

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
INNOVATION AND
INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION
(IJIREV)**www.gaexcellence.com/ijirev**AI-ASSISTED ACADEMIC WRITING: PERCEIVED
MOTIVATIONS AND STRATEGIES FOR RESPONSIBLE
USE**Wan Imran Daniel Aminurrashid^{1*}, Noridah Sain², Ameiruel Azwan Ab Aziz³¹Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Cawangan Johor, Kampus Segamat, Malaysia
 2025101569@student.uitm.edu.my  <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7194-509X>²Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Cawangan Johor, Kampus Segamat, Malaysia
 noridahs@uitm.edu.my  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8170-6640>³Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Cawangan Melaka, Kampus Alor Gajah, Malaysia
 ameiruel@uitm.edu.my  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3645-3530>

*Corresponding Author

Article Info:**Article history:**Received date: 23.07.2026
Revised date: 18.08.2026
Accepted date: 25.09.2026
Published date: 28.09.2026**To cite this document:**Aminurrashid, W. I. D., Sain, N., & Aziz, A. A. A. (2026). AI-Assisted Academic Writing: Perceived Motivations and Strategies for Responsible Use. *International Journal of Innovation and Industrial Revolution*, 8(26), 767-783.**Abstract:**

Existing discussions of artificial intelligence (AI) in academic writing often focus on whether its use is acceptable, rather than why students use AI and what practices they believe can support responsible use and academic integrity. This qualitative descriptive study examined the reported perceptions of 84 Accounting undergraduates at a Malaysian public university. Participants responded to two open-ended survey questions concerning their perceived motivations for students' use of AI in academic writing and how to use it responsibly to maintain academic integrity. Responses were analysed using inductive qualitative content analysis. Non-exclusive descriptive categories were developed because individual responses could express multiple motives or responsible-use practices. Students reported motives regarding generating ideas and initiating writing, improving efficiency and organising tasks, improving language and writing, supporting understanding and clarification, alongside assisting with structure or information. Participants' conceptions of responsible use included preserving authorship, keeping AI within a bounded support role, limiting its use, verifying its outputs, and following institutional rules. Some participants instead proposed using detector scores, paraphrasing, or other surface-compliance strategies. These findings indicate a perceived boundary between support and substitution: students generally regarded AI as acceptable when it assisted their thinking or expression, but less acceptable when it replaced their intellectual contribution or writing work. Conceptually, this boundary frames responsible AI use as the preservation of human

authorship through bounded delegation, critical verification, and transparency. However, the limited emphasis on verification and disclosure, together with reliance on technical detection, identifies specific gaps in students' responsible AI literacy. The findings represent students' brief, self-reported perceptions and do not demonstrate their actual AI-use practices, compliance with academic-integrity requirements, or effects on learning.

DOI: 10.35631/IJIREV.826046

Keywords:

Academic Integrity, Academic Writing, Generative Artificial Intelligence, Qualitative Content Analysis, Responsible AI Use, Student Perceptions



© The authors (2026). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY NC) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. For commercial re-use, please contact ijirev@gaexcellence.com.

Introduction

With the rapid rise of artificial intelligence (AI), university students have been integrating its usage into their academic writing tasks (Kim et al., 2025). Studies in higher education have identified several reasons students perceive AI as useful. The use of AI tools has been documented in higher education settings, with students often appreciating them for their ability to provide personalised guidance, writing assistance, and research support (Chan & Hu, 2023; Laak et al., 2024). Access, feedback, and productivity are also cited as benefits in the reviews by Lo (2023) and Tlili et al. (2023) but with the educational value being dependent on the use of the technology.

Academic integrity is further complicated by the diversity of writing functions (Kellogg, 2008). The use of AI support in a practice is acceptable depending on the learning objective, rules of assessment, what must be disclosed, and how much the student writes (Klimova, 2013; Naini & Ulya, 2025). Previous studies have reported issues such as inaccurate output, plagiarism, unclear authorship, and institutional preparedness (Ateriya et al., 2025; Sodangi & Isma'il, 2025; Subaveerapandiyani et al., 2025). Barrett and Pack (2023) found that students and educators evaluated the appropriateness of AI differently according to the writing task and how the output was incorporated or disclosed. In addition, the policy framework proposed by Chan (2023) lists important elements of responsible education as attribution, output assessment, avoiding over-reliance, and complementary instead of substitutive use. The results indicate that responsible use is not merely about the presence or absence of AI usage by a student. Rather, it also is contingent upon what the tool contributed and how much of the work is originally of the students.

The available evidence from Malaysia gives context to the questions but is not comprehensive. Liu et al. (2026) has made a comparison between the Education students from one Malaysian private university and a similar sample from China. Respondents from Malaysia reported using AI often and were most concerned about the trustworthiness of information generated by AI. The study is cross-nationally designed, thus the results do not directly offer representation for the Malaysian ESL Accounting undergraduates studied in a public university.

In the present research, two related areas within this particular population are explored. Firstly, it explores students' perceived motivations to use AI in academic writing. Perceived motivations in this study are the reasons students explicitly state for the use of AI in academic writing. It does not refer to statistically tested predictors of technology adoption. Second, the research explores strategies students suggest for using AI responsibly. These strategies represent students' normative understandings rather than evidence of their actual practices or compliance with academic-integrity requirements.

Accordingly, this study aims to explore students' perceived motivations for the use of AI in academic writing. Additionally, it also intends to identify responsible-use practices that students believe can maintain academic integrity.

The paper proceeds as follows. The next section discusses the literature review regarding student motivations for AI-assisted writing. It also elaborates on the responsible use and academic integrity. The subsequent section explains on the research methodology adopted. After that, the findings and discussions are presented. Finally, the last section provides the conclusion and suggestion for future research.

Literature Review

Student Motivations for AI-Assisted Academic Writing

Student perceptions of the use of AI in academic writing suggest that there are several functions that are of interest to explaining why AI is appealing. Chan and Hu (2023) conducted a survey of students from six universities in Hong Kong and discovered perceived advantages of personalised learning, writing support, brainstorming support, and research assistance. The results show that students see AI as a multi-purpose learning tool. However, the study's focus was on perceived benefits in higher education, not on why students use AI within specific disciplines or in specific contexts for writing.

Studies that focus on writing give more detailed accounts of these functions. Kim et al. (2025) investigated students' experience of an AI-supported writing system and revealed three anticipated roles. The system was said to be a writing assistant, an on-demand tutor, and a digital peer. In these positions, students were expected to be assisted in explaining, proofreading, drafting, information retrieval, and idea development. These findings demonstrate that perceived reasons for using AI can extend across the writing process.

Wang (2025) distinguishes between global and local forms of writing assistance among native and non-native English speakers. ChatGPT was utilised by participants for global concerns like structure, argument, and coherence. They also employed it for issues that concerned them, such as grammar, syntax, and academic diction. This is important because it shifts responsibility in

various ways to the tool. Student-generated content may be edited by a language editor, and the argument generator might influence the intellectual material of the content.

Efficiency also appears in studies of student perceptions. Chan and Hu (2023) found that students responded positively to the ease of access and the instant availability of the AI support. Liu et al. (2026) found that Malaysian Education students associated AI with efficiency, brainstorming support, and improvement of academic work. These findings are consistent with one of the perceived reasons for using AI found in the literature, that is efficiency.

All these studies indicate that students may perceive AI as useful for brainstorming ideas, organising their writing assignments, refining their language, understanding complex content, and structuring information. These functions serve as a background for the current research. It does not represent fixed categories of analysis. The current analysis develops its categories inductively from the participants' responses.

Responsible Use and Academic Integrity

The responsible use of AI in academic writing relies on how students incorporate AI support into their assessed work. Barrett and Pack (2023) explored perceptions of AI in brainstorming, outlining, writing, revision, feedback, and evaluation. The evaluations of the participants were spread across the categories of the function performed by AI and whether students used or cited generated content. The results show that responsible use is more than just a simple decision of using or not using AI.

Responsibility is also defined through institutional guidance, in terms of human control and transparency. Chan (2023) states that it is important to have rules regarding academic misconduct, referencing, output assessment, and acceptable limits. It also encourages students to not rely solely on AI but to consider it a supplementary tool. UNESCO also emphasises the importance of human agency and accountability in the use of educational AI (Miao & Holmes, 2023). In this way, pupils remain accountable for assessing and arguing for what they include in their work.

The responsibilities can be based on evaluative judgement as a useful educational basis. Bearman et al. (2024) state that students must be able to evaluate the soundness of text produced by AI and make defensible decisions about its use. When used in academic writing, this ability involves evaluating facts, tracking sources, recognising inappropriate content, and determining the appropriateness of using AI support for the purposes of the assessment.

Responsible AI use requires students to follow assessment-specific rules and disclose permitted assistance transparently, since acceptable practices vary by institution, course, and learning outcome (Foltýnek et al., 2023). Lack of AI generated wording does not imply acceptable use as AI could provide the ideas or reasoning being evaluated. Responsibility is thus related to the writing process and the resulting text, such as what AI has done, and whether it has been authorised and acknowledged (Chan, 2023). AI-text detectors cannot resolve these questions. They show widely differing levels of performance and a drop in performance when generated text is modified (Weber-Wulff et al., 2023; Perkins et al., 2024). The scores of the detector, therefore, are not sufficient on their own to show authorship, understanding, or compliance, and paraphrasing the generated text so that it is no longer detectable does not restore the student's authorship.

The literature thus points to several aspects of responsible use, such as maintaining student authorship, restricting the use of AI in specified roles, assessing the output, and adherence to disclosure obligations. In the present study, the researcher is not assessing whether students practices the above mentioned. It discusses their own suggested strategies for a responsible use of AI when asked why its use is adopted in academic writing.

Methodology

Research Design

Qualitative descriptive research design and inductive qualitative content analysis was used in the study. The choice of qualitative description was made because a formal theory was not the goal of the study, but rather the concern was to organise students' short written accounts in terms closely akin to how they expressed them. The idea of developing categories was informed by the content-analysis approach outlined by Schreier (2012). The Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (O'Brien et al., 2014) and the APA Journal Article Reporting Standards for qualitative research (Levitt et al., 2018) were used as the structure for reporting.

Sample and Sampling Method

Participants were 84 Malaysian ESL undergraduates enrolled in an accounting programme at one Malaysian public university. The researchers used homogeneous purposive sampling to focus on this specific undergraduate population. Lecturers assisted with recruitment in the selected classes. The inclusion criterion was having prior experience in using AI for academic writing

Instrument

The process of inquiry used two open-ended questions: (1) 'In your opinion, why do students use AI in academic writing?' and (2)'How can students use AI responsibly while maintaining academic integrity?'.

The researchers conceptually adapted the prompts from published work on students perceived uses and expected roles of AI in academic writing (Chan & Hu, 2023; Kim et al., 2025) and on responsible educational use, academic misconduct, attribution, output evaluation, and bounded assistance (Chan, 2023). The wording was not adopted from a validated scale. Before administration, the researchers briefly explained AI as digital tools that possess human-intelligence qualities which can generate output or assist with academic writing. Furthermore, academic integrity was also defined to them as honest, transparent work that complies with assessment rules and represents the student's own contribution.

The questions refer to separate but related constructs. The first invites broad accounts of motivation. The second one seeks normative practices. Both questions are not directly related to actual use of AI, actual integrity compliance, nor learning effects. The term 'maintaining academic integrity' can also foster socially desirable responses. These limits informed interpretation.

Data Analysis

Analysis proceeded at the respondent level via a qualitative coding software, NVivo 15. First, the administrative class-group column was removed, and pseudonyms were assigned. Second, all responses were read repeatedly and segmented into meaning units. Third, inductive labels were developed separately for motivations and responsible-use practices. Fourth, similar labels were merged into descriptive categories with explicit inclusion and exclusion rules. Fifth, every response was recoded against the final codebook. A respondent could receive more than one category when a response contained several ideas. Sixth, category memberships and frequencies were checked against the 84 respondents.

Frequencies indicate how many respondents mentioned a category in this dataset. They are not inferential statistics and do not estimate population prevalence. Percentages use $N = 84$ as the denominator. Quotations are reported verbatim. The codebook is provided in Appendix A.

Reflexivity and Trustworthiness

The primary researcher conducted the initial coding and had no prior relationship with the participants. Two co-researchers cross-checked the codebook and respondent-level category assignments. The team resolved differences through discussion. This process was a collaborative cross-check rather than a formal independent-coder reliability study, so no inter-rater coefficient was calculated. The analysis maintained an audit trail consisting of the dataset, NVivo coding records, respondent-level category assignments, code definitions, and frequency checks. Trustworthiness was strengthened through explicit category boundaries, preservation of non-substantive responses, review of overlapping and borderline cases, and direct links between claims and quotations.

The initial coder was the primary researcher who was not previously acquainted with the participants. The codebook and the categories assigned to each respondent were cross checked by two co-researchers. The team settled any disagreements by discussion. This process was not an independent-coder reliability study, but rather a cross-checking of the process. No inter-rater coefficient was calculated. The analysis recorded a series of audit trails, such as the dataset, NVivo coding records, respondent-level category assignments, code definitions and frequency checks. The explicit categories, preserving non-substantive answers and direct connections between claims and quotations were used to increase the trustworthiness.

Findings

Why Students Use AI In Academic Writing

Students' perceived motivations of AI use in academic writing were described in terms of five non-exclusive categories. Table 1 presents the frequency of each category. Percentages are based on the full sample ($N=84$), and categories were not mutually exclusive, so the percentages do not total 100%.

Perceived Motivations for AI-Assisted Academic Writing

Table 1: Perceived Motivations for Using AI in Academic Writing

Category	n	%
Brainstorming and task initiation	44	52.4
Efficiency and convenience	33	39.3
Enhancement of language and writing	27	32.1
Comprehension and clarification	24	28.6
Structuring and information support	14	16.7

Brainstorming and Task Initiation

The most common motivation was the desire to generate ideas. Participants reported that AI can provide them with ideas, points, alternate viewpoints, or a starting point when they do not know where to start. The category was not a requirement for the student to use AI to write the final text. Many responses included ideas placed as a starting resource.

“...to find idea as spark to start writing report.” (R28)

“When students get stuck in generating ideas, they can use AI to help them.” (R77)

Efficiency and Convenience

Many responses included ideas placed as a starting resource. 33 respondents attributed the use of AI to time-saving, faster completion, deadline handling, and or ease of task. A few answers correlated convenience with burden of work or stress. Others said that the AI is a shortcut. This reflects user motivation, rather than the actual productivity impact of AI.

“Students are often given a tight deadline and too much workloads.” (R19)

“AI tools is the shortcut for the students to get a task quickly done on time” (R71)

Enhancement of Language and Writing

27 respondents mentioned grammar, vocabulary, sentence construction, English proficiency, professional expression, or general writing quality. This function was particularly noticeable in the respondents' descriptions of having ideas but not being sure how to communicate them.

“...improve our grammar; upgrade our word,” and “organize our writing more better.” (R37)

“...student have low confident in expressing their ideas, so AI can help us explaining things better in our writing.” (R42)

Comprehension and Clarification

AI served as the interpretive tool for 24 respondents to interpret questions, simplify difficult material, obtain explanations or understand a topic. The responses position AI as an on-demand explanatory resource.

“To understand what the question is actually looking for.” (R20)

“To simplify something that I not understand.” (R32)

Organisation and Task Management

14 respondents referred to outlines, organisation, drafts, references, notes, or summaries. This smaller category captures support for managing material rather than generating the core argument.

“...assist in structuring outline for writing” (R53)

“...to find easier references, to help make easier notes and summary of information that is found online.” (R6)

Perceived Strategies for Responsible AI Use

Students suggested various strategies for responsible use of AI, with recurring themes centred around the need to preserve authorship alongside retaining AI's role as a support for specific tasks within the writing process rather than a replacement of the student. The five non-exclusive categories identified from the responses are presented in Table 2. These are all practices that students linked with responsible use of AI and did not need to be mutually exclusive.

Table 2: Proposed Practices For Responsible AI Use

Category	n	%
Retained authorship and personal effort	47	56.0
Bounded support role	44	52.4
Limit use and avoid over-reliance	17	20.2
Verify and evaluate AI output	16	19.0
Follow rules, disclose use, or cite sources	12	14.3
Technical and surface-compliance strategies	10	11.9

Retained Authorship and Personal Effort

The most common responsible-use category had to do with the ownership of the final work. Participants expressed reluctance to copy, generate entire assignments with AI, or submit AI-generated work as their own. They stressed the presentation in the students' own words and their original thinking.

“Use it as a collaborator, not a full replacement of our work.” (R19)

“...the final work that the student submit must be their own understanding, analysis and original idea.” (R12)

Bounded Support Role

44 respondents identified specific functions they considered acceptable, particularly brainstorming, grammar support, explanation, revision, and study notes. These were the responses that attributed responsibilities by function, in which AI can help with a portion of writing, such as brainstorming or learning, but not the in the entire process of work completion.

“...use it to help them study new things, not to do all the work for them.” (R55)

“...for giving ideas only, not doing all the jobs for them.” (R53)

Limit Use and Avoid Over-Reliance

17 respondents recommended moderation in use, adopting it only when necessary, and to avoid relying on it too much. Some participants also described having self-discipline as a primary factor to control usage. These responses suggest that students recognised moderation and self-discipline as essential components of responsible AI use, although such strategies were less frequently articulated than boundaries regarding authorship and the role of AI in developing academic work.

“Students must know the limit to stop using AI.” (R69)

“Students should discipline themselves to put the limit when use AI tools and learn to use their own ideas instead of AI tools...” (R73)

Verification And Evaluation

16 respondents suggested checking facts, assessing information or reviewing outputs. The verification was therefore present and not dominant. It is a rather low frequency given the potential for misinformation and falsified content, which is a serious gap in AI-literacy.

“...giving credit to sources and checking the facts before sending to lecturer their work.” (R79)

“...make sure the all information is true.” (R50)

Rules, Disclosure, And Citation

12 respondents mentioned institutional guidance, disclosure, acknowledgement, or citation. These practices link responsibility to local rules in completing their assignment. The frequency of their use is relevant because it is possible for an AI to have an educationally small use but still be prohibited or disclosure-dependent on a specific assessment policy.

“...properly acknowledge AI use when you are asked to.” (R15)

“...follow the university guidelines on the AI usage.” (R37)

Technical And Surface-Compliance Strategies

10 respondents suggested to consider AI percentages, utilise a plagiarism checker (Turnitin), paraphrasing, or humanising the generated text. The following statements have been included because they provide insight into the understanding of integrity of some students. They were not considered to be evidence-based safeguards.

“...using Turnitin or change the word and sentences after using the AI.” (R27)

“Read and humanize it after that. Make sure that the percentage of AI is very low if you use it.” (R60)

Discussions

Relationship Between Motivations And Safeguards

The two questions have a consistent and meaningful pattern of function. The students were interested in AI for ideation, efficiency, language improvement, explanation, and organisation. Their proposed safeguards were frequently offered to support their own functions but not full-text substitution. This suggests a support-substitution boundary. The data does not indicate that students are reliant on AI, nor does it demonstrate that the same individual is always adopting the safeguard they had suggested.

AI Is Valued As A Multi-Function Writing Resource

The results indicate that students perceived AI as serving multiple functions in their academic writing endeavours, particularly idea generation, efficiency, and language support. These findings are consistent with previous student studies that found AI is applied throughout the writing process (Chan & Hu, 2023; Kim et al., 2025). Wang (2025) also identified uses of writing at the global and local levels, while Kim et al. (2025) presented students' expectations of writing as an AI writing assistant and tutor. The present results provide a succinct description of Malaysian ESL Accounting undergraduates' perceptions about AI in the context of a set of task-specific supports rather than a single writing machine.

This distinction is important for pedagogy and for policy. The binary answer of yes and no to the question of whether students use AI is not sufficient to show what tasks have been delegated. The cognitive and authorial transfers vary in the stages of brainstorming, interpreting a prompt, checking grammar, writing a draft, and composing a full essay. The organisation of guidance should therefore be based on function and learning outcome.

Students Locate Responsibility at The Boundary Between Support and Substitution

The highest-scoring categories of responsible use were those of authorship and bounded assistance. Students repeatedly positioned AI as a helper rather than a replacement. This is consistent with previous research that students can identify acceptable writing at each stage (Barrett & Pack, 2023). It also questions the notion of students using AI primarily for malicious purposes. The survey results of other contexts show that students are found to be very supportive of clear rules and integrity preserving use (Morari et al, 2026).

However, some parts of the boundary still aren't specified. Using AI for ideas can mean getting one or more ideas or outsourcing the conceptual structure of an essay. Additionally, the student might retain the language, but depend on AI to generate the argument, if the task was, for instance: 'Write in your own words'. The final wording alone therefore cannot be used to define responsible use. It should also reflect intellectual source, content of the lesson, and the level of judgment a student considers keeping.

Verification And Disclosure Are Weak Points

Verification and rule-based practices appeared much less often than authorship and support. Students may be aware of the moral sense that the AI should not complete the entire work but not know how to conduct a fact-check, trace sources, disclose, or quote. This is aligned with

the need for institutionally embedded AI literacy as opposed to blanket warnings (Miao & Holmes, 2023).

The practical sequence should be clear and explicit. Students need to identify the permitted function, inspect the output against reliable evidence, integrate only material they understand, retain a record of their own process, and disclose assistance according to task requirements. A rule merely stating 'use AI responsibly' may leave all these decisions unanswered.

Detector-Centred Integrity Is A Misconception

The surface-compliance category is the most concerning minority pattern. Some of the respondents equated integrity with achieving an acceptable detector score or paraphrasing the output. This model is an attention switch from authorship to detectability. It could also encourage hiding. Overall, it is evident that there are variability and degradation in performance of detectors after text modification (Weber-Wulff et al., 2023). Another challenge is the unequal risk for English-language learners and others as a result of detector bias (Stowe et al., 2026).

Institutions should state that similarity scores and AI-detection indicators are investigative signals, not proof of misconduct or learning. Process evidence, oral explanation, source trails, staged drafting, and task-specific disclosure give more credibility to the evaluation of authorship. Technical systems can assist in the review but can't make the integrity judgement.

Conclusion

The findings support function-based guidance. Instructions for assignments should make it clear on which uses are allowed, which need disclosure, and which would be a substitute for the assessed learning. Examples should differentiate between brainstorming and explanatory support, feedback, language editing, argument generation, and full-text production. The boundary can also be different from one task to another. Help with grammar can be acceptable in one task but may be problematic in another.

Furthermore, teaching for AI-literacy should not be limited to prompting. Students should be taught to identify claims and find the evidence to back them up, to distinguish between claims and sources that they have not encountered before, to acknowledge any sources they have used to help them, and to determine when what they have read or heard seems to be useful information but is actually false.

Moreover, the design of assessment should make judgement visible. Staged outlines, annotated readings, chapter rationales, brief oral explanations and reflective disclosure statements can show students' process of development and assessment of their work. The practices should not be seen as a form of surveillance. Their value in education is in having to provide reasons and show ownership.

Students noted that AI was useful for providing ideas, saving time, enhancing expression, clarifying challenging content, and organising writing. What they established as responsible use was primarily to keep authorship in the hands of the humans and have AI play a supportive role. The two findings are consistent with each other. The legitimate-use boundary, in students' accounts, concerns substitution rather than the mere presence of AI.

Ultimately, students' responses suggest that they generally recognise the importance of maintaining authorship, evaluating AI output, and limiting AI assistance to appropriate functions. However, recognising responsible-use practices does not necessarily indicate how students apply these principles during actual academic writing. The challenge, therefore, is not simply establishing awareness of responsible AI practices, but understanding how students translate these principles into decisions when using AI tools in specific writing contexts.

The present study also has significant limitations. It examines brief responses from 84 Accounting undergraduate students of one public university located in Malaysia. No demographic data is available to assess transferability across the study year, language background, and other participant characteristics. Homogeneous sampling offers a more in-depth report but restricts transferability to the participating ESL Accounting student population. Open-ended surveys provide breadth but cannot probe ambiguous answers or explore contradictions with the depth of interviews. The questions are normative and elicit perceptions. They are not based on actual AI behaviour or academic-integrity compliance.

The initial codebook was developed and applied by the primary researcher and two co-researchers checked the coding. There is an explicit audit trail and collaborative review but no participant validation and an independent-coder reliability estimate. Category frequencies are code dependent and are not necessarily population measures. Future research should combine open-ended accounts with interviews, assignment artefacts, process evidence, and observed writing. It should also explore how well the stated safeguards correlate to decisions made.

-
- Acknowledgements:** The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to University Teknologi MARA for providing the necessary resources and support throughout the course of this research. Special appreciation is extended to colleagues and peers who contributed valuable insights and constructive feedback, which greatly enhanced the quality of this paper.
- Funding Statement:** No Funding
- Conflict of Interest Statement:** The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper. All authors have contributed to this work and approved the final version of the manuscript for submission to the Advanced International Journal of Innovation and Industrial Revolution (IJIREV).
- Ethics Statement:** This study was conducted in accordance with ethical research standards. All procedures involving human participants were reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) approval number [REC/10/2024 (ST/MR/215)]. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to data collection. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were assured of confidentiality and anonymity. The data collected were used solely for academic purposes.
- Author Contribution Statement:** All authors contributed significantly to the development of this manuscript. Noridah Sain was responsible for the conceptualisation, methodology, and overall supervision of the study. Wan Imran Daniel Aminurrashid handled data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results. Ameiruel Azwan Ab Aziz contributed to the literature review, drafting, and critical revision of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript prior to submission.
-

References

- Ateriya, N., Sonwani, N. S., Thakur, K. S., Kumar, A., & Verma, S. K. (2025). Exploring the ethical landscape of AI in academic writing. *Egyptian Journal of Forensic Sciences*, 15, Article 36. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41935-025-00453-1>
- Barrett, A., & Pack, A. (2023). Not quite eye to A.I.: Student and teacher perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence in the writing process. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20, Article 59. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00427-0>
- Bearman, M., Tai, J., Dawson, P., Boud, D., & Ajjawi, R. (2024). Developing evaluative judgement for a time of generative artificial intelligence. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 49(6), 893–905. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2335321>
- Black, R. W., & Tomlinson, B. (2025). University students describe how they adopt AI for writing and research in a general education course. *Scientific Reports*, 15, Article 8799. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-92937-2>
- Chan, C. K. Y. (2023). A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20, Article 38. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3>
- Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20, Article 43. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8>
- Foltýnek, T., Bjelobaba, S., Glendinning, I., Khan, Z. R., Santos, R., Pavletic, P., & Kravjar, J. (2023). ENAI recommendations on the ethical use of artificial intelligence in education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19, Article 12. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00133-4>
- Kellogg, R. T. (2008). Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. *Journal of Writing Research*, 1(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2008.01.01.1>
- Kim, J., Yu, S., Detrick, R., & Li, N. (2025). Exploring students' perspectives on generative AI-assisted academic writing. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(1), 1265–1300. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12878-7>
- Klimova, B. F. (2013). Developing thinking skills in the course of academic writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 508–511. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.09.229>
- Levitt, H. M., Bamberg, M., Creswell, J. W., Frost, D. M., Josselson, R., & Suárez-Orozco, C. (2018). Journal article reporting standards for qualitative primary, qualitative meta-analytic, and mixed methods research in psychology: The APA Publications and Communications Board task force report. *American Psychologist*, 73(1), 26–46. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000151>
- Liu, Y., Zuo, X. Q., Rawal, A. P., & Liu, J. (2026). Generative AI for academic purposes: Comparing Chinese and Malaysian university students' knowledge, willingness, and concerns. *SAGE Open*, 16(2), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440261455370>
- Lo, C. K. (2023). What is the impact of ChatGPT on education? A rapid review of the literature. *Education Sciences*, 13(4), Article 410. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13040410>
- Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/EWZM9535>
- Morari, V., Grimes, D., & Hawe, D. (2026). Academic integrity and generative artificial intelligence: Views and perceptions of students in an Irish university. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 24, Article 17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09689-x>

- Naini, I., & Ulya, R. H. (2025). Reasoning patterns and sentence construction errors in students' scholarly articles: A content analysis of academic writing in Padang City. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 17(2), 2786–2796. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v17i2.7447>
- O'Brien, B. C., Harris, I. B., Beckman, T. J., Reed, D. A., & Cook, D. A. (2014). Standards for reporting qualitative research: A synthesis of recommendations. *Academic Medicine*, 89(9), 1245–1251. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000000388>
- Perkins, M., Roe, J., Vu, B. H., Postma, D., Hickerson, D., McGaughran, J., & Khuat, H. Q. (2024). Simple techniques to bypass GenAI text detectors: Implications for inclusive education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21, Article 53. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00487-w>
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. SAGE Publications.
- Sodangi, U., & Isma'il, A. (2025). Responsible integration of generative artificial intelligence in academic writing: A narrative review and synthesis. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning and Neural Network*, 5(2), 13–23. <https://doi.org/10.55529/jaimlenn.52.13.23>
- Stowe, K., Afanaseva, S., Raimundo, R. C., Sun, Y., & Patil, K. (2026). Identifying bias in machine-generated text detection. In M. Liakata, V. P. Moreira, J. Zhang, & D. Jurgens (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 64th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 1, Long papers* (pp. 2383–2395). Association for Computational Linguistics. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2026.acl-long.109>
- Subaveerapandiyar, A., Kalbande, D., & Ahmad, N. (2025). Perceptions of effectiveness and ethical use of AI tools in academic writing: A study among PhD scholars in India. *Information Development*, 41(3), 728–746. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026666669251314840>
- Tlili, A., Shehata, B., Adarkwah, M. A., Bozkurt, A., Hickey, D., Huang, R., & Agyemang, B. (2023). What if the devil is my guardian angel: ChatGPT as a case study of using chatbots in education. *Smart Learning Environments*, 10, Article 15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00237-x>
- Wang, C. (2025). Exploring students' generative AI-assisted writing processes: Perceptions and experiences from native and nonnative English speakers. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, 30, 1825–1846. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-024-09744-3>
- Weber-Wulff, D., Anohina-Naumeca, A., Bjelobaba, S., Foltýnek, T., Guerrero-Dib, J., Popoola, O., Šigut, P., & Waddington, L. (2023). Testing of detection tools for AI-generated text. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19, Article 26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00146-z>

Appendix A. Final Coding Framework

Categories were developed separately for each research question. Inclusion was non-exclusive. A respondent was counted once within a category even when the same idea appeared more than once in that response.

Table A1

Coding framework for motivations

Category	Inclusion rule	Boundary or exclusion
Brainstorming and task initiation	Mentions ideas, brainstorming, points, perspectives, writer's block, or a starting prompt.	Does not include generic 'help' without an ideation function.
Efficiency and convenience	Mentions saving time, speed, convenience, workload, deadlines, stress reduction, or easier completion.	Does not assume efficiency from a generic assignment reference.
Enhancement of language and writing	Mentions grammar, spelling, vocabulary, English, sentence expression, drafting quality, or writing confidence.	Pure organisation without language improvement is coded under structuring.
Comprehension and clarification	Mentions explaining, simplifying, understanding a topic, or interpreting an assignment question.	Information retrieval without an explicit understanding function is excluded.
Structuring and information support	Mentions outlines, organisation, references, sources, summaries, notes, or draft structure.	General idea generation without organisation or information support is excluded.

Table A2

Coding framework for responsible-use practices

Category	Inclusion rule	Boundary or exclusion
Retain authorship and personal effort	Rejects direct copying, full-assignment generation, cheating, or loss of personal ideas. Requires own wording, analysis, or effort.	A detector check alone does not demonstrate authorship.
Bounded support role	Limits AI to named support functions such as brainstorming, grammar, explanation, review, study notes, or guidance.	A generic instruction to use AI 'wisely' is insufficient.
Limit use and avoid over-reliance	Mentions moderation, limits, use only when needed, independent attempts, or avoiding dependence.	A task boundary without a frequency or reliance boundary is coded only as bounded support.
Verify and evaluate output	Requires fact-checking, information checking, source comparison, or critical review.	AI-detection checks are not treated as factual verification.
Follow rules, disclose use, or cite sources	Mentions institutional guidelines, declaring AI use, acknowledgement, or source citation.	Generic honesty without a rule, disclosure, or citation practice is coded under authorship only.
Technical or surface compliance	Proposes AI percentages, detector checks, Turnitin, paraphrasing, or 'humanising' generated text.	Reported as a respondent strategy, not endorsed as an integrity safeguard.