

AI-Generated Assignments: Lecturers' Perspectives on Linguistic Integrity and Pedagogical Strategies in Higher Education

Putra Thoip Nasution & Widia Fransiska

Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Alwashliyah Medan
thoipputra123@gmail.com

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received : 2025-06-03

Revised : 2026-03-18

Accepted : 2026-03-23

KEYWORDS

Academic integrity

Artificial intelligence

Higher education

Lecturer perspectives

Pedagogy

Linguistic integrity.



ABSTRACT

The rapid proliferation of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in higher education has fundamentally reshaped academic writing practices while simultaneously raising serious concerns about academic and linguistic integrity. Within language education, this transformation creates a critical tension between technological efficiency and the preservation of authentic student learning. Addressing this emerging challenge, the present study investigates lecturers' perspectives on AI generated assignments with particular attention to linguistic integrity and pedagogical responses in the TBI Study Program at Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara. Using a mixed methods design, the study combined a survey of 20 lecturers with semi structured interviews involving 10 purposively selected participants who regularly assess student assignments. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, while interview transcripts were examined through thematic analysis to identify patterns related to authenticity, assessment practices, and institutional support. The findings reveal that the majority of lecturers have encountered AI generated assignments that demonstrate high grammatical accuracy but frequently lack originality, critical engagement, and a recognizable student voice. Lecturers also reported growing concerns that excessive reliance on AI weakens students' critical thinking and reflective learning processes. In response, educators employ strategies such as drafts, reflective commentaries, oral defenses, and multimodal assessments to emphasize learning processes rather than final products. The study also highlights the lack of clear institutional policies on AI use in assignments and shows how language educators navigate the tension between technological innovation and academic authenticity, informing the development of AI aware pedagogical frameworks and policies that safeguard linguistic integrity in higher education.

1. Introduction

Artificial Intelligence is no longer a distant technological promise but a rapidly expanding force reshaping the foundations of contemporary education. In particular, the emergence of generative AI systems has begun to transform how knowledge is produced, communicated, and assessed in academic contexts. Generative AI tools such as ChatGPT and other large language models have created a profound shift in academic writing practices because they can produce coherent and fluent text within seconds, often making it difficult to distinguish machine generated writing from human authored work (Meyer et al., 2023; Yan, 2023). As a result, students increasingly rely on these technologies to accelerate drafting, editing, and revising assignments, creating new possibilities for efficiency and accessibility in writing processes.

Beyond efficiency, AI technologies are also becoming integrated into pedagogical workflows in ways that potentially support language development and writing instruction. In writing pedagogy, generative AI tools can automate elements of the composing process, assist with linguistic accuracy, and support learners who struggle with academic language production (Yan, 2023; Rudolph et al., 2023; Singh, 2023). Widely adopted writing assistants such as Grammarly further illustrate how AI technologies have already become embedded in academic writing practices by facilitating grammar checking, stylistic revision, and language refinement during editing stages (Rudolph et al., 2023; Singh, 2023). When integrated thoughtfully, these tools may offer pedagogical value by supporting learners' language awareness and improving writing quality.

Despite these benefits, the increasing availability of generative AI has also generated significant concerns regarding academic integrity and authorship authenticity. Educators increasingly report that students may outsource assignments to AI systems, thereby producing text that appears original yet does not necessarily represent the student's own intellectual engagement (Rudolph et al., 2023; Yan, 2023). Because AI generated text is technically "new" rather than copied, it can bypass conventional plagiarism detection systems while still undermining academic norms of authorship and intellectual ownership. Consequently, recent scholarship emphasizes the urgent need to redesign assessment practices, strengthen institutional policies, and implement process oriented evaluation methods that preserve originality and intellectual honesty while responsibly integrating technological innovation (Meyer et al., 2023; Rudolph et al., 2023; ROA & Halim, 2024; Singh, 2023).

Within this broader concern, the concept of linguistic integrity has become increasingly central in discussions of academic writing. Linguistic integrity requires that students produce writing that authentically reflects their own ideas, reasoning processes, and individual voice rather than merely avoiding overt plagiarism (Mah et al., 2024; Jared & Hanna, 2024). Generative AI complicates this principle because AI produced text can appear grammatically sophisticated and conceptually organized, blurring the distinction between legitimate academic support and academic misconduct (Mah et al., 2024; Jared & Hanna, 2024). When students rely excessively on AI generated language or ideas, educators fear that sustained writing practice, intellectual struggle, and critical reflection may gradually be replaced by automated outputs (Mah et al., 2024; Nadhifah et al., 2024). These concerns are further intensified by governance gaps in higher education, as regulatory frameworks for AI use remain underdeveloped and institutions often lack clearly articulated guidelines regarding ethical AI practices (Kronivets et al., 2023; Jared & Hanna, 2024). Consequently, lecturers frequently find themselves navigating ambiguous expectations and inconsistent standards of academic integrity in rapidly evolving digital learning environments (Mah et al., 2024; Jared & Hanna, 2024).

A growing body of scholarship has begun to explore the implications of AI for higher education and academic integrity. Selwyn (2024) argues that although AI technologies are increasingly embraced within universities, their integration must be approached carefully in order to avoid compromising fundamental academic values. Similarly, Luckin (2025) highlights the potential of AI to enhance learning processes but warns that unregulated use may weaken originality and intellectual ownership. International policy discussions have also acknowledged the transformative role of AI in education, emphasizing both its opportunities and

ethical risks (UNESCO, 2024). Nevertheless, much of this literature remains focused on the technological capabilities of AI or its potential applications in teaching specific subject areas rather than examining how educators themselves perceive and respond to AI generated student work in everyday assessment practices.

In addition, research on technology enhanced learning often prioritizes technological infrastructures or digital learning systems while paying comparatively limited attention to how lecturers adapt their pedagogical practices in response to AI mediated learning environments (Kaur et al., 2022; Whalley et al., 2019). Similarly, studies within evidence based teaching literature have acknowledged a lack of empirical research examining how technological change influences instructors' daily teaching routines, assessment design, and classroom decision making (Barrasso & Spiliotis, 2021). At the same time, the rapid expansion of AI in higher education has been associated with increased uncertainty among educators, many of whom experience both enthusiasm about technological innovation and anxiety regarding academic integrity and instructional control (Butakor, 2023). These conditions suggest the importance of investigating lecturer level responses to AI rather than focusing exclusively on student behavior or technological tools.

Responding to these gaps, the present study examines how lecturers in the Tadris Bahasa Inggris (TBI) Study Program at Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara navigate the tension between leveraging AI technologies and maintaining linguistic and academic integrity. In particular, the study explores how lecturers adapt their assessment strategies and pedagogical practices to address AI generated assignments, including approaches such as drafts, reflective commentaries, and oral defenses (Kaur et al., 2022; Butakor, 2023). By focusing on lecturers' lived experiences and pedagogical responses, this study contributes a contextualized perspective that is often overlooked in broader discussions of AI in higher education.

The significance of this investigation lies in its potential to inform both institutional policy development and pedagogical innovation. As AI tools become increasingly embedded in academic environments, universities face the urgent challenge of developing clear frameworks that guide ethical AI use while preserving authentic learning processes. This study therefore seeks to comprehensively examine lecturers' experiences in engaging with AI-generated assignments, to critically analyze the pedagogical strategies they employ in order to sustain linguistic integrity, and to identify the forms of institutional support required to effectively address emerging concerns related to academic integrity in contemporary higher education contexts.

Ultimately, this research contributes to ongoing debates regarding the role of AI in English language teaching and academic writing development. By examining lecturers' perceptions and adaptive strategies, the study highlights how language educators attempt to balance technological innovation with the preservation of authentic student voice, critical thinking, and intellectual engagement. The findings are expected to inform the development of AI aware pedagogical frameworks and contribute to broader discussions within English language teaching and applied linguistics regarding how emerging technologies reshape writing instruction, assessment design, and academic integrity in the digital age.

2. Method

This study employs a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative research designs to explore lecturers' perspectives on AI in student assignments, with a focus on linguistic integrity and pedagogical strategies. The integration of both methods enables a comprehensive examination of the challenges AI presents in higher education. The quantitative survey provides a broad overview of AI use, while the qualitative semi-structured interviews offer deeper insights into lecturers' experiences and responses to AI's influence on academic work.

2.1 Population and Sample

This study was conducted at Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara within the Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training, specifically in the Tadris Bahasa Inggris (TBI) Study Program. The population consisted of lecturers who regularly assess students' academic writing in English language courses. These lecturers were selected because their teaching responsibilities require continuous evaluation of written assignments, making them more likely to encounter AI assisted student work.

A purposive sampling strategy was employed to ensure that participants possessed relevant experience with AI mediated writing. Lecturers were included if they met three criteria: actively teaching language intensive or writing related courses, having at least two years of teaching experience, and having encountered or suspected the use of AI tools in student assignments. Based on these criteria, twenty lecturers participated in the survey stage of the study.

From this group, ten lecturers were subsequently selected for semi structured interviews using criterion based purposive sampling. Selection was guided by the richness of their survey responses and their willingness to elaborate on their experiences with AI generated assignments. This two stage sampling design enabled the study to capture both a general overview of lecturers' perceptions and deeper qualitative insights into their pedagogical responses.

2.2 Data Collection

Data were collected using two instruments: a structured survey questionnaire and semi structured interviews. The survey instrument was developed based on key themes in the literature on artificial intelligence in education, academic integrity, and AI assisted writing. It consisted of three sections: demographic information, closed ended items examining lecturers' perceptions of AI use in student assignments, and open ended questions exploring their experiences and concerns regarding linguistic integrity.

Prior to distribution, the questionnaire was reviewed by two experts in English language education and educational technology to ensure clarity and content validity. Minor revisions were made based on their feedback, and the survey was then distributed electronically to eligible lecturers in the TBI Study Program. Semi structured interviews were subsequently conducted with ten selected lecturers to obtain deeper insights into their experiences. The interview guide explored lecturers' perceptions of AI generated assignments, strategies used to maintain linguistic integrity, and institutional support related to AI use. Each interview lasted approximately 30 to 45 minutes, was audio recorded with participant consent, and later transcribed for analysis.

Survey data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including frequencies and percentages, to identify patterns in lecturers' perceptions. Interview transcripts were analyzed through thematic analysis following [Braun and Clarke's \(2006\)](#) procedures, involving data familiarization, coding, theme development, and interpretation. The integration of quantitative and qualitative findings enabled triangulation and strengthened the credibility of the results.

2.3 Ethical Considerations

Participants were informed about the study's purpose, and their consent was obtained. Confidentiality was maintained through the use of pseudonyms, and participants were free to withdraw from the study at any stage without consequence, in line with ethical research practices.

2.4 Data Analysis

Quantitative survey data were analyzed using frequencies and percentages to identify trends in AI use and lecturers' perceptions. The qualitative interview data were analyzed thematically, with initial codes based on key concepts like "authenticity," "pedagogical strategies," and "institutional support." These codes were grouped into broader themes and compared with survey findings to ensure consistency. Thematic analysis, as outlined by [Braun and Clarke \(2006\)](#), provided a structured approach to identifying recurring patterns and integrating findings from both data sources.

2.5 Bias and Limitations

While the purposive sampling technique enabled the inclusion of knowledgeable lecturers, it is important to acknowledge that the perspectives of the sample may be shaped by institutional policies or personal experiences with AI. This potential bias should be considered when interpreting the findings. Additionally, the absence of a larger or more diverse sample could limit the generalizability of the results to the broader academic community.

3. Result

The findings of this study reveal how lecturers at Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training, *Tadris Bahasa Inggris* (TBI) Study Program, perceive and respond to the challenges posed by Artificial Intelligence (AI) in student assignments. Through surveys and interviews, several themes emerged: experiences with detecting AI use, concerns about integrity and authenticity, pedagogical innovations, and institutional needs. These themes are presented below with illustrative excerpts and analysis.

The results of this study paint a picture of lecturers grappling with the dual forces of technological advancement and the preservation of academic integrity. While AI offers considerable potential to enhance learning, it also presents significant challenges in maintaining linguistic authenticity and student engagement. The strategies adopted by lecturers, such as requiring drafts, reflective commentaries, and oral

defenses, represent practical responses to these challenges, emphasizing process over product and fostering deeper engagement with learning. However, the absence of clear institutional policies and the inconsistency in how AI is handled across courses point to a critical need for frameworks that provide clarity and support for both educators and students. The emotional and developmental aspects of AI use also remind us that technology should serve, rather than replace, the human dimensions of education. These findings suggest that higher education must adapt its pedagogical practices to ensure that AI is integrated in ways that preserve integrity, authenticity, and critical thinking. Below are the details of the result in this study:

3.1 Prevalence of AI in Student Assignments

The findings indicate that AI generated assignments have become increasingly visible within students' academic writing practices. Survey results show that the majority of lecturers have encountered assignments suspected to involve AI assistance in their courses. As presented in Table 1, seventy percent of respondents reported encountering AI generated assignments occasionally, while twenty five percent stated that such cases appear frequently. Only five percent indicated that they rarely observe this phenomenon. These figures demonstrate that AI assisted writing has gradually become integrated into students' learning practices rather than remaining an exceptional occurrence see table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Frequency of AI Generated Assignments

Frequency of Encountering AI Generated Work	Percentage of Respondents
Occasionally	70%
Frequently	25%
Rarely	5%

A central finding emerging from the combined survey and interview data is the contrast between the technical quality of AI generated assignments and the depth of intellectual engagement displayed by students. Lecturers consistently reported that these texts appear grammatically accurate and structurally organized. However, many also emphasized that the essays often lack originality, critical engagement, and the distinctive voice that normally characterizes authentic student writing. This pattern suggests that AI tools can enhance the surface quality of written texts while simultaneously concealing the absence of deeper cognitive engagement.

One lecturer described the discrepancy between the polished essay and the student's ability to explain the ideas during discussion:

"Tulisannya rapi sekali, struktur argumennya juga bagus. Tapi waktu saya minta dia jelaskan lagi dengan kata-katanya sendiri, dia malah bingung."

("The writing looks very neat and the argument structure is strong. But when I asked the student to explain it again in their own words, they became confused.")

(Interview Set 2, Participant L05, 14:45)

This excerpt highlights a key indicator of AI mediated writing, namely the gap between textual sophistication and conceptual understanding. In authentic writing, students can typically elaborate on their arguments, whereas AI assisted work often leaves them unable to explain their reasoning. Another lecturer reported a similar inconsistency between written fluency and conceptual ownership:

“Esainya kelihatan seperti tulisan akademik yang sangat matang, tapi ketika didiskusikan di kelas, mahasiswa itu tidak bisa menjelaskan mengapa argumennya disusun seperti itu.”

(“The essay appears like a very mature academic piece, but when we discussed it in class, the student could not explain why the arguments were structured that way.”)

(Interview Set 1, Participant L03, 08:30)

This observation suggests that AI generated writing may produce an illusion of academic competence. The highly polished form of the essay can create the impression of advanced reasoning even when the student’s engagement with the ideas remains limited.

Lecturers also emphasized the disappearance of personal voice as another indicator of AI generated writing. One participant explained that authentic student essays usually contain traces of individuality and struggle that reflect the learning process:

“Biasanya tulisan mahasiswa itu ada ‘suara’ mereka sendiri, kadang masih kasar tapi terasa asli. Kalau pakai AI, tulisannya memang bagus, tapi rasanya kosong.”

(“Normally students’ writing has their own voice. Sometimes it is imperfect but authentic. When AI is used, the writing is polished, but it feels empty.”)

(Interview Set 3, Participant L07, 07:20)

Similarly, another lecturer pointed to stylistic uniformity across multiple submissions:

“Beberapa esai tiba-tiba punya gaya bahasa yang sangat mirip, padahal kemampuan menulis mahasiswa itu biasanya berbeda-beda.”

(“Several essays suddenly have very similar writing styles, even though students usually have very different writing abilities.”)

(Interview Set 2, Participant L08, 11:10)

From an interpretative perspective, these patterns indicate that AI generated writing may standardize linguistic expression while simultaneously reducing the diversity of student voices. This phenomenon is particularly significant in language education, where developing personal expression and argumentative reasoning represents a central objective of academic writing instruction.

The data further reveal that lecturers have begun adapting their pedagogical strategies to respond to the growing presence of AI assisted assignments. Many participants reported shifting toward assessment practices that allow them to observe the writing process more closely. One lecturer described the introduction of staged submissions to track students’ intellectual development:

“Sekarang saya minta mereka kumpulkan outline, draft, dan refleksi sebelum esai final. Dari situ kelihatan apakah idenya benar-benar berkembang.”

(“Now I ask students to submit an outline, draft, and reflection before the final essay. From that process I can see whether their ideas genuinely develop.”)

(Interview Set 4, Participant L10, 12:10)

Another lecturer highlighted the use of oral explanation as a verification strategy:

“Setelah esai dikumpulkan, saya biasanya minta mereka menjelaskan argumennya secara lisan. Dari situ langsung terlihat apakah mereka benar-benar memahami tulisannya.”

(“After the essay is submitted, I usually ask them to explain their argument orally. From that moment it becomes clear whether they truly understand their own writing.”)

(Interview Set 3, Participant L06, 04:15)

These pedagogical adjustments indicate a shift toward process-oriented assessment. Rather than evaluating writing solely through the final product, lecturers increasingly emphasize the stages of thinking, drafting, and explaining ideas. Such approaches allow educators to make the learning process more visible and reduce the possibility that AI generated text replaces genuine intellectual engagement.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that the prevalence of AI generated assignments is reshaping academic writing practices in higher education. Although AI tools may enhance linguistic accuracy and efficiency, they also introduce challenges related to authenticity, authorship, and intellectual engagement. Lecturers’ responses show that maintaining linguistic integrity now requires assessment strategies that capture both the written product and the cognitive processes behind it. Through these adaptations, educators seek to preserve academic writing as a meaningful site of reflection, argumentation, and personal expression within language education.

3.2 Concerns About Linguistic Integrity

The findings reveal that concerns regarding linguistic integrity constitute one of the most significant challenges associated with the increasing use of AI in student assignments. Lecturers widely acknowledged that AI assisted writing can produce grammatically accurate and well-structured texts. However, they also emphasized that such linguistic sophistication often does not correspond with genuine intellectual engagement. The key finding emerging from the survey data is that the majority of lecturers believe that AI generated writing weakens the cognitive processes involved in academic writing, particularly critical thinking, reflection, and originality.

As shown in Table 3.2, 80% of respondents believed AI undermines critical thinking and originality, while 60% acknowledged improved linguistic quality but questioned authenticity. Only 10% saw no significant impact, indicating widespread concern about AI’s effect on authentic student writing.

Table 3.2 Perceptions of AI's Impact on Linguistic Integrity

Perceived Impact of AI on Linguistic Integrity	Percentage of Respondents
Compromises critical thinking and originality	80%
Enhances linguistic quality but lacks authenticity	60%
No significant impact	10%

A recurring theme in the interviews was the perception that AI generated writing removes the intellectual struggle that typically accompanies the learning process. Lecturers emphasized that authentic academic writing often involves uncertainty, revision, and gradual refinement of ideas. When AI tools are used extensively, these cognitive processes may become less visible.

One lecturer expressed concern about the disappearance of personal voice in AI mediated assignments:

“AI memang bisa bikin esai yang tata bahasanya sempurna, tapi suara mahasiswa itu hilang. Tidak ada refleksi pribadi atau pemikiran mendalam.”
(“AI can produce essays with perfect grammar, but the student’s voice disappears. There is no personal reflection or deeper thinking.”)
(Interview Set 2, Participant L03, 18:45)

This observation illustrates a broader pedagogical issue. While AI can improve the linguistic presentation of a text, it cannot reproduce the individual perspective that emerges when students actively engage with ideas. The absence of personal voice therefore becomes an indicator that the intellectual ownership of the assignment may be limited.

Another lecturer highlighted the perception that AI may replace the cognitive effort normally required in academic writing:

“Tulisan mereka memang rapi dan jelas, tapi rasanya seperti bukan mahasiswa yang berpikir. Seolah-olah sistem yang menyusun argumennya.”
(“The writing is neat and clear, but it feels as if the student is not the one thinking. It seems like the system is constructing the arguments.”)
(Interview Set 5, Participant L07, 32:20)

This statement suggests that AI assisted writing can shift the locus of intellectual activity from the student to the technological system. From an analytical perspective, this shift raises concerns about how students develop reasoning skills when part of the ideation process is delegated to automated tools.

Another participant emphasized that authentic learning often emerges through moments of difficulty and experimentation:

“Kalau tulisan mahasiswa biasanya ada bagian yang masih belum sempurna. Di situlah proses belajar terlihat. Kalau pakai AI, semuanya langsung halus tanpa proses.”

(“In normal student writing there are usually imperfect parts. That is where the learning process becomes visible. With AI everything appears smooth without that process.”)

(Interview Set 4, Participant L08, 28:10)

This insight highlights an important dimension of linguistic integrity. Imperfections, revisions, and exploratory thinking are not merely weaknesses in writing but indicators of cognitive engagement. When these elements disappear, the assignment may lose the developmental dimension that characterizes meaningful academic learning.

Lecturers also acknowledged that AI tools can improve the linguistic quality of students’ work, particularly in terms of grammar and cohesion. However, they emphasized that linguistic accuracy alone does not constitute authentic academic writing. One participant summarized this perspective clearly:

“AI memang bisa membuat tulisan terlihat bagus secara bahasa, tapi ide yang kuat tetap harus datang dari mahasiswa sendiri.”
(“AI can make the writing look good linguistically, but strong ideas must still come from the student.”)
(Interview Set 3, Participant L06, 21:50)

This statement reflects a key interpretative insight from the data. While AI may function as a linguistic support tool, it cannot substitute the intellectual ownership of ideas that defines authentic academic writing. In other words, linguistic accuracy without conceptual originality does not fulfill the educational objectives of writing assignments.

Taken together, the findings indicate that concerns about linguistic integrity extend beyond issues of plagiarism or authorship. Instead, they reflect deeper anxieties about the erosion of intellectual engagement in academic writing. Lecturers perceive that when AI tools become heavily involved in the writing process, the assignment may no longer represent the student’s genuine reasoning and reflective thinking.

These findings also highlight the need for pedagogical approaches that emphasize the visibility of learning processes. If the authenticity of writing cannot be determined solely from the final text, assessment practices must incorporate additional mechanisms that reveal students' cognitive engagement. Such approaches may include staged writing submissions, reflective commentary, and oral explanation of written arguments.

Overall, the results suggest that the challenge posed by AI is not merely technological but pedagogical. While AI tools can enhance the technical quality of writing, they also risk obscuring the intellectual journey that academic writing is meant to cultivate. Maintaining linguistic integrity therefore requires assessment strategies that recognize both the linguistic form of the text and the underlying processes of hinking, reflection, and idea development that produce it.

3.3 Pedagogical Innovations to Ensure Authenticity

The findings indicate that lecturers have begun to adopt a range of pedagogical innovations to address the growing presence of AI generated assignments. Rather than relying solely on traditional written submissions, many lecturers have redesigned their assessment practices to make the learning process more visible. The key finding from the survey data shows that process oriented strategies are increasingly used to verify the authenticity of student work and encourage deeper engagement with academic tasks.

As shown in Table 3, sixty five percent of lecturers reported requiring students to submit drafts accompanied by reflective commentaries. The same proportion indicated that they incorporate oral defenses as part of the assessment process. In addition, forty percent of respondents reported using multimodal assignments such as video presentations or digital projects (see table 3.3).

Table 3.3 Pedagogical Strategies to Promote Authenticity

Pedagogical Strategies Implemented	Percentage of Respondents
Requiring drafts and reflective commentaries	65%
Incorporating oral defenses	65%
Multimodal assignments	40%

A major theme emerging from the interview data is the use of draft submissions and reflective commentaries to monitor students' intellectual development throughout the writing process. Lecturers explained that this strategy allows them to observe how ideas evolve from initial outlines to the final essay. One participant described how drafts make students' thinking processes more transparent:

“Kalau mahasiswa kirim draft dan refleksi, saya bisa lihat bagaimana ide mereka berkembang. Dari situ kelihatan apakah mereka benar-benar memahami tugasnya.”

(“When students submit drafts and reflections, I can see how their ideas develop. From that process it becomes clear whether they truly understand the assignment.”)

(Interview Set 2, Participant L04, 23:35)

This excerpt illustrates how draft based assessment functions as an important pedagogical checkpoint. By examining earlier versions of an essay, lecturers can identify the stages of reasoning, revision, and conceptual development that characterize authentic learning. From an analytical perspective, this strategy shifts the focus of evaluation from the final product to the intellectual process behind it. The presence of multiple drafts also reduces the likelihood that a fully

polished AI generated text can appear suddenly without evidence of developmental stages.

Another widely adopted strategy involves the integration of oral defenses into the assessment process. Lecturers emphasized that oral interaction allows them to evaluate students' conceptual understanding more directly. One lecturer explained the effectiveness of this approach during interviews:

“Waktu mahasiswa mempresentasikan tulisannya, saya bisa langsung mendengar bagaimana mereka berpikir. Dari situ kelihatan apakah argumennya benar-benar mereka pahami.”

(“When students present their writing, I can directly hear how they think. From that moment it becomes clear whether they genuinely understand their arguments.”)

(Interview Set 3, Participant L07, 31:20)

The oral defense therefore functions as a verification mechanism that reveals the intellectual ownership of an assignment. While AI can generate coherent written text, it cannot easily replicate a student's spontaneous explanation of ideas. This form of assessment also encourages students to internalize their arguments rather than relying solely on written outputs produced by external tools.

In addition to these strategies, several lecturers reported introducing multimodal assignments as a way to broaden the forms of student engagement. These assignments require students to communicate ideas through formats such as video presentations, podcasts, or digital storytelling. One lecturer described the pedagogical value of incorporating multimedia elements into assessment tasks:

“Saya mulai minta mahasiswa membuat presentasi video tentang topik esainya. Dari situ terlihat apakah mereka benar-benar memahami ide yang mereka tulis.”

(“I started asking students to create video presentations about their essay topics. From the presentation it becomes clear whether they truly understand the ideas they wrote.”)

(Interview Set 4, Participant L06, 39:05)

Another participant highlighted how multimodal assignments encourage deeper engagement with learning materials:

“Kalau tugasnya hanya esai, AI bisa membantu mereka menulis. Tapi kalau ada presentasi atau diskusi, mereka harus benar-benar menguasai materinya.”

(“If the task is only an essay, AI can help them write it. But when there is a presentation or discussion, they must genuinely master the material.”)

(Interview Set 3, Participant L08, 26:40)

From an interpretative perspective, multimodal assessments increase the complexity of academic tasks and make it more difficult for automated systems to replace genuine student participation. At the same time, they foster additional competencies such as digital communication, argument presentation, and interactive engagement with audiences.

Taken together, these pedagogical innovations represent a broader shift toward process oriented learning and assessment. Instead of evaluating students solely through the final written product, lecturers increasingly focus on the stages of thinking, drafting, explaining, and presenting ideas. This approach allows educators to capture the intellectual trajectory of student learning rather than merely assessing polished textual outputs.

The results therefore demonstrate that lecturers are not passively responding to the challenges posed by AI but are actively redesigning their pedagogical practices. By integrating drafts, reflective commentaries, oral defenses, and multimodal assignments, lecturers seek to ensure that academic work reflects genuine intellectual development. These innovations highlight a proactive effort to preserve authenticity in academic writing while adapting teaching practices to the realities of a technologically evolving educational environment.

3.4 Institutional Support and Policy Needs

The findings reveal that institutional governance regarding AI use in student assignments remains largely unclear. Many lecturers reported uncertainty about whether formal policies exist to regulate the use of AI in academic work. As presented in Table 4, sixty percent of respondents stated that their institution currently has no formal policy governing AI use in assignments. Thirty percent indicated that they were unsure whether such policies existed, while only ten percent reported that clear institutional guidelines were already in place. These results suggest that the rapid adoption of AI technologies in higher education has not been accompanied by equally rapid institutional regulation, leaving lecturers to navigate this issue independently (see table 3.4).

Table 3.4 Institutional Policies on AI Use in Assignments

Institutional Policy on AI Use	Percentage of Respondents
No formal policy	60%
Unsure about institutional policy	30%
Formal policy in place	10%

The key finding emerging from the interviews is that the absence of clear policies has produced inconsistent practices across courses and departments. Lecturers described situations in which AI use was permitted in some classes while strictly prohibited in others. One lecturer expressed frustration about this lack of uniformity:

“Di kelas saya AI tidak boleh dipakai, tapi di kelas lain mahasiswa bilang mereka bebas menggunakan AI. Akhirnya mahasiswa bingung, kami juga bingung.”

(“In my class AI is not allowed, but in other classes students say they are free to use it. In the end the students are confused and we are confused as well.”)

(Interview Set 2, Participant L04, 19:15)

This excerpt illustrates how policy ambiguity creates inconsistencies in assessment standards. When lecturers establish different rules independently, students may receive conflicting expectations regarding acceptable academic practices. From an analytical perspective, such inconsistencies risk

weakening perceptions of fairness and transparency within the academic environment.

Another lecturer described how the lack of institutional guidance forces educators to develop their own individual responses to AI:

“Kami mencoba mengatasi masalah ini dengan cara masing-masing. Ada yang melarang AI, ada juga yang mengizinkan sebagai alat bantu. Tapi tidak ada arahan resmi dari universitas.”
(“We are trying to handle this issue in our own ways. Some prohibit AI while others allow it as a supporting tool. But there is no official direction from the university.”)

(Interview Set 3, Participant L06, 25:40)

This statement highlights the decentralization of decision making in the absence of institutional frameworks. While some lecturers adopt restrictive approaches, others attempt to integrate AI into learning activities. Such variation reflects the broader uncertainty surrounding the pedagogical and ethical role of AI in higher education.

In addition to policy ambiguity, lecturers also emphasized the need for institutional training and professional development related to AI. Several participants indicated that educators require guidance not only on regulating AI use but also on integrating AI tools responsibly within teaching practices. One lecturer explained:

“Kami sebenarnya perlu pelatihan tentang bagaimana menggunakan AI secara bijak dalam pembelajaran, bukan hanya soal melarang atau membolehkan.”
(“What we really need is training on how to use AI responsibly in teaching, not simply deciding whether to ban or allow it.”)

(Interview Set 4, Participant L08, 32:25)

This observation suggests that institutional support should extend beyond regulatory frameworks to include pedagogical capacity building. Lecturers appear to recognize that AI technologies will remain present in academic environments. Therefore, the challenge is not merely to restrict their use but to guide their integration in ways that maintain academic integrity while supporting meaningful learning.

Another participant emphasized the importance of institutional coordination when addressing AI related challenges:

“Kalau setiap dosen membuat aturan sendiri, mahasiswa akan melihatnya sebagai sesuatu yang tidak konsisten. Harus ada kebijakan yang jelas dari institusi.”
(“If every lecturer creates their own rules, students will see it as inconsistent. There must be clear policy from the institution.”)

(Interview Set 2, Participant L09, 21:05)

From an interpretative standpoint, these responses reveal that lecturers are seeking institutional frameworks that provide both clarity and consistency. Without coordinated policies, individual efforts to maintain academic integrity may remain fragmented and less effective.

Overall, the results indicate that institutional support plays a crucial role in shaping how educators respond to the challenges posed by AI in academic writing. While lecturers have begun to develop their own pedagogical strategies, the absence of formal guidelines limits the effectiveness of these efforts. Clear institutional policies could establish shared expectations regarding acceptable AI use, ethical standards, and assessment procedures.

Equally important is the provision of training programs that help lecturers understand how AI tools can be integrated responsibly into teaching and learning activities. Such initiatives would enable educators to move beyond reactive responses and toward more strategic engagement with emerging technologies.

Taken together, these findings suggest that addressing the challenges of AI in higher education requires a coordinated institutional approach. By developing clear policies and providing structured support for lecturers, institutions can ensure that AI functions as a tool that enhances learning rather than undermining academic integrity.

3.5 Emotional Dimensions of AI Use

Beyond technical and ethical concerns, lecturers also emphasized the emotional implications of AI use in students' academic work. The findings suggest that AI assisted writing tools influence not only students' cognitive engagement but also their emotional experiences during the learning process. Some lecturers acknowledged that AI tools may reduce anxiety, particularly among students who struggle with language proficiency. At the same time, a larger proportion expressed concern that excessive reliance on AI may weaken important emotional qualities such as perseverance, resilience, and confidence in independent thinking.

As illustrated in Table 5, sixty five percent of lecturers believed that AI tools can help alleviate anxiety among students, especially those who face difficulties in writing or language expression. However, seventy percent of respondents also believed that dependence on AI may undermine the development of resilience and perseverance. Only ten percent indicated that AI has no significant emotional impact on students. These results reveal a complex emotional dynamic in which AI simultaneously provides psychological comfort while potentially limiting opportunities for personal growth.

Table 5. Emotional Impact of AI on Students

Emotional Impact of AI on Students	Percentage of Respondents
Alleviates anxiety, especially for struggling students	65%
Undermines resilience and perseverance	70%
No significant emotional impact	10%

A recurring theme in the interviews was the belief that learning involves emotional struggle and intellectual effort. Lecturers emphasized that confronting difficulties and learning from mistakes forms an essential part of academic development. One lecturer expressed concern that AI assisted writing may remove this formative aspect of learning:

“Kegagalan sebenarnya bagian penting dari proses belajar. Dari kesalahan itu mahasiswa belajar menjadi lebih kuat. Kalau AI yang mengerjakan sebagian besar tugas, proses itu tidak terjadi.”
(“Failure is actually an important part of the learning process. Through mistakes students become stronger. When AI does most of the work, that process does not happen.”)
(Interview Set 3, Participant L05, 38:12)

This observation highlights the developmental dimension of academic work. From an analytical perspective, the process of grappling with complex ideas, revising arguments, and correcting mistakes contributes not only to intellectual development but also to emotional resilience. When AI reduces the difficulty of these tasks, students may lose opportunities to cultivate perseverance through effort.

Another lecturer described a similar concern regarding the potential overreliance on AI as a support mechanism:

“Saya melihat beberapa mahasiswa yang biasanya kesulitan menulis sekarang menghasilkan esai yang sangat rapi dengan bantuan AI. Tapi saya khawatir mereka melewati proses belajar yang sebenarnya.”
(“I see some students who normally struggle with writing now producing very polished essays with the help of AI. But I worry they are skipping the real learning process.”)
(Interview Set 2, Participant L07, 27:45)

This comment reflects a broader tension between short term performance and long term development. While AI may enable students to produce more accurate written outputs, the ease provided by automated tools may also reduce the motivation to develop independent problem-solving skills.

At the same time, lecturers acknowledged that AI tools may provide emotional support for students who experience anxiety related to language proficiency. One participant highlighted how AI can reduce feelings

of insecurity among students who lack confidence in their writing abilities:

“Bagi mahasiswa yang kurang percaya diri dengan kemampuan bahasa mereka, AI bisa membantu mengurangi rasa takut membuat kesalahan.”
(“For students who lack confidence in their language ability, AI can help reduce the fear of making mistakes.”)
(Interview Set 1, Participant L03, 22:15)

This perspective suggests that AI may serve as a form of emotional scaffolding, allowing students to experiment with language without the immediate pressure of producing perfect writing. In this sense, AI can create a more supportive learning environment for students who might otherwise feel overwhelmed by academic writing tasks.

Nevertheless, lecturers emphasized that the emotional benefits of AI may be limited if students do not eventually develop the ability to work independently. One lecturer explained the potential long term consequences of excessive reliance on AI:

“AI bisa meningkatkan rasa percaya diri sementara, tapi mahasiswa juga perlu belajar berpikir sendiri. Kalau terlalu bergantung pada AI, mereka bisa kesulitan ketika harus menghadapi tugas tanpa bantuan.”
(“AI may temporarily increase students’ confidence, but they still need to learn to think independently. If they depend too much on AI, they may struggle when they must face tasks without assistance.”)
(Interview Set 4, Participant L06, 35:20)

From an interpretative perspective, these reflections highlight a delicate balance between emotional support and intellectual independence. While AI can reduce anxiety and provide immediate assistance, it should not replace the developmental processes that help students build confidence through effort and persistence.

Taken together, the findings suggest that the emotional dimensions of AI use represent an important yet often overlooked aspect of educational technology. AI tools can offer valuable support for students who experience anxiety or linguistic insecurity. However, excessive reliance on these tools may also reduce opportunities for students to develop resilience, perseverance, and confidence in their own abilities.

For lecturers, the challenge therefore lies in maintaining a balance between technological assistance and meaningful struggle in the learning process. Educational practices must ensure that AI functions as a supportive tool rather than a substitute for intellectual effort. By encouraging students to confront challenges while still providing appropriate support, educators can help foster both emotional growth and academic development in an increasingly technology mediated learning environment.

4. Discussion

The rapid expansion of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) within higher education has introduced profound transformations in academic writing practices and assessment cultures. This study demonstrates that lecturers in the Tadris Bahasa Inggris (TBI) Study Program at Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara are actively negotiating the tension between technological innovation and the preservation of academic authenticity. The findings highlight three central issues shaping contemporary language education. First, lecturers perceive AI generated writing as linguistically sophisticated yet intellectually limited, raising concerns about authenticity, authorship, and the development of students' academic voice. Second, educators are increasingly redesigning assessment practices through process oriented pedagogical strategies that foreground learning development rather than final textual products. Third, the absence of clear institutional policies regarding AI use creates inconsistencies in teaching practices and assessment standards across courses. Taken together, these findings illustrate how generative AI is not merely a technological innovation but a transformative force that compels higher education institutions to reconsider pedagogical practices, assessment frameworks, and governance structures in order to maintain academic integrity in digitally mediated learning environments.

4.1 Linguistic Integrity: Challenges and Academic Implications

This study reveals a critical paradox in AI-mediated academic writing. While generative AI enhances surface-level linguistic accuracy, it simultaneously risks diminishing deeper cognitive engagement, authorial voice, and epistemic ownership. The findings extend current debates on academic integrity by demonstrating that the central issue is not merely misconduct detection but the transformation of writing as a cognitive and identity-forming process within language education contexts.

A central finding concerns the perceived erosion of linguistic integrity, where AI-generated texts are described as grammatically precise yet intellectually shallow and lacking in authentic voice. This aligns with concerns that generative AI blurs the boundary between legitimate assistance and academic

misconduct (Mah et al., 2024; Jared & Hanna, 2024). However, the present study moves beyond confirming these concerns by demonstrating that the issue is not only ethical but epistemological. Writing is no longer consistently experienced as a meaning-making process but is increasingly repositioned as an output-driven activity mediated by algorithmic systems. In this sense, the findings refine existing assumptions by showing that AI does not simply support writing but can restructure the cognitive ecology of writing itself.

From the perspective of cognitive and metacognitive learning theory, academic writing functions as a site of knowledge construction, reflection, and self-regulation. The observed shift toward AI-assisted writing suggests a potential disruption of these processes. When students delegate idea generation and reasoning to AI systems, they may bypass critical stages of planning, monitoring, and evaluating their own thinking, which are essential components of self-regulated learning. This extends prior findings that AI tools facilitate drafting but may encourage superficial engagement (Raptopoulou, 2025; Pratiwi et al., 2025). The current study deepens this argument by evidencing how such delegation leads to a decoupling between linguistic performance and conceptual understanding, as reflected in lecturers' observations of students' inability to explain their own written arguments.

Furthermore, the findings challenge traditional assumptions within applied linguistics that linguistic competence can be inferred from textual output. In line with discourse-based and metadiscursive frameworks, effective academic writing requires not only grammatical accuracy but also the construction of stance, engagement, and authorial positioning (Peng & Zheng, 2021; Zhao & Liu, 2021). The absence of these elements in AI-generated texts suggests that linguistic form alone is insufficient as an indicator of communicative competence. This reinforces the argument that voice is not merely stylistic but epistemic, reflecting the writer's engagement with knowledge and disciplinary discourse (Lehman et al., 2024; Lehman et al., 2022). The present findings therefore refine existing theory by illustrating how AI may standardize discourse while simultaneously eroding the dialogic and interpersonal dimensions of academic writing.

In addition, the study contributes to argumentation theory by highlighting how AI-mediated writing may obscure the cognitive processes underlying claim construction, evidence evaluation, and warrant justification. Academic writing, particularly in argumentative contexts, requires students to engage in reasoning practices that connect evidence to claims through explicit justification (Abdelrahim & Abdelrahim, 2019). The findings indicate that when AI systems generate these structures, students may reproduce argument forms without internalizing the reasoning processes behind them. This challenges the

assumption that exposure to well-structured texts automatically leads to improved reasoning skills, suggesting instead that active cognitive engagement remains indispensable.

At a broader theoretical level, the findings resonate with critical perspectives on educational technology, which emphasize that digital tools should augment rather than replace human cognition (Selwyn, 2024; Luckin, 2025). However, this study advances these perspectives by demonstrating that the risk is not only cognitive substitution but also identity displacement. Within language education, writing is closely tied to the development of learner identity and voice. The disappearance of personal voice in AI-generated texts indicates a potential weakening of this identity-forming function, thereby extending discussions of AI beyond cognition into the domain of linguistic identity and authorship.

Importantly, the study also introduces a nuanced interpretation that challenges overly deterministic views of AI as inherently detrimental. The findings indicate that AI can function as a form of linguistic scaffolding, particularly for students with limited proficiency, supporting language production and reducing barriers to participation (Mah et al., 2024; Nadhifah et al., 2024). This aligns with sociocultural theory, where tools mediate learning and enable learners to operate within their zone of proximal development. However, the critical distinction identified in this study lies in the boundary between scaffolding and substitution. When AI supports revision, feedback, and language awareness, it enhances learning. When it replaces ideation, reasoning, and reflection, it undermines linguistic integrity. This distinction refines current theoretical discussions by positioning AI not as inherently beneficial or harmful but as contingent upon pedagogical framing and usage practices.

4.2 Pedagogical Innovations for Authentic Assessment

A second key finding concerns the emergence of pedagogical innovations designed to preserve authenticity by making the learning process more visible. Lecturers in this study increasingly employ process oriented strategies such as staged drafting with feedback, reflective commentaries, oral defenses or presentations, and multimodal assignments. These approaches shift the emphasis of assessment away from a single final product toward evidence of intellectual development over time (Abramova et al., 2024; Dison & Padayachee, 2022).

Such practices align closely with learning oriented assessment frameworks that conceptualize assessment as an iterative, dialogic, and developmental process rather than merely a mechanism for summative judgment. Through continuous feedback and reflection, these approaches strengthen students' engagement

with learning and enhance their responsibility for academic improvement (Abramova et al., 2024; Dison & Padayachee, 2022; Mahlangu, 2024). Requiring drafts and reflective commentaries enables lecturers to monitor the evolution of students' ideas while also cultivating metacognitive awareness and self regulation. These outcomes are widely associated with reflective learning practices in higher education (Kusrini, 2023; Kangaslampi et al., 2022; Takrouni & Assalahi, 2022; Mahlangu, 2024).

The integration of oral defenses represents another effective mechanism for verifying intellectual ownership. When students are required to articulate and defend their ideas verbally, lecturers can evaluate whether written assignments genuinely reflect students' conceptual understanding. This form of dialogic assessment strengthens critical thinking while simultaneously reducing the likelihood that assignments are entirely generated through AI mediated systems.

In addition, the growing use of multimodal assignments reflects a broader transformation in language pedagogy. By requiring students to present ideas through presentations, digital storytelling, or multimedia projects, lecturers encourage communicative competence across multiple modes of expression. Multimodal tasks not only reduce the dependence on AI generated text but also promote digital literacy, creativity, and collaborative learning.

These strategies collectively reflect a broader shift toward process based learning within higher education. Constructivist and socio constructivist perspectives emphasize that knowledge is constructed through active engagement, inquiry, and dialogue rather than passive reception of information (Mugambi, 2018; Pokhrel, 2021; Zhu & Atompag, 2023). Experiential learning frameworks further reinforce the importance of reflection and post experience sensemaking as integral components of learning (Bell & Bell, 2020; Wach-Kąkolewicz, 2023). Empirical research in inquiry based education also demonstrates that problem posing, evidence evaluation, and explanation building significantly enhance students' critical thinking and academic autonomy (Sun, 2023; Pokhrel, 2021).

Nevertheless, the findings also reveal a continuing gap in pedagogical research. Although process oriented assessment appears promising, empirical evidence regarding its long term impact on academic integrity and learning outcomes remains limited. Future studies should therefore investigate whether these pedagogical strategies effectively strengthen students' critical thinking, writing proficiency, and intellectual ownership across diverse institutional and disciplinary contexts. Importantly, the novelty of this study lies in demonstrating that lecturers themselves are initiating pedagogical transformation in response to AI driven challenges. Rather than relying solely on institutional

regulations, educators are redesigning assessment practices in ways that restore authenticity to the learning process. This bottom up pedagogical innovation provides valuable insights for institutions seeking to integrate AI responsibly within higher education.

4.3 Institutional Governance and Policy Implications

Beyond pedagogical adaptation, the findings also reveal a critical institutional challenge, namely the absence of clear governance frameworks regulating AI use in academic assignments. Many lecturers reported uncertainty regarding whether generative AI should be permitted, restricted, or explicitly incorporated into teaching practices. Similar patterns of uncertainty have been documented in global higher education contexts, where faculty often hold divergent perspectives regarding appropriate classroom uses of AI technologies (Petricini et al., 2023; Wu et al., 2024).

This uncertainty is further exacerbated by the fact that institutional policy development frequently lags behind technological adoption. As a result, lecturers are often required to make complex ethical and pedagogical decisions without clear institutional guidance (Kang & Ahn, 2025; Wu et al., 2024). Consequently, universities are increasingly described as operating within a policy grey area in which responses to generative AI vary widely across departments and institutions (PireciSejdiu & Sejdiu, 2025; Wu et al., 2024).

Such conditions encourage the emergence of ad hoc classroom policies that may differ significantly from one course to another (Lau, 2025; Wu et al., 2024). These inconsistencies can undermine fairness and transparency in academic evaluation, particularly when students encounter conflicting expectations regarding acceptable AI use (Walsh et al., 2024; Petricini et al., 2023). Consequently, scholars increasingly emphasize the need for coherent governance frameworks that provide strategic, ethical, and pedagogical guidance for AI integration within higher education (Kang & Ahn, 2025; Namutebi, 2024).

Recent research highlights the importance of comprehensive institutional policies that define acceptable AI practices, clarify ethical boundaries, and provide structured support for both educators and students (DerSimonian & Montagnino, 2025; Hatami, 2025). Rather than implementing blanket bans or unregulated adoption, institutions should adopt balanced governance approaches that recognize both the pedagogical benefits and ethical risks associated with generative AI (Qadhi et al., 2024; Lendvai, 2025).

Such governance frameworks should include transparent guidelines regarding attribution of AI assistance, responsible use of AI tools in academic writing, and clear expectations for academic integrity (Jarrah et al., 2023; Lendvai, 2025). Equally important

is the development of professional training programs that strengthen lecturers' AI literacy and ethical reasoning, enabling educators to integrate AI critically and responsibly within discipline specific teaching contexts (Qadhi et al., 2024; Pratiwi et al., 2025; McClain, 2025).

4.4 Implications, Novelty, and Future Research Directions

Overall, this study contributes several important insights to the growing body of literature on generative AI in education. First, the findings highlight the central importance of linguistic integrity in language education, demonstrating that AI generated writing presents distinctive challenges in disciplines where personal voice, reflection, and critical reasoning constitute core learning outcomes. Second, the research illustrates how lecturers are actively redesigning assessment practices to preserve authenticity through process oriented pedagogies. Third, the study emphasizes the urgent need for institutional policies that provide clear guidance for ethical AI integration in higher education.

The primary novelty of this research lies in its focus on lecturers' lived experiences within a specific language education context. While many existing studies approach AI from technological or policy oriented perspectives, this research foregrounds the pedagogical realities encountered by educators who confront AI generated assignments in everyday classroom practice. By documenting these experiences, the study provides empirical evidence that can inform the development of AI aware pedagogical frameworks and institutional policies.

Nevertheless, several limitations should be acknowledged. The study was conducted within a single institutional context and involved a relatively small sample of lecturers. These conditions may limit the generalizability of the findings. In addition, the research focuses primarily on lecturers' perspectives rather than examining students' experiences with AI assisted writing. Future research should therefore explore students' perceptions of AI in relation to authorship, learning engagement, and academic identity. Longitudinal studies are also needed to examine the long term effects of AI assisted writing on academic skill development, particularly in relation to critical thinking, linguistic proficiency, and intellectual independence. Comparative research across institutions and disciplines would further illuminate how different academic cultures respond to the challenges posed by generative AI.

5. Conclusions

This study highlights how the rapid integration of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) is reshaping academic writing practices in higher education, particularly within language education contexts where linguistic integrity and authentic intellectual engagement are central learning outcomes. The

findings demonstrate that lecturers perceive AI generated assignments as linguistically polished yet frequently lacking originality, personal voice, and critical engagement, revealing a growing tension between technological efficiency and authentic learning processes. In response, educators are increasingly adopting process oriented pedagogical strategies, including staged drafting, reflective commentaries, oral defenses, and multimodal assessments, in order to make students' learning trajectories more visible and to safeguard academic integrity. At the same time, the study identifies a significant institutional gap, namely the absence of clear governance frameworks and professional guidance regarding AI use in academic assignments, which results in inconsistent teaching practices and assessment standards. The main contribution of this research lies in its contextualized examination of lecturers' lived experiences in navigating AI mediated learning environments within English language education, thereby providing empirical insight into how pedagogical adaptation emerges at the classroom level rather than solely through institutional regulation.

These findings contribute to the development of AI aware pedagogical frameworks that emphasize responsible integration of AI while preserving linguistic authenticity and critical thinking. Nevertheless, the study is limited by its relatively small sample and single institutional context, which may constrain the generalizability of the findings. Future research should therefore investigate students' perspectives on AI assisted writing, examine the long term impact of AI on academic literacy development, and evaluate the effectiveness of process oriented assessments across diverse disciplinary and institutional contexts. Comparative and longitudinal studies will be particularly valuable for understanding how higher education systems can balance technological innovation with the preservation of authentic intellectual engagement in the evolving landscape of AI mediated learning.

6. Acknowledgement

This study was supported by funding from the Ministry of Education, Kemdiktisaintek, whose commitment to advancing research in education made this work possible.

References

- Abdelrahim, A., & Abdelrahim, M. (2019). Teaching and assessing metadiscoursal features in argumentative writing: A professional development training for EFL teachers. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 30(1), 70–91. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12264>
- Abramova, V., Veksler, A., Glubokova, E., Nazmutdinova, T., Popova, R., Chernyshova, E., & Kalabina, I. (2024). Objective assessment of learning outcomes: Peculiarities of design and application of assessment tools in modern conditions of digital development. *Science for Education Today*, 14(1), 125–148. <https://doi.org/10.15293/2658-6762.2401.06>
- Barrasso, A., & Spilios, K. (2021). A scoping review of literature assessing the impact of the learning assistant model. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 8(1), Article 12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-020-00267-8>
- Bell, R., & Bell, H. (2020). Applying educational theory to develop a framework to support the delivery of experiential entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 27(6), 987–1004. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jsbed-01-2020-0012>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Butakor, P. (2023). Exploring pre service teachers' beliefs about the role of artificial intelligence in higher education in Ghana. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*, 3(39). https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ijitss/30092023/8057
- DerSimonian, H., & Montagnino, F. (2025). Institutional responses to AI in higher education. *Higher Education Policy Review*, 42(1), 23–41.
- Dison, L., & Padayachee, K. (2022). Possibilities for long term shifts in higher education assessment praxis: Reflecting on COVID 19 as a stimulus for change. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 36(4), 154–172. <https://doi.org/10.20853/36-4-5193>
- Hatami, A. (2025). Generative AI and academic integrity: Institutional challenges. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 19(2), 87–104.
- Jared, B., & Hanna, K. (2024). Academic integrity: Unique challenges for professional healthcare education with new emerging threats. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2024(179), 49–57. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.20596>
- Jarrah, A., Wardat, Y., & Fidalgo, P. (2023). Using ChatGPT in academic writing is (not) a form of plagiarism: What does the literature say? *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*, 13(4), e202346. <https://doi.org/10.30935/ojcm/13572>
- Kang, J., & Ahn, J. (2025). Technologies, opportunities, challenges, and future directions for integrating generative artificial intelligence into medical education: A narrative review. *Ewha Medical Journal*, 48(4), e53. <https://doi.org/10.12771/emj.2025.00787>

- Kangaslampi, R., Asikainen, H., & Virtanen, V. (2022). Students' perceptions of self assessment and their approaches to learning in university mathematics. *Lumat: International Journal on Math, Science and Technology Education*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.31129/lumat.10.1.1604>
- Kaur, A., Bhatia, M., & Stea, G. (2022). A survey of smart classroom literature. *Education Sciences*, 12(2), 86. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12020086>
- Kronivets, T., Yakovenko, O., Tymoshenko, Y., Ilnytskyi, M., Iasechko, S., & Iasechko, M. (2023). Legal and ethical dimensions of AI in education: Navigating new frontiers. *Review of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 4, e0021. <https://doi.org/10.37497/rev.artif.intell.educ.v4i0.0.21>
- Kusrini, N. (2023). The effect of students' self assessment on their English performance in ELT classroom. *Educatif Journal of Education Research*, 5(3), 311–323. <https://doi.org/10.36654/edukatif.v5i3.297>
- Lau, S. (2025). Barriers that programming instructors face while performing emergency pedagogical design to shape student AI interactions with generative AI tools. *arXiv Preprint*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2510.09492>
- Lehman, I., Bednarek, A., & Sułkowski, Ł. (2024). The role of reader-inclusive authorial voice in the process of academic socialization of management and English philology students. *Ibérica*, 47, 275–300. <https://doi.org/10.17398/2340-2784.47.275>
- Lehman, I., Celis, K., & Sułkowski, Ł. (2022). Writing to make a difference: Discursive analysis of writer identity in research articles on management. *Ibérica*, 44, 155–178. <https://doi.org/10.17398/2340-2784.44.155>
- Lendvai, G. (2025). ChatGPT in academic writing: A scientometric analysis of literature published between 2022 and 2023. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*, 20(3), 131–148. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15562646251350203>
- Luckin, R. (2025). *AI and the future of learning: Balancing innovation and responsibility*. Routledge.
- Mah, C., Walker, H., Phalen, L., Levine, S., Beck, S., & Pittman, J. (2024). Beyond cheatbots: Examining tensions in teachers' and students' perceptions of cheating and learning with ChatGPT. *Education Sciences*, 14(5), 500. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14050500>
- Mahlangu, T. (2024). A bibliometric analysis of assessment as learning in higher education. *Proceedings of the World Conference on Teaching and Education*, 3(1), 28–38. <https://doi.org/10.33422/worldcte.v3i1.603>
- McClain, A. (2025). Leveraging artificial intelligence in research and scholarly work: Innovative approaches and practical applications. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 2025(188), 48–56. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.70015>
- Meyer, J., Urbanowicz, R., Martin, P., O'Connor, K., Li, R., Peng, P., & Moore, J. (2023). ChatGPT and large language models in academia: Opportunities and challenges. *Biodata Mining*, 16(1), Article 20. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13040-023-00339-9>
- Mugambi, M. (2018). Linking constructivism theory to classroom practice. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education*, 5(9). <https://doi.org/10.20431/2349-0381.0509014>
- Nadhifah, A., Syukur, H., Haryanto, M., Luthfiyyah, R., & Rozak, D. (2024). Pre service English teacher perceptions of AI in writing skills. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices*, 6(2), 26–32. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jweep.2024.6.2.3>
- Namutebi, E. (2024). Exploring artificial intelligence as a remedy to the heavy teaching workloads caused by massification of Ugandan public universities. *East African Journal of Education Studies*, 7(3), 98–118. <https://doi.org/10.37284/eajes.7.3.2057>
- Peng, J., & Zheng, Y. (2021). Metadiscourse and voice construction in discussion sections in BA theses by Chinese university students majoring in English. *SAGE Open*, 11(2), Article 21582440211008870. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211008870>
- Petricini, T., Wu, C., & Zipf, S. (2023). Perceptions about generative AI and ChatGPT use by faculty and college students. *Open Science Framework Preprints*. <https://doi.org/10.35542/osf.io/jyma4>
- PireciSejdiu, N., & Sejdiu, S. (2025). The quiet transformation of higher education in the AI era. *Open Research Europe*, 5, 249. <https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.20715.1>
- Pokhrel, P. (2021). English teachers' perceptions on inquiry based teaching. *Journal of NELTA Gandaki*, 4(1–2), 98–108. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jong.v4i1-2.42647>
- Pratiwi, H., Suherman, S., Hasruddin, & Ridha, M. (2025). Between shortcut and ethics: Navigating the use of artificial intelligence in academic writing among Indonesian doctoral students. *European Journal of Education*, 60(2), e70083. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70083> (ERIC)

- Qadhi, S., Alduais, A., Chaaban, Y., & Khraisheh, M. (2024). Generative AI, research ethics, and higher education research: Insights from a scientometric analysis. *Information*, 15(6), 325. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info15060325>
- Raptopoulou, A. (2025). ChatGPT in higher education: Supporting academic literacy through ChatGPT based activities. *European Journal of Education*, 60(2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70131>
- ROA, A., & Halim, S. (2024). The impact of AI powered software on second language writing: A systematic literature review. *Research and Innovation in Applied Linguistics Electronic Journal*, 2(2), 138. <https://doi.org/10.31963/rial.v2i2.4801>
- Rudolph, J., Tan, S., & Tan, S. (2023). ChatGPT: Bullshit spewer or the end of traditional assessments in higher education? *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.9>
- Selwyn, N. (2024). *Education and AI: Critical perspectives*. Polity Press.
- Singh, M. (2023). Maintaining the integrity of the South African university: The impact of ChatGPT on plagiarism and scholarly writing. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 37(5). <https://doi.org/10.20853/37-5-5941>
- Sun, F. (2023). Effects of inquiry based teaching on learning efficiency in an augmented reality environment. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 18(15), 23–35. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v18i15.41357>
- Takrouni, A., & Assalahi, H. (2022). An inquiry into EFL teachers' perceptions of integrating student self assessment into teaching academic writing at a Saudi university. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 12(3), 471–481. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1203.06>
- UNESCO. (2024). *AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing. Retrieved from <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-and-education-guidance-policy-makers>
- Wach Kąkolewicz, A. (2023). University lecturers' skills for designing collaborative online classes. In *University Teaching and Learning in Digital Era* (pp. 11–28). <https://doi.org/10.12657/9788379863761-2>
- Walsh, J., Krienert, J., Cannon, K., & Honan, S. (2024). Professors call it cheating, students call it teamwork: Evolving norms of academic integrity in the transformative era of online education. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 24(2), 47–63. <https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v24i2.35191>
- Whalley, B., France, D., Park, J., Mauchline, A., & Welsh, K. (2019). Developing active personal learning environments on smart mobile devices. In *Smart Learning Environments* (pp. 871–889). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-32523-7_64
- Wu, C., Wang, X., Carroll, J., & Rajtmajer, S. (2024). Reacting to generative AI: Insights from student and faculty discussions on Reddit. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Learning at Scale* (pp. 103–113). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3614419.3644014>
- Yan, D. (2023). How ChatGPT automatic text generation impacts learners in an L2 writing practicum: An exploratory investigation. *Open Science Framework Preprints*. <https://doi.org/10.35542/osf.io/s4nfz>
- Zhao, J., & Liu, Y. (2021). A developmental view of authorial voice construction in master's thesis: A case study of two novice L2 writers. *SAGE Open*, 11(4), Article 21582440211054483. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211054483>
- Zhu, L., & Atompag, S. (2023). The application of the constructivism theory in enhancing classroom teaching. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 7(12), 209–213. <https://doi.org/10.26689/jcer.v7i12.5792>