffold. Learners exercise agency by

integrating AI with teacher guidance, showing the importance of developing feedback literacy in the digital age.

DISCUSSION

This discussion critically synthesizes the findings of the present study with existing research and theoretical frameworks. The NVivo-assisted analysis generated four themes: (1) perceived usefulness of AI feedback, (2) affective responses, (3) trust and distrust in AI feedback, and (4) negotiation between AI and teacher feedback. Each theme is examined in depth and compared with prior studies to highlight both convergence and divergence. The analysis also identifies the theoretical, pedagogical, and policy implications of the study, while acknowledging limitations and directions for future research.

Theme 1: Perceived Usefulness of AI Feedback

All participants reported that AI feedback was particularly useful for grammar and vocabulary. This perception is consistent with Ranalli (2021), who found that Chinese EFL learners viewed Grammarly as a 'safety net' for catching surface errors. Similarly, Wang (2025) observed that automated writing evaluation systems were valued primarily for mechanical corrections. Our findings extend these insights by showing that Indonesian learners also appreciated AI for surface-level accuracy, but were ambivalent about its capacity to improve coherence and organization. Some participants acknowledged that ChatGPT could suggest transitions and rephrased sentences, yet others rejected such suggestions as disruptive to their intended meaning. Recent experimental evidence supports this nuanced view. Mekheimer (2025) demonstrated that AI feedback improved not only accuracy but also coherence and content quality among Saudi postgraduate students. This suggests that AI's potential extends beyond grammar, but uptake depends on learners' critical evaluation and contextual factors. In our study, selective uptake reflects both opportunities and constraints of AI integration.

Theme 2: Affective Responses

Students expressed ambivalent emotions toward AI feedback. Four reported increased confidence and motivation, describing AI as a supportive tool that encouraged more drafting. However, three participants raised concerns about dependency and reduced learning autonomy. This duality echoes Mohammed (2024), who documented both empowerment and overreliance among Saudi EFL learners using ChatGPT. Similar patterns were reported by Mohammed et al. (2025), who found that AI feedback enhanced motivation and emotional intelligence but also introduced anxiety about authenticity. In the Indonesian context, such ambivalence may be intensified by cultural norms emphasizing teacher authority and self-reliance (Majid et al., 2025). Thus, affective responses to AI feedback cannot be viewed merely as individual preferences; they are mediated by sociocultural and pedagogical traditions.

Theme 3: Trust and Distrust in AI Feedback

A clear trust hierarchy emerged. Students trusted AI for grammar and spelling but distrusted content-related suggestions such as synonyms or reorganized arguments. This aligns with Chen et al. (2025), who reported that learners accepted surface-level feedback but resisted changes that altered meaning. Teng (2024) similarly found that Chinese EFL learners conceptualized ChatGPT as a 'companion' rather than an authority, reflecting both trust and caution. Our participants' skepticism underscores their awareness of the limits of AI. Alyami et al. (2025) further confirmed that Saudi students valued AI for mechanics but doubted its reliability for deeper content issues. Collectively, these studies indicate that while AI is widely trusted for surface-level corrections, its authority remains contested at higher levels of writing. This critical stance reflects an emerging form of feedback literacy.

Theme 4: Negotiating AI and Teacher Feedback

Rather than viewing AI and teacher feedback as mutually exclusive, participants described blended strategies. They used AI to prepare cleaner drafts and relied on teachers for content-level guidance. This resonates with Yan and Carless (2021), who conceptualize feedback literacy as the ability to navigate and integrate multiple sources of feedback. Kurt and Kurt (2024) highlighted that the effectiveness of ChatGPT feedback depends heavily on prompt quality, suggesting that teacher mediation remains essential. In our study, students positioned teachers as the final authority, especially in culturally teacher-centered contexts (Barnard & Hasim, 2018). This illustrates how AI can complement but not replace human feedback, reinforcing traditional pedagogical hierarchies while enhancing efficiency in the drafting process.

CONCLUSION

This study explored Indonesian EFL learners' perceptions of AI-powered feedback in academic writing through a qualitative analysis. The findings highlight key aspects of AI feedback that address the research questions:

Perception of Usefulness and Limitations of AI Feedback
EFL students perceived AI feedback as highly useful for surface-level corrections, particularly for grammar and vocabulary. The AI tools were seen as effective "safety nets" for these mechanical aspects of writing. However, students expressed limitations regarding AI's ability to enhance content quality, coherence, and organization, areas where human teacher feedback was considered more valuable. This finding emphasizes the role of AI as a supportive tool rather than a complete solution for academic writing improvement.

Factors Shaping Trust or Distrust in AI-Generated Feedback
The study revealed a trust hierarchy in students' engagement with AI feedback. Students were generally trusting of AI when it addressed mechanical errors but were skeptical of AI's ability to provide content-related feedback. This skepticism stemmed from concerns about the accuracy and depth of AI suggestions, particularly when it came to altering the meaning or argumentation in their writing. Trust in AI was shaped by its perceived usefulness, but students remained cautious about its limitations, especially in areas requiring higher cognitive processing.

Negotiation Between AI Feedback and Teacher Feedback
The findings show that students adopted blended feedback strategies, combining AI suggestions with traditional teacher feedback. AI feedback was primarily used to refine the surface-level aspects of their writing, while teacher feedback provided deeper, content-related insights. This negotiation of feedback highlights the students' growing feedback literacy, as they developed strategies for integrating multiple sources of feedback to improve their writing.

The study demonstrates that AI feedback is perceived as a valuable tool for enhancing mechanical accuracy in EFL writing but is not a replacement for teacher feedback in areas requiring critical thinking and content development. These findings underscore the importance of integrating AI as a supplementary tool while maintaining human-centered feedback in the writing process.

Limitations and Future Research

This study is limited by its small sample (n=7), reliance on self-reported perceptions, and cross-sectional design. Future studies should adopt mixed-methods approaches to link perceptions with measurable learning outcomes, longitudinal designs to capture change over time, and cross-cultural comparisons across ASEAN contexts.

Interventional research could also test the effectiveness of explicit AI feedback literacy training and institutional policy frameworks.

Pedagogical and Policy Implications

AI should be positioned as a supplementary tool that supports, but does not replace, teacher feedback. Teachers can encourage students to use AI as a pre-draft assistant, while focusing class feedback on higher-order concerns. Institutions should embed AI feedback literacy into curricula, training learners to evaluate suggestions critically and ethically. Professional development for teachers, together with university-level guidelines on transparency and integrity, is crucial to ensure responsible integration.

Indonesian EFL learners view AI-powered feedback as valuable yet limited: they trust it for mechanics, doubt it for content, feel both empowered and dependent, and integrate it with teacher input. These practices reflect the emergence of critical feedback literacy in the digital age. Ultimately, AI should be framed as a complement to, not a substitute for, teacher feedback, ensuring that human judgment remains central in language education.

REFERENCES

- Al Adawi, I. (2023). *Developing intercultural competence in EFL: A qualitative enquiry into the beliefs and classroom practices of a group of Omani EFL teachers in a higher education institution in Oman* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Glasgow). University of Glasgow. <https://theses.gla.ac.uk/83755/>
- Algrin, A. H., Sofyan, D., & Syafryadin. (2025). EFL students' perceptions toward ChatGPT as a writing instrument. *ELTIN Journal*, 13(1), 75–88. <https://e-journal.stkipsiliwangi.ac.id/index.php/eltin/article/view/5466>
- Alyami, A., Alotaibi, S., & Khan, W. (2025). Saudi EFL learners' perceptions of using artificial intelligence and its impact on their writing skills. *Arab World English Journal*, 16(1), 349–365. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol16no1.22>
- Barnard, R., & Hasim, Z. B. (2018). *English medium instruction programmes: Perspectives from South East Asian universities*. Routledge.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11(4), 589–597. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE.
- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1315–1325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>
- Chen, H., Rasool, U., Hu, T., & Bhattacharyya, E. (2025). Examining the beliefs of non-native English-speaking teachers and EFL students about WCF in enhancing

- writing skills. *Acta Psychologica*, 256, 103664.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105064>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE.
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Guest, G., Namey, E., & Chen, M. (2020). A simple method to assess and report thematic saturation in qualitative research. *PLoS ONE*, 15(5), e0232076.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0232076>
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2019). Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (2nd ed., pp. 1–19). Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547>
- Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Gawelczyk, A., Harteis, C., Kollar, I., Lachner, A., Lorenz, R., Rumann, S., & 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>
- Kohnke, L., Moorehouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023). ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. *RELC Journal*, 54(3), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868>
- Kurt, G., & Kurt, Y. (2024). Enhancing L2 writing skills: ChatGPT as an automated feedback tool. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, 23, 421–439.
<https://doi.org/10.28945/5370>
- Li, Z., & Hegelheimer, V. (2013). Mobile-assisted grammar exercises: Effects on self-editing in L2 writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 17(3), 135–156.
<https://doi.org/10.125/44341>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE.
- Lubis, A. H., & Adara, R. A. (2023, September). *English as medium of instruction in Indonesia: What insights and future directions can be gained from existing publications (2012–2023)?* [PowerPoint slides]. TEFLIN. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
[https://teflin.upi.edu/file/ppt/PPT EMI - Arif Husein Lubis.pptx](https://teflin.upi.edu/file/ppt/PPT%20EMI%20-%20Arif%20Husein%20Lubis.pptx)
- Majid, F. F. D. N., Rahman, A., & Anwar, S. (2025). EFL students' perceptions on digital learning media technology: The case of secondary school in Indonesia. *English Language Teaching Methodology*, 5(2), 139–151.
<https://doi.org/10.56983/eltm.v5i2.1862>

- Mekheimer, M. (2025). Generative AI-assisted feedback and EFL writing: A study on proficiency, revision frequency and writing quality. *Discover Education*, 4, 170. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00602-7>
- Mohammed, G. M. S. (2024). Exploring the Saudi EFL learners' perceptions and challenges in AI-assisted post-editing tools for writing. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences*, 22(2), 13802–13814. <https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2024-22.2.00991>
- Mohammed, S. J., & Khalid, M. W. (2025). Under the world of AI-generated feedback on writing: Mirroring motivation, foreign language peace of mind, trait emotional intelligence, and writing development. *Language Testing in Asia*, 15, 7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-025-00343-2>
- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>
- Ranalli, J. (2021). L2 student engagement with automated feedback on writing: Potential for learning and issues of trust. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 52, 100816. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100816>
- Teng, M. F. (2024). “ChatGPT is the companion, not enemies”: EFL learners' perceptions of ChatGPT in academic writing. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 100270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100270>
- Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): A 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 19(6), 349–357. <https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042>
- Wang, X. (2025). Students' perceptions of automated writing evaluation in autonomous learning. *Educational and Information Technologies*, 30(11), 14703–14735. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13378-y>
- Yan, Z., & Carless, D. (2021). Self-assessment is about more than self: The enabling role of feedback literacy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(7), 1116–1128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.2001431>
- 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, 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>