

Exploration of The Role of Meta-AI-Based Learning Media in Students' Writing Skills in Phase F

Muhammad Husnu

oesnoedotuu@gmail.com

Muhammad Yusron Azani

muhamadyusranazani@gmail.com

Siti Ayu Surayya

ssurayya@hamzanwadi.ac.id

Universitas Hamzanwadi

ABSTRACT

This study explores the use of Meta AI in writing instruction, students' experiences of its assistance, and implementation barriers in a Phase F EFL classroom. A qualitative case study was conducted in 2026 at Baiturrahman Mahmudi Bebuaq Islamic High School in Central Lombok, Indonesia, involving one English teacher and 20 Grade XII students. Data were collected through non-participant classroom observation, semi-structured interviews with the teacher and a purposively selected subset of students, and documentation of writing activities. Analysis involved data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing, with thematic analysis used to identify patterns across sources. The classroom account indicates that Meta AI supported idea generation, vocabulary exploration, grammar checking, sentence construction, and revision. Teacher guidance emphasized preparing independent drafts and evaluating AI suggestions before incorporating them into students' writing. Students described the assistance as helpful and reported greater confidence, while also expressing concerns about originality and dependence. Implementation barriers included unstable internet connectivity, limited device access, difficulties formulating relevant prompts, and acceptance of suggestions without sufficient understanding. These findings provide a contextual account of reported and observed writing practices rather than evidence of measured improvement in writing competence. The study highlights teacher guidance, critical evaluation, and access conditions as important considerations when integrating conversational AI into secondary school writing instruction.

Keywords: Meta AI; Generative Artificial Intelligence; Writing Instruction; Phase F; Teacher Mediation

INTRODUCTION

Writing in English requires learners to coordinate idea development, vocabulary selection, grammatical accuracy, text organization, and revision. For learners of English as a foreign language (EFL), these demands can make writing challenging

because expressing ideas and managing linguistic form occur simultaneously. Generative artificial intelligence (AI) offers a potential source of assistance by responding to questions, providing language examples, and suggesting revisions. However, the availability of immediate responses also raises questions about accuracy, originality, learner responsibility, and whether students understand the suggestions they receive. Consequently, the educational value of generative AI needs to be examined through its use within classroom activities, including the guidance provided by teachers and the decisions made by learners (Kasneci et al., 2023; UNESCO, 2023).

Research on generative AI in language education has examined its potential contribution to writing assistance and feedback. Werdiningsih et al. (2024) reported that Indonesian EFL learners used ChatGPT to support vocabulary selection, grammar, idea generation, organization, and language refinement. Polakova and Ivenz (2024) investigated ChatGPT feedback in relation to EFL writing, while Mahapatra (2024) examined its use as a formative feedback tool in academic writing. These studies provide a basis for considering conversational AI as a resource during the writing process. Nevertheless, evidence concerning a particular platform, participant group, or instructional arrangement cannot automatically explain how another classroom uses AI. Learners' responses to assistance, their opportunities to access technology, and the teacher's expectations require attention when interpreting its classroom role.

Students' experiences also reveal why writing assistance should be distinguished from demonstrated writing development. Teng (2024) examined learners' perceptions and experiences of ChatGPT feedback, highlighting the importance of understanding how learners respond to AI support. Xiao et al. (2025) similarly discussed opportunities for generative AI in EFL writing alongside concerns about critical thinking, information literacy, and academic integrity. An AI response may help a learner complete a sentence or revise a paragraph, but this does not necessarily establish that the learner can perform the same task independently. Examining classroom practices and reported experiences can therefore clarify how assistance is used without treating perceived usefulness or confidence as evidence of sustained improvement in writing competence.

These issues are relevant to Phase F of Indonesian secondary education, which generally encompasses Grades XI and XII. The national English subject guidance emphasizes communicating ideas through written and multimodal texts, using appropriate text structures and language features, and applying correction strategies with teacher assistance or independently (Pusat Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran, 2025). These expectations make learners' participation in composing and revising texts an important instructional concern. Within this context, AI use warrants examination in relation to students' responsibility for their writing: how they develop initial ideas, seek assistance, interpret suggestions, and decide which revisions preserve their intended meaning.

The present study examines a Grade XII Phase F classroom at Baiturrahman Mahmudi Bebuaq Islamic High School in Central Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara. The classroom account presented in the manuscript identifies difficulties related to generating ideas, selecting English vocabulary, and developing sentences. It also describes unstable internet connectivity, limited device access, and difficulty formulating prompts that match students' writing needs. These concerns provide a contextual basis for investigating AI assistance. However, they are not presented as the results of a formal diagnostic assessment, and the study does not assume a uniform level of writing difficulty among all participating students. Its focus is how writing support is sought and used within the conditions of this particular classroom.

Meta AI is examined because it was the conversational AI tool used in the classroom under investigation. Its inclusion is therefore grounded in the instructional case rather than an assumption that it is superior to ChatGPT or other writing tools. The manuscript describes its use during idea exploration, vocabulary support, and revision, alongside teacher instructions that students prepare their own drafts and evaluate AI suggestions. This arrangement raises questions about how teacher guidance and student decision making operate when conversational AI becomes part of the writing process. Limited connectivity and shared devices also make it necessary to consider how access conditions shape participation and the organization of writing activities.

The contribution of this study extends beyond examining a different AI platform. It brings together the Phase F secondary school setting, teacher guidance across writing stages, students' experiences of conversational assistance, and the practical constraints of classroom access. Together, these dimensions provide an opportunity to investigate how AI support is negotiated within an actual instructional setting. Research conducted with other platforms or learner groups offers useful points of comparison, but the present case requires contextual interpretation of how students seek help, respond to suggestions, and encounter barriers. The study therefore seeks to contribute an account of classroom practices and perceived support rather than evidence of a causal effect on writing achievement.

Accordingly, this study addresses three research questions: (1) How is Meta AI used during writing instruction in the selected Phase F classroom? (2) How do students describe their experiences of using Meta AI to support writing activities? (3) What technical and pedagogical barriers arise during its classroom use? A qualitative case study involving one English teacher and 20 Grade XII students is used to explore these questions through observation, interviews, and documentation. By examining practices, experiences, and implementation conditions, the study aims to clarify the role of Meta AI in this classroom while maintaining a distinction between reported assistance and independently assessed writing development.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Previous Related Studies

Research on generative artificial intelligence in EFL writing has examined assistance during composition, feedback during revision, and learners' experiences of using conversational tools. These areas are related, but they address different aspects of writing instruction. Assistance with vocabulary or sentence construction concerns the immediate completion of a writing task, whereas writing development involves learners' ability to understand and apply knowledge across tasks. This distinction is important when interpreting studies that report improved texts, positive perceptions, or increased engagement, because these findings do not necessarily demonstrate independent writing competence.

Studies of ChatGPT illustrate the range of assistance available during the writing process. Werdiningsih et al. (2024), in a study involving Indonesian master's students, examined strategic uses of ChatGPT for vocabulary, grammar, idea generation, organization, and language refinement. Their study provides a useful comparison for understanding how learners consult conversational AI at different stages of composition. However, the academic experience and educational level of postgraduate learners differ from those of Grade XII students. Findings from this population therefore offer interpretive insights rather than direct predictions about how secondary school learners will formulate requests, assess responses, or maintain responsibility for their writing.

Feedback research provides another perspective on AI assistance. Polakova and Ivenz (2024) examined ChatGPT feedback in relation to EFL writing development, while Mahapatra (2024) investigated ChatGPT as a formative feedback tool in an academic writing intervention. These studies foreground the relationship between feedback and revision. Their relevance to the present study lies in identifying revision as an instructional activity that requires attention to learners' responses. Nevertheless, an intervention examining writing outcomes differs from a qualitative case study documenting classroom practices. The present study therefore draws on this literature to interpret the use of feedback without adopting its outcome claims as evidence that Meta AI improves students' writing skills.

Learners' experiences introduce a further distinction between perceived assistance and demonstrated learning. Teng (2024) examined EFL learners' perceptions and experiences of using ChatGPT for writing feedback, including their responses to its usefulness and the concerns associated with AI use. Such research helps explain why students may value immediate assistance while remaining uncertain about originality, accuracy, or dependence. Fathi and Rahimi (2024) approached AI assistance through writing mediation, directing attention to the interaction through which support becomes part of learners' writing activity. Together, these perspectives suggest that the availability of feedback is only one part of the process.

How learners seek, interpret, and respond to assistance is also central to understanding its instructional role.

Conversational generative AI should also be distinguished from automated writing evaluation. Conversational tools allow learners to make requests for explanations, examples, idea development, or revisions through an interactive exchange. Automated writing evaluation is more specifically concerned with evaluating submitted writing and providing feedback on textual features. Yang et al. (2024), who investigated learners' interaction with AI programmed automated writing evaluation feedback, provide a relevant perspective on responses to automated suggestions. However, findings about a particular evaluation system cannot be transferred directly to Meta AI. The transferable issue is learners' engagement with feedback, including whether they examine its relevance and decide how to use it, rather than an assumption that the systems produce equivalent feedback.

The broader literature also identifies conditions that complicate the use of generative AI in writing instruction. Xiao et al. (2025) reviewed empirical research on generative AI in EFL writing and discussed opportunities involving idea development, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and feedback alongside concerns about critical thinking, information literacy, and academic integrity. Kasneci et al. (2023) and UNESCO (2023) similarly emphasize the need to consider reliability, human oversight, and responsible use. These concerns indicate that AI assistance should be examined within instructional arrangements that establish expectations for student authorship and evaluation. They also support attention to experiences in which suggestions are unsuitable, difficult to understand, or accepted without sufficient reflection.

Taken together, these studies inform three dimensions of the present inquiry: the stages of writing in which assistance is sought, learners' experiences and responses, and the conditions surrounding classroom implementation. Their differences in participant level, research design, writing context, and technology limit direct comparison. In particular, findings concerning postgraduate academic writing, ChatGPT interventions, or automated evaluation do not fully explain the use of Meta AI in a Phase F classroom with uneven device access and internet connectivity. The present study contributes a contextual account of how conversational assistance is incorporated into writing activities, how teacher guidance is described and observed, and what barriers participants encounter. Its contribution rests on this combination of instructional and contextual dimensions rather than on the change of platform alone.

Conceptual Framework

The present study conceptualizes Meta AI as a conversational generative AI tool used to support writing activities. Potential forms of assistance include exploring ideas, discussing vocabulary choices, requesting explanations, and obtaining suggestions for revision. These functions position AI responses as resources that

learners may consider during composition. Godwin-Jones (2022) discusses intelligent writing assistance in relation to language learning, offering a basis for examining interaction between learners and technological support. In this study, however, access to assistance is not treated as evidence of learning. Interpretation focuses on the use of the tool and participants' responses within the classroom case.

A social constructivist perspective informs attention to interaction and mediation. From this perspective, writing activity can be examined through the support available to learners and the ways they engage with that support. Teacher instructions, classroom discussion, and AI responses may each contribute to the conditions under which students compose and revise texts. Meta AI is treated as a technological resource within these interactions rather than as equivalent to a human teacher or peer. The analytical concern is how assistance is incorporated into students' activity and how the teacher establishes expectations for its use.

Teacher mediation is understood here as instructional guidance concerning when and how students consult Meta AI. Relevant practices may include requiring an initial draft, helping students formulate requests, discussing the suitability of suggestions, and reminding students to preserve their intended meaning. These practices provide a way to interpret classroom observations and participant accounts. Their presence does not, by itself, demonstrate that students become more independent or that guidance causes improved writing. Such conclusions would require evidence beyond descriptions of classroom support.

A process writing perspective complements this focus on mediation by distinguishing idea generation, drafting, revision, and editing. These activities provide an organizing lens for examining when students seek AI assistance and what they seek from it. For example, a request for possible ideas differs from a request to explain a grammatical problem in an existing draft. Likewise, applying a suggested correction differs from explaining why that correction is appropriate. Examining these distinctions helps clarify the role of AI across writing activities while recognizing that writers may move repeatedly between stages.

Student agency and critical engagement form another part of the framework. Agency concerns students' participation in decisions about content, language, and revision. Critical engagement concerns their examination of AI suggestions in relation to intended meaning and task requirements. Evidence of these processes would include accounts or records of students questioning, adapting, rejecting, or explaining suggestions. An improved final text alone would not establish that such evaluation occurred. Similarly, reported confidence is interpreted as a perception of assistance rather than a direct measure of writing competence.

The AI technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge perspective discussed by Ning et al. (2024) provides a complementary way to consider the instructional integration of AI. It directs attention to the relationship between the technology used, the writing content addressed, and the teaching activities organized around it.

In the present study, this perspective serves as a contextual interpretive lens. The research does not assess the teacher's AI knowledge or measure AI-TPACK competence, so classroom practices cannot be used to assign a level of teacher expertise.

Finally, access conditions and prompt formulation are considered in relation to participation. Device availability and internet connectivity can influence opportunities to consult AI, while the wording of a request can influence the relevance of the response received. These conditions are examined alongside teacher guidance and students' experiences rather than assumed to determine outcomes. The framework therefore connects writing stages, instructional mediation, student decision making, and practical access conditions as dimensions for interpreting the case. It supports an account of how Meta AI is used and experienced without presuming a causal relationship between its use and sustained writing development.

METHOD

Design and Sample

This study employed a qualitative case study design to explore the use of Meta AI in English writing instruction, students' experiences of its assistance, and barriers encountered during classroom implementation. A qualitative approach was appropriate because the inquiry concerned classroom practices and participants' perspectives within a specific educational setting rather than the measurement of an intervention effect (Creswell, 2009). The case was bounded by the use of Meta AI during writing activities involving one English teacher and one Grade XII Phase F class at Baiturrahman Mahmudi Bebuaq Islamic High School in Central Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia, in 2026. The unit of analysis was the classroom practice of integrating Meta AI into writing instruction, with teacher and student accounts providing complementary perspectives.

The participants consisted of one English teacher and 20 Grade XII students. All 20 students were included in classroom observations, while a subset was selected purposively for interviews concerning their experiences of using Meta AI. The findings were intended to provide a contextual understanding of this classroom rather than represent all Phase F students or establish the effectiveness of Meta AI across schools. The case was informative because it brought together writing activities, teacher guidance, student responses, and practical constraints involving connectivity and device access.

Instruments and Procedures

Data were collected through non-participant observation, semi-structured interviews, and documentation. The researcher observed classroom activities without taking the instructional role. Observation focused on the stages of writing

in which Meta AI was used, the assistance students sought, the teacher's instructions, students' responses to AI suggestions, and barriers affecting participation. Particular attention was given to idea generation, drafting, and revision, including the classroom expectation that students prepare their own drafts and consider the suitability of AI suggestions.

Semi-structured interviews explored the teacher's instructional practices and students' experiences of AI assistance. Interview topics included reasons for consulting Meta AI, the kinds of assistance requested, responses to suggestions, perceived usefulness, concerns about originality and dependence, and difficulties associated with access and prompt formulation. The semi-structured format allowed follow-up questions to clarify participants' accounts while retaining the study's three research focuses. Statements about confidence and usefulness were treated as participants' perceptions rather than as independently assessed changes in writing competence.

Documentation included student writing, teaching materials, relevant classroom records, and evidence of activities involving Meta AI. These materials provided contextual information about writing tasks and the use of AI assistance. Where documentary evidence was available, it was considered alongside observation and interview accounts. The analysis did not assume that complete sequences of initial drafts, prompts, AI responses, and final revisions had been retained. Consequently, documentary materials were used to support interpretations only to the extent that the available records permitted. The three collection techniques addressed related aspects of the case. Observation documented classroom practices, interviews explored participants' interpretations of those practices, and documentation provided writing and instructional materials for comparison. Reported experiences were distinguished from directly observed actions. No reconstructed quotations, prompts, or writing examples were introduced to supplement missing records.

Data Analysis

Data analysis involved data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. The available observation records, interview material, and documents were organized according to their source and relevance to the research questions. Data condensation involved selecting information concerning Meta AI use during writing, participants' experiences, and implementation barriers while preserving the context needed to interpret participants' actions and accounts. Thematic analysis was used to identify recurring meanings within the organized material. The three research questions provided broad areas of attention, while patterns within the data informed the description of classroom practices and experiences. Related information was grouped and compared to develop the reported themes: the use of Meta AI in writing instruction, students' experiences of its assistance, and technical and pedagogical barriers. These themes served as an interpretive organization of the case rather than numerical measures of prevalence or effectiveness.

Data displays brought together relevant information from different sources to support interpretation. Comparisons across observations, interviews, and documents were used to consider whether an interpretation was supported by classroom practice, participant accounts, or both. Triangulation was understood as comparison across sources rather than an assumption that the use of three techniques automatically established agreement. Where the available material did not establish convergence, the interpretation was restricted to the source that supported it. Conclusion drawing focused on answering the research questions within the boundaries of the case. Interpretations concerning classroom use were distinguished from students' perceptions and from broader implications proposed by the researcher. Reports of confidence, immediate assistance, or successful task completion were not treated as evidence of sustained independent writing development. Because the study did not include a systematic assessment of writing gains, its conclusions concerned the role and perceived usefulness of Meta AI within the observed instructional setting.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The Use of Meta AI in Writing Instruction

The classroom account describes Meta AI use during idea generation, drafting support, and revision. Students consulted the tool to explore possible ideas, identify vocabulary related to their topics, and obtain suggestions concerning grammar and sentence construction. These uses indicate that conversational AI occupied several positions within the writing process rather than serving only as a tool for correcting completed texts. However, the available account does not establish how frequently each function was used or whether all students used the tool in the same way. Teacher guidance emphasized students' responsibility for composing their own initial drafts. During revision, students were directed to compare AI suggestions with their writing and consider whether proposed changes matched their intended meaning. This instructional arrangement positioned Meta AI as a source of assistance within a writing activity. The requirement to prepare an initial draft is relevant because it preserves an opportunity for students to formulate content before consulting generated suggestions. Nevertheless, the existence of this instruction does not establish that every student followed it consistently or evaluated feedback successfully.

These practices can be interpreted through a process writing perspective. Assistance with idea exploration relates to planning, while suggestions concerning language and coherence relate to revision and editing. The distinction matters because each activity requires different decisions from the learner. Generating possible content, correcting a grammatical form, and reorganizing a paragraph are not equivalent forms of assistance. The classroom account therefore supports an interpretation of Meta AI as a flexible writing resource, although the absence of a displayed sequence linking drafts, prompts, responses, and revisions limits examination of how that assistance affected particular texts.

The findings correspond with Werdiningsih et al. (2024), who examined uses of ChatGPT involving ideas, vocabulary, grammar, organization, and language refinement. The present case adds a secondary school context in which AI consultation was accompanied by instructions about independent drafting and evaluating suggestions. Its contribution concerns the instructional arrangement surrounding conversational assistance rather than evidence that Meta AI produces the same outcomes as ChatGPT. Differences in learner level, writing tasks, and classroom conditions require caution when comparing these studies.

Research by Polakova and Ivenz (2024) and Mahapatra (2024) provides a relevant comparison concerning feedback and revision. However, the present study documents practices and experiences rather than assessing an intervention through systematic writing measures. It consequently supports claims about the use of assistance during writing, but it cannot determine whether students' revised texts improved according to defined assessment criteria or whether any learning transferred to writing completed without AI.

Students' Experiences of Meta AI Assistance

The interview summaries describe Meta AI as a source of help when students encountered difficulty generating ideas, selecting vocabulary, or developing sentences. Participants also associated access to explanations and suggestions with greater confidence during writing. These accounts indicate perceived usefulness in managing immediate writing demands. They do not establish that students' underlying writing competence increased. The manuscript also reports concerns about originality and dependence. These concerns suggest that students' experiences were not uniformly positive and that perceived assistance could coexist with uncertainty about appropriate use. The classroom account includes descriptions of students comparing suggestions with their writing and retaining responsibility for content decisions. Such descriptions are relevant to student agency, but the available presentation does not show the reasoning behind individual decisions. Without accompanying excerpts or writing records, it is difficult to determine whether a suggestion was accepted because the student understood it, because it appeared correct, or because it offered an easier way to complete the task.

This distinction is important when interpreting reported confidence. Immediate feedback may reduce uncertainty or make a task feel more manageable. Teacher encouragement, familiarity with the activity, or the novelty of using AI could also contribute to a positive experience. The study does not isolate these possibilities, so confidence should be interpreted as a reported response to the classroom experience rather than an effect attributable solely to Meta AI. Teng (2024) provides a useful comparison through research on learners' perceptions and experiences of ChatGPT feedback. Both perspectives direct attention to how learners experience assistance, including its perceived benefits and associated concerns. Fathi and Rahimi (2024)

similarly offer a mediation perspective for interpreting AI support as part of learners' writing activity. In the present case, this perspective helps explain why students' interaction with suggestions matters alongside the availability of the tool. However, the evidence presented does not establish whether students could explain corrections or apply the same knowledge in subsequent unaided writing. The findings therefore distinguish three aspects of the experience: obtaining assistance, perceiving that assistance as useful, and demonstrating learning from it. The available classroom and interview summaries address the first two aspects more directly than the third. This distinction preserves the value of students' accounts while keeping conclusions proportionate to the evidence.

Technical and Pedagogical Barriers

The classroom account identifies unstable internet connectivity and limited device access as practical barriers. Students sometimes needed to share devices, wait for access, or work in groups because phones and reliable connections were not equally available. These conditions affected the organization and pace of writing activities. Access was therefore part of the instructional context, shaping opportunities to consult Meta AI rather than functioning merely as a background condition. Shared devices may provide opportunities for collaborative discussion, but they may also limit individual interaction with the tool. The present account does not establish which students controlled the device, formulated prompts, or evaluated responses during group use. It also does not show whether students with more reliable access were more prominently represented in the interview material. Consequently, differences in access should be considered when interpreting the range of experiences captured by the study.

Prompt formulation was another reported challenge. Students had difficulty expressing requests clearly enough to obtain responses relevant to their writing needs. Teacher assistance with prompt formulation was described as part of classroom implementation. This finding highlights an instructional demand beyond making the technology available: students need to communicate what they want help with. However, without examples of initial and revised prompts, the account cannot demonstrate the extent of changes in prompting or attribute more relevant responses directly to teacher guidance. A further concern involved accepting AI suggestions without adequately understanding them. This issue connects immediate task completion with the risk of dependence. A student may incorporate a correction into a draft while remaining unable to explain the change. Teacher reminders to examine suggestions addressed this concern at the instructional level, but the study does not establish that these reminders consistently produced critical evaluation. The reported practice and its possible educational value therefore need to remain analytically distinct.

These barriers correspond with broader concerns about reliability, learner responsibility, and human oversight discussed by Kasneci et al. (2023) and UNESCO (2023). Xiao et al. (2025) also identify critical thinking, information

literacy, and academic integrity as continuing issues in generative AI writing instruction. The present case gives these concerns a concrete classroom context involving uneven access, difficulty communicating requests, and uncertainty about understanding suggested corrections. It suggests that classroom implementation requires attention to participation and interpretation as well as technical availability.

Interpretation and Scope of the Findings

Across the three themes, Meta AI appears as a resource incorporated into writing activities through teacher guidance and student consultation. The account describes assistance with ideas and language, perceived confidence, and practical barriers to participation. Its contextual contribution lies in examining these dimensions together within a Grade XII Phase F classroom, where expectations for student authorship operated alongside conversational AI assistance and uneven access to technology. Teacher mediation offers a useful interpretation of the reported instructional practices. Requiring an initial draft, helping students formulate requests, and encouraging evaluation of suggestions establish boundaries around AI use. These practices may create opportunities for students to remain involved in composing and revising. Nevertheless, the study does not demonstrate that teacher mediation caused improved writing, reduced dependence, or strengthened independent competence. Those outcomes would require evidence that directly examines students' understanding and subsequent performance.

The scope of interpretation is also limited by the presentation of the empirical material. The findings are reported primarily as summaries, without anonymized interview excerpts, detailed observation episodes, or linked examples of initial writing, AI suggestions, and final revisions. This limits the reader's ability to examine how particular interpretations were developed. The available account also provides insufficient detail to determine the prevalence of experiences or examine contradictory cases. For these reasons, the findings should be understood as a contextual description of reported and observed practices rather than a comprehensive demonstration of their effects. The case nevertheless identifies useful directions for classroom practice and further inquiry. Independent drafting, discussion of suggested changes, and attention to equitable access are relevant considerations arising from the reported activities and barriers. Future research could document complete writing episodes and examine whether students understand the feedback they use and transfer that understanding to unaided writing. Such evidence would help distinguish assistance with completing a task from sustained development of writing competence.

CONCLUSION

This qualitative case study explored Meta AI use in writing instruction, students' experiences, and implementation barriers in one Grade XII Phase F classroom. The findings describe its use for idea generation, vocabulary exploration, grammar checking, sentence construction, and revision. Teacher guidance emphasized

preparing initial drafts and evaluating suggestions before incorporating them into students' writing. Students reported useful assistance and greater confidence, alongside concerns about originality and dependence. Unstable internet connectivity, limited device access, difficulty formulating prompts, and insufficient understanding of suggested corrections complicated classroom implementation. The study provides a contextual account of AI assistance rather than evidence of improved writing competence. Its scope is limited to one school, one teacher, and one class, with interviews involving a subset of students. The absence of a systematic assessment of writing gains, longitudinal evidence, and detailed examples linking drafts to AI suggestions and revisions limits conclusions about sustained learning or transfer to independent writing. Reported confidence and successful task completion should therefore be distinguished from demonstrated writing development. Within these boundaries, the findings suggest that classroom use of Meta AI should include opportunities for independent drafting, guidance on formulating requests, and discussion of why suggested changes are appropriate. Attention to equitable device and internet access is also necessary to support participation. Future research should document complete writing episodes, examine students' understanding of feedback, and assess whether they can apply that understanding in subsequent writing without AI assistance.

REFERENCES

- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Fathi, J., & Rahimi, M. (2024). Utilising artificial intelligence-enhanced writing mediation to develop academic writing skills in EFL learners: A qualitative study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2024.2374772>
- Godwin-Jones, R. (2022). Partnering with AI: Intelligent writing assistance and instructed language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, 26(2), 5–24. <https://doi.org/10.64152/10125/73474>
- Kasneci, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., Stadler, M., Weller, J., Kuhn, J., & 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>
- Mahapatra, S. (2024). Impact of ChatGPT on ESL students' academic writing skills: A mixed methods intervention study. *Smart Learning Environments*, 11, Article 9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00295-9>
- Maysuroh, S., Agustina, Y., Surayya, S. A., & Astuti, M. (2025). Contextual teaching and learning (CTL) approaches in teaching English writing. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 10(5), 548–552. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v10i5.1420>

- Ning, Y., Zhang, C., Xu, B., Zhou, Y., & Wijaya, T. T. (2024). Teachers' AI-TPACK: Exploring the relationship between knowledge elements. *Sustainability*, 16(3), 978. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16030978>
- Polakova, P., & Ivenz, P. (2024). The impact of ChatGPT feedback on the development of EFL students' writing skills. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2410101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2410101>
- Sabili, A. S., Nazri, M. A., Surayya, S. A., & Wati, L. (2024). Smart learning: The impact of AI technologies on English language proficiency in the digital era. *Jurnal Review Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, 7(4), 14040–14049. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jrpp.v7i4.34436>
- Teng, M. F. (2024). “ChatGPT is the companion, not enemies”: EFL learners' perceptions and experiences in using ChatGPT for feedback in writing. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 7, 100270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100270>
- UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research>
- Werdiningsih, I., Marzuki, Indrawati, I., Rusdin, D., Ivone, F. M., Basthomi, Y., & Zulfahreza. (2024). Revolutionizing EFL writing: Unveiling the strategic use of ChatGPT by Indonesian master's students. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2399431. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2399431>
- Xiao, F., Zhu, S., & Xin, W. (2025). Exploring the landscape of generative AI (ChatGPT)-powered writing instruction in English as a foreign language education: A scoping review. *ECNU Review of Education*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/20965311241310881>
- Yang, H., Gao, C., & Shen, H.-z. (2024). Learner interaction with, and response to, AI-programmed automated writing evaluation feedback in EFL writing: An exploratory study. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29, 3837–3858. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11991-3>