SIGEH ELT: Journal of Literature and Linguistics
Volume 6 Number 1, March 2026
ISSN ONLINE: 2775-8834

INDONESIAN EFL UNDERGRADUATES' MOTIVATION IN WRITING AND GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: A CORRELATIONAL STUDY

Benito Dira[1], Andrias Yulianto[2]
English Literature Study Program, Jakarta International University, Indonesia
benitodira@jiu.ac

Abstract

Generative AI (GenAI) is an enhanced fragment of Artificial Intelligence (AI). The emergence of GenAI has engendered numerous impacts on many sectors, including the English language learning and education industry. Motivation, one of the key aspects in language learning, has inspired many scholars as a subject of discussion within language education and second language learning and acquisition. This research sought to determine the correlation between GenAI and EFL Indonesian learners' perceptions of using GenAI to motivate them in writing. An open-ended and close-ended questionnaire was used to collect quantitative and qualitative data from 30 Indonesian EFL undergraduate students through purposive sampling. The other group of 32 Indonesian EFL undergraduate students participated in the pilot study to test the credibility and validity of research instruments. The result suggests a moderate positive correlation between EFL undergraduate motivation in writing and GenAI's usage. Qualitative data analysis also demonstrated students' positive perceptions of using GenAI technology in writing. They found it resourceful for boosting motivation, delivering immediate and personalized feedback, and encouraging self-directed learning. These findings indicate that integrating GenAI into language learning classes, particularly writing, can moderately enhance students' motivation and engagement, thus improving their overall writing skills. The primary limitation stemmed from the small scale and targeted group of participants. Future scholars and researchers are encouraged to explore the influence of a specific GenAI-driven app (e.g., Google Gemini), on another language's core skills, such as speaking or listening, throughout different educational environments and student demographics.

Keywords: Correlational study; EFL; Generative AI; Motivation; Writing Skills

---

Submit date : January 29, 2026
Accept date : February 14, 2026
Publish date : March 31, 2026
Correspondence Author: Benito Dira, Jakarta International University, Indonesia. E-Mail: benitodira@jiu.ac
Doi: https://doi.org/10.36269/sigeh.v6i1.4736

INTRODUCTION

Rapid advancements in information and communication technology have had significant impact on the landscape of education and language learning. One of the most influential developments in this field is the emergence of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), particularly tools capable of processing and generating human-like language. Of these technologies, ChatGPT, a GenAI model developed by OpenAI which applies natural language processing (NLP), has emerged as one of the most

impactful technological innovations (Miao & Holmes, 2021; Molenaar, 2022; Moybeka et al., 2023). ChatGPT is particularly invented to execute complex instructions in NLP applications involving virtual assistants, language writing and summarization, and essay creation (Bozkurt, 2023). A study done by Tuomi (2018) argues that the simplifications they display are ultimately the outcome of the prompts we contribute, which feeds into their big data (Holmes & Tuomi, 2022). Therefore, it possesses the capacity to holistically understand human language.

Learning is innately social (Dewey, 1938; Vygotsky, 1978; Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994), and thus interaction and communication are the main components of educational processes. Provided these points, the capacity to efficiently utilize generative AI becomes critical, establishing rapid engineering as a rising trend of digital literacy (Burkhard, 2023; Rahman & Sahayu, 2020). The primary discipline has gradually shifted from comprehensive knowledge acquisition to mastery of inquiry and information management.

A research report from Sumakul et al. (2023) corroborates that the term Artificial Intelligence (AI) was initially invented in 1955 by John McCarthy, widely acknowledged as the father of AI, when he and his fellow researchers composed a proposal for the 1956 Dartmouth Summer Research Project on Artificial Intelligence. In their theoretical frameworks, AI is classified as computer systems capable of applying language, generating ideas and abstractions, solving problems typically reserved for humans, and improving their own performance.

In the context of English language teaching, traditional instructional approaches have often emphasized heavily on memorization and repetition of syntactic structures rather than exposure to authentic communicative situations (Ali Alghamdi et al., 2019). Such strategies are considered less effective in improving English language learners' (ELLs) ability to communicate in real-world conversation contexts using the target language (Celce-Murcia, 2014). As the result, recent educational innovations have encouraged the integration of digital technologies and AI-powered tools to support more interactive and meaningful language learning experiences.

A growing number of research has begun to explore the role of artificial intelligence in education and language learning. For example, Moybeka et al. (2023) conducted a study exploring the influence of AI on EFL students’ motivation. Similarly,

Sumakul et al., 2023 reported that AI-powered tools can stimulate undergraduates' motivation to learn foreign languages. Rahman & Sahayu (2020) explored how foreign language teachers motivate Indonesian students by focusing on both internal and external motivational factors in classroom settings. Meanwhile, Cacicio and Riggs (2023) reported in their study that educators should ensure they understand the wide-ranging roles of GenAI in education. In addition, Chan and Zhou (2023) examined the perceptions of higher education students in Hong Kong regarding generative intelligence and its potential use in academic environment. Qamili (2023) also conducted survey-based research related to teaching English as a foreign language, contributing to broader discussion of innovation in EFL instruction.

Motivation has often been considered a key factor in impacting learning performance and outcome (Sumiyoshi & Svetanant, 2017; Cahyono & Rahayu, 2020). Dörnyei (2001) proposes several practical strategies for motivating students in Second Language Learning and Acquisition (SLLA) including choice motivation, executive motivation, and motivation retrospection. Choice motivation means setting goals or targets (Gardner & lambert, 1972). Executive motivation pertains to how a learner maintains ongoing motivation, whereas motivation retrospection links with students' contemplation and self-assessments of their efforts.

Another profound and impactful concept about motivation is the self-determination theory (SDT). Ryan and Deci (2000) argue that SDT is a means of studying personality and motivation of a human that integrates standard scientific techniques and analysis with an organismic metatheory. It is an approach that underlies the relevance of individuals' inner resources development for personality improvement and behavioral self-regulation.

Moreover, academic writing as a means of communication has long been recognized as a crucial form of communication in higher education. Writing and reading entail delicate and subtle relationships between writers and readers (Bruning & Kauffman, 2016; Wright & McTigue, 2019). Since higher educational institutions have increased their enrollment in the number of diverse students, similarly, the need to assist them in developing academic literacy skills has also risen to prominence (Elliot & Church, 1997; Santelmann *et al., 2018*). The most impactful collection of studies on writing motivation has revolved around self-efficacy, which can be elaborated as

people's management of their ability to do specific activities (Bandura, 1977). These theoretical perspectives suggest that motivation plays a crucial role in supporting EFL learners' success, particularly in academic writing contexts.

Despite the increasing body of studies on artificial intelligence in education, several limitations remain in the existing literature. First, Moybeka et al. (2023) investigated AI and student motivation; however, the study did not specify the type of AI being used, whether it was traditional AI or generative AI. Furthermore, the methodology did not elaborate on the research location. Second, Rahman and Sahayu (2020) explored teacher strategies in motivating Indonesian students but did not incorporate AI technology. Third, Cacicio and Riggs (2023) examined the broader role of generative AI in education without addressing specific domains such as language learning or linguistics. At the same point, Chan and Zhou (2023) explored student perceptions of generative AI but did not relate their findings to English language learning. Finally, although Sumakul et al. (2023) suggested that AI tools may increase motivation in foreign language learning, the study did not specify which of the four language skills- speaking, listening reading, or writing- was affected. Therefore, these remains a gap in research examining the relationship between generative AI usage and EFL students' motivation, particularly in the context of academic writing.

Considering the imitations identified in previous studies, it remains unclear how the use of generative AI tools specifically influences EFL students' motivation in learning academic writing. While AI technologies are increasingly integrated into educational settings, empirical evidence regarding their impact on writing motivation among Indonesian EFL undergraduate students remains limited.

Thus, this study covers two major focuses. First, it investigates the relationship between the usage of generative AI and Indonesian EFL undergraduate's motivation to study English in college writing classes. Based on this question, two hypotheses are developed: the null hypothesis (H0.1a), which states there is no statistically significant relationship between the use of generative AI and the students' motivation in these classes. Second, the study investigates the perspectives of Indonesian undergraduate students about the influence of generative AI on their writing. Overall, the findings from this study were expected to enrich the current literature, particularly debates about whether or not to integrate GenAI in English classrooms.

METHOD

As a correlational research design, this study collected quantitative and qualitative data through closed-ended and open-ended questionnaires (Creswell & Clark, 2017). The questionnaires were tested for reliability and validity before being administered to the research participants. The questionnaire contained three different sections. The first part was the personal information, which was modified from Sicam and Lucas (2016) as cited in Mbato and Kharismawan (2018), and asked for data about informed consent, name, gender, and last semester GPA (See Table 1).

The second one was the close-ended questions to determine participants' perceptions related to their motivation in writing. The last section, open-ended questions, measured their understanding of GenAI's presence and utilization within the area of motivation in writing. Survey research, also described as descriptive research, utilizes tools such as interviews and questionnaires to find information from groups of people (Dawadi et al., 2021).

Table 1. The Distribution of Questions from the Questionnaire

Theory	Components	Number of Questions
Sicam & Lucas, 2016	Informed Consent	1
	Name	1
	Last Semester GPA	1
	Gender	1
Dörnyei's Dynamic Model of Motivation in Second Language Learning and Acquisition, 2001; Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Ryan & Deci, 2000	Planning and goal-directed activity	2
	Self-regulatory skill	1
	Self-evaluation and reflection	2
Holmes & Tuomi, 2022; Bozkurt, 2023; Chan & Zhou, 2023	GenAI for motivating students	2
	GenAI for learning development	2
	GenAI's influence on autonomy	2
Dörnyei's Dynamic Model of Motivation in Second Language Learning and Acquisition, 2001; Holmes & Tuomi, 2022	GenAI and motivation in writing (Open-Ended Questions)	6
Total		21

The above table is the framework used to create the questions within the survey. The total questions were 21 items of questions. We utilized a 5-point Likert scale as the type of the close-ended questionnaire. Surveys enable us to recapitulate the unique findings of various groups or to assess their attitudes and opinions on a certain phenomenon. The measurement scale started from "1" equals strongly disagree and to "5" equals strongly agree. We have translated the questions into English since the original statements were in Indonesian.

Meanwhile, according to Creswell and Clark (2017), the qualitative data technique comprises information gathered through open-ended questions in which the researcher does not use established categories or framework of questions to collect the data. Not to mention, the participants answer questions that are open to their alternatives for replying or it does not restrict their options for responding.

Table 2. The Results of the Validity Test

No.	Aspects of Questions	Item of Questions	
		Invalid	**Valid**
1.	Motivation in the Intermediate Reading and Writing Class	3,4,6,7	1,2,5,8,9
2.	GenAI's utilization to motivate in the IRW class	3,6,7	1,2,4,5,8,9
Total		7	11

The total participants of the pilot study were 32 students. They were undergraduate students of another IRW class taught by a different lecturer. Adams and McGuire (2022) elucidate that reliability concerns consistency and validity concerns accuracy. On the grounds of that, we have applied Pearson Product Moment Correlation.

Before the tests, the questionnaire had 15 items along with six open-ended questions. According to the result denoted in Table 2, four questions were invalid from the total of nine questions of motivation in collegiate writing classes. In addition, the other three questions were invalid in the section on Generative AI utilization from the total of nine questions. A research instrument, particularly a questionnaire, must be

tested for its reliability as well. We have utilized Cronbach's alpha to determine the internal consistency of the measurement scale. The results are depicted in Table 3.

Table 3. The Results of Reliability Analysis from Two Variables

	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Motivation in IRW Class	.663	5
GenAI's Utilization	.797	6

According to Table 3, the reliability test showed that the alpha was .663. Concurrently, the alpha for the reliability test of GenAI's utilization was .797. According to Adams and McGuire (2023), if the alpha indicates 0.60, it is still acceptable. Hence, the questionnaires proved reliable to be used for this research.

Within this research, purposive sampling was selected to choose the subject participants. From the total of 30 participants, six males and 24 females participated in the research. The pilot study participants were the first-year students, whereas the research participants were second-year students of a language department located in the Gejayan University (pseudonym). These students were chosen since their lecturer allowed them to use Generative Artificial Intelligence to improve their writing when necessary.

We also contacted several colleagues who were still studying as undergraduates to collect some information regarding the usage of GenAI in their studies. Across many other classes that we have checked, we intentionally selected the IRW students since they displayed frequent usage of GenAI, particularly for collegiate writing assignments. And, to maintain the confidentiality, all respondents' names were changed into pseudonyms, for example Student 1 (S01), Student 2 (S02), and others.

The procedure of the research was conducted in three phases. The first phase involved conducting a pilot study to test the clarity and reliability of questionnaire instrument. We utilized Google Forms to do the survey to a small group of participants prior to the main data collection. This was intended to ensure the validity and reliability of the instrument. Content validity was established by reviewing the questionnaire items referring to relevant literature on EFL motivation and generative AI usage. Furthermore, the items were reviewed to ensure that they accurately represented the constructs being

measured. Reliability analysis was conducted using Cronbach's Alpha to determine the internal consistency of the questionnaire items. Referring to the results of the pilot study,s everal items were revised to enhance the clarity and consistency before the instrument was redistributed to the participants of the IRW students for the main data collection.

The second phase involved examining and scrutinizing the quantitative and qualitative data to find a correlation between GenAI usage and EFL students' motivation. We also denoted the motivation's mean range of each questionnaire's statement to interpret the participants' motivation level in Table.4 We adopted the interpretation design from Astriningsih and Mbato (2019).

Table 4. Motivation's Mean Range

Mean Range	**Interpretation**
1.00 - 2.33	Low Level of Motivation
2.34 - 3.67	Moderate Level of Motivation
3.68 - 5.00	High Level of Motivation

In the final phase, this research presented the statistical data combined with qualitative analysis from the open-ended questions. The analysis of Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient and descriptive statistics were applied to elaborate on the first research question by examining the relationship between generative AI usage and students' motivation. The strength of correlation was interpreted based on the classification proposed by Evans (1996), where correlation values between .00 and .19 are considered very weak, .20 to .39 weak, .40 to .59 moderate, .60 to .79 strong, and .80 to 1.0 very strong. Meanwhile, the qualitative responses from the open-ended questions were analyzed thematically to explore students' perspectives on the influence of generative AI on their writing practices.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

The data denoted in Table 5 summarizes the descriptive analysis from each questionnaire statement and the mean score of each questionnaire, while Table 6 indicates the result of Pearson correlation coefficient. We have interpreted the level of motivation using the range of mean scores (See Table. 4).

Table 5. Result of the Descriptive Analysis

Statements		Mean	Standard Deviation
Motivation in the Intermediate and Writing Class			
A1	Before I start working on my writing, I set the goals, for example, I want to understand more deeply how to create the main idea in a paragraph.	4.1	0.59
A2	I always build a positive mindset before starting to write in English.	4.03	0.70
A3	I have a specific reason to improve my writing skills, for example, pursuing a master's degree at home or abroad in the field of English.	3.76	0.84
A4	If I feel confused when writing English, I know who to ask.	3.46	0.92
A5	I reflect on and evaluate my mistakes in writing English work when the writing turns out to be wrong.	3.96	0.83
$\underline{x}$A	*Mean Score of Motivation*	3.86	0.78
GenAI's utilization to motivate in the IRW class			
B1	Utilizing generative AI technology such as Google Gemini and ChatGPT to find ideas, inspiration or rephrase a sentence can motivate me to write in English.	3.86	0.76
B2	The use of generative AI can motivate me to write because it will not judge or rate my writing.	3.23	0.71
B3	Generative AI motivates me to learn new words and understand English grammar structures better.	3.8	0.65

Statements		Mean	Standard Deviation
B4	The use of generative AI motivates me to write better in English because it can provide personalized and immediate feedback.	3.7	0.69
B5	I feel motivated in the IRW class because I can perceive generative AI as a means to help, not to replace my duty as a student in working on English writing.	4.26	0.67
B6	I believe that generative AI can be a big boost to improving my English writing skills, although I still need to put a lot of effort into learning and practicing it.	3.73	0.72
$\underline{x}$B *Mean Score of GenAI*		3.76	0.70

According to Table 5, the analysis reveals that the writing motivation in IRW classes is typically high. The average mean score of motivation is 3.86. Despite the data showing a high average score on participant motivation, it can be seen that the lowest point is located in statement number four (A4; $\underline{x}$ = 3.46). The statistical data on the mean score of motivation also uncovered another significant finding. Statement number one is revealed to be the highest mean score among all of the statements, reaching the value of 4.1. Not to mention, the EFL students, indeed, possessed the capacity to establish a positive frame of mind before taking any writing assignments (A2; $\underline{x}$ = 4.03). The undergraduate students deem reflections as a significant process, given that the average mean score on statement number five is particularly high (A5; $\underline{x}$ = 3.96).

From Table 5, it can be agreed as well that the mean score of GenAI's usage is substantially high; shown by the average mean score of 3.76. In the same vein, perception could be a key process for the EFL learners to integrate GenAI as a reliable resource in motivating their writing processes, provided that the mean score is the highest on statement number five (B5; $\underline{x}$ = 4.26). However, these learners did not seem to view GenAI's presence holistically as a non-judgmental helper. The numerical analysis proves the result mentioned above on statement number two, which also has the lowest score on participants' GenAI usage (B2; $\underline{x}$ = 3.23). Apart from that, many undergraduate students were inclined to agree that GenAI can be one of the alternatives

for brainstorming ideas. Statement number one affirms the said finding (B1; $\bar{x}$ = 3.86).

Table 6. The Correlation Between Motivation in Writing and GenAI's Utilization

Motivation in the Intermediate and Writing Class	**GenAI's utilization to motivate in the IRW class**	
.443*		**Pearson Correlation**
0.14		**Sig. (2-tailed)**
30		**N**
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).		

Data in Table 6 above suggest the correlation was to a moderate degree (Evans, 1996). Hence, the correlation value between the motivation in the IRW class and GenAI's utilization was moderate with r =. 443, along with a significant 0.05 level. As stated in the correlation result, the null hypothesis (H0.1a) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H1.1a) was accepted. As an outcome, we inferred that there was a positive and moderate correlation between motivation in writing and GenAI's utilization. Based on this analysis, the presence and utilization of GenAI in the IRW class had a good influence on undergraduate students' motivation in writing their collegiate assignments, albeit the correlation was not significantly strong.

Discussion

Based on the analysis of open-ended questions, many students underlined the relevance of GenAI in their academic duties. Some respondents argued that GenAI's existence is heavily associated with their enthusiasm for partaking in writing assignments. We have quoted one of the respondents; all responses were translated into English:

> "GenAI can motivate my writing performance in multiple ways. First, an AI like GPT-4 can offer instant feedback on

> my writing, highlighting grammatical errors and providing suggestions for improvement so that I can learn from them straight away. Second, tools like Grammarly and ProWritingAid help me sharpen the quality of my writing by seeking suggestions on sentence structure and writing style, making my writing clearer and more effective." (S17)

Some students also mentioned that GenAI aids them in enhancing their language and syntax, making their tasks more sharpened and enriching (Nurmaisyah & Hasriani, 2025). For some, GenAI evoked brainstorming moments, enabling them to discover new ideas that they would not have thought of before. Apart from that, several respondents claimed that GenAI technologies' convenience and guidance enabled them to perceive writing tasks with confidence rather than anxiousness. GenAI as an educational tool inferred it was being incorporated into students' academic schedules to enhance learning. It was used not just for working on assignments but also for learning and discovering by having real-time and personalized feedback.

Though some students expressed slight advancements in their writing skills as a result of the utilization of GenAI, some other students became immoderately reliant on AI, which could hinder their development to acquire independent writing skills. For example:

> "Around 50% because I, myself, am quite happy to write essays but my interest in writing is not that strong so AI is adequate motivation to push me to write." (S26)

A few respondents felt a lack of familiarity with the technology, although they utilized ChatGPT occasionally to ask questions and check their writing work. One of the respondents admitted that asking for help from people motivated her more compared to asking from ChatGPT. However, the common responses differed, with some students explaining that while GenAI could assist with particular tasks, it may not comprehensively transmit a bigger improvement in their writing skills (Nuristama, 2025). Despite the positive responses to GenAI's utilization in motivating to write, others were more hesitant to make conclusions about said technology.

Participants viewed generative AI technology as a resourceful tool for learning. They admitted its capability to help learn the English language, particularly grammar

knowledge and new vocabulary. GenAI is implemented substantially in education, emphasizing that it has become a helpful learning tool and can aid grammar correction (Ongkosaputri & Kendenan, 2025). However, integrating GenAI into classroom practices has not been culturally widespread (Chan & Zhou, 2023). Additionally, some students saw it as a tool that provided access to vast information and academic materials.

The findings above corroborate the theory from Russell and Norvig (2016) that GenAI offers insightful solutions to our intricate issues in the field of education. Altogether, most respondents perceive GenAI as a kind of artificial technology that could be used based on prompts or commands, thereby producing results tailored to their inquiries. We also quoted another one of the respondents directly:

> "Generative AI is a technology that I use to search for ideas, materials, or other things related to the field of English education." (S22)

This aforementioned qualitative analysis aligned with one of the numerical data findings. A unity of perception occurred knowing that the undergraduate students had the fundamental understanding that GenAI is a helpful tool to learn anything (B5; = 4.26). Data reported by Chan and Hu (2023) connote that GenAI is rising as a friendly learning tool with unique benefits for learners. Those findings were aligned with the research report conducted by Chan and Hu. A large number of participants responded that GenAI was necessary to motivate their writing processes due to its capability of improving language structure and providing fresh new vocabulary. It stimulated creativity by giving access to extensive ideas and suggestions, ensuring the writing process was more enjoyable and compelling.

Thus, it connected to the quantitative result that explained that the utilization of AI promoted many novel ideas (B1; = 3.86). Corresponding to GenAI having an array of data, Dai and Lim (2023) argue that GenAI is designed from an enormous corpus of training data, making it possible to offer various ideas and solutions. Enhanced grammar and linguistic structure boosted learners' confidence. When people were convinced that their writing was grammatically acceptable, they were more motivated to write more

often and with stronger determination. Additionally, this was one of the respondents' answers:

> "Knowing AI can provide feedback automatically and spot my mistakes; it motivates me to enhance my performance." (S05)

These findings may affirm the theory of SDT by Ryan and Deci (200) that the determination derives from within the learner's ability to perceive externally driven factors, which is technology. It is also aligned with what has been stated by Rusell and Norvig (2016), which is that GenAI enables learners to develop a sense of autonomous learning via tailored and immediate feedback. Not to mention, the data from the descriptive analysis also mentioned this finding saying that GenAI's motivation stems from its features to offer personalized feedback (B4; = 3.7), as mentioned by another respondent:

> "By providing new ideas that make me have new and broader thoughts to write better." (S25)

As students received help from GenAI's features, it cultivated a sense of development, which was a strong motivator. Looking at real progress in their writing skills motivated them to seek more accomplishment. It also aided learners in overcoming common problems like writer's block and fear of criticism. GenAI eliminated these hurdles by giving continuous guidance and critical feedback, making writing more attainable and pleasant.

Gardner and Lambert (1972) corroborate that integrative motivation derives from the more profound determination to learn a language, such as culture, academic purposes, or learning about the people. Those undergraduate students were motivated to learn English due to the emergence of AI and to understand the holistic concept of English skills. This finding also affirms one of the dynamic model of motivation by Dörnyei (2001). Learners intend to do something because they want an increase in knowledge mastery. GenAI exhibits self-assessment, permitting learners to manage their own learning pace. This autonomy motivates them because it gives them a sense of power and control over their goals.

> "Normally, I write something and put my writing on the AI app to be given feedback since it is quite difficult to find someone willing to look at my writing." (S04)

AI technologies offered spontaneous feedback, which enabled quick learning and continual development. The students were inspired by their progress and the evident benefits, encouraging them to continue writing and growing. This particular finding is closely associated with the main theoretical framework of this paper, Dörnyei's (2001b) theory of motivation. One of his profound theories in the realm of motivation, choice motivation, deals with setting prior objectives, while motivation retrospection pertains to the learner's contemplation and self-assessment.

Feedback from GenAI helped the undergraduates set specific goals for improvement in their upcoming writing tasks. Along with that, the feedback also requires them to reflect on their writing processes and progress. GenAI offers a sense of autonomy, which correlates with Bandura's theory (1977), of self-efficacy. It strongly links with autonomous skills. One can exert a full potential to achieve the designated goals by having a sense of control.

The findings also claimed that the overly reliant students could be towards GenAI's utilization, despite it was not directly mentioned in responses. In the close-ended questions, several respondents viewed GenAI's as a helpful means of studying, not as a total replacement for completing tasks as implied from one of the descriptive analysis results (B5; = 4.26). This finding was also reaffirmed by the open-ended response.

> "The role of generative AI is not that important to me because I am personally not too dependent on AI and there are still other things that motivate me to improve my writing skills." (S08)

The statement above showed that GenAI's influence could still be maintained to some extent. The deeper worries regarding reliance on GenAI may be associated with wider ethical debates concerning its usage in education. This dependency might inhibit students from cultivating critical thinking and problem-solving capabilities, which are normally flourished via the writing process.

As a whole, by looking at the mean score of motivation (- 3.86; SD = 0.78), Gen AI (= 3.76; SD = 0.70) and qualitative analysis, generative AI technology is a cutting-edge tool that increases different components of the writing aspects, all of which function as crucial roles in increasing and keeping motivation level. Both findings consistently indicate that GenAI technology enables the writing journey and process to be less overwhelming, tedious, and productive. It also strengthened what Chan and Hu (2023) discovered: academic credibility, inventiveness, and the chances of AI replacing human judgment need to be investigated thoroughly.

CONCLUSION

The utilization of Generative AI in writing was moderately correlated with higher motivation. Students perceived AI technology as having the potential to enhance grammar knowledge and linguistic structure, stimulate creativity, promote new vocabulary acquisition, and offer individualized feedback for self-assessment, all of which supported an Indonesian EFL undergraduate's motivation. However, considering the likelihood of excessive dependency and the diverse influence on overall writing skills, educators have to carefully evaluate how GenAI is combined into the learning methods to optimize its advantages while constraining its negatives.

As suggested by the findings from both quantitative and qualitative data, GenAI could provide a positive learning atmosphere that permitted students to construct precise objectives, contemplate their progress, and be in control of their learning processes. These findings had vital implications for policymakers, academic practitioners, educational staff, and educators who intended to incorporate technology to make language teaching more engaging.

By integrating GenAI technology, schools, colleges, and universities may develop more innovative and interactive learning experiences that are personalized to current and actual interests. This notion of integrating aided in improving writing skills and mechanics and resulted in a better understanding of how technology could motivate and encourage students' particular capabilities.

Nonetheless, this study had some limitations. The primary limitation derived from the small scale and targeted group of participants. It diminished the ability to draw for a broader result. It only delved into the one language skill. The scope of study was

meant to be bigger, but the time constraints made it impossible. Despite the questionnaire gathered gender and students' grade point average, these data points were ultimately not applied in the research, with only informed consent and name being utilized. Future scholars and researchers should seek to examine the influence of a specific GenAI-driven app, for instance, perplexity AI, on another language's core skills, such as speaking or listening, throughout different educational environments and student groups.

REFERENCES

Adams, K. A., & McGuire, E. K. (2022). Student study guide with IBM® SPSS® workbook for research methods, statistics, and applications. SAGE Publications.

Ali Alghamdi, Y., Mohammed Alghamdi, A., & Gabr Alsolami, T. (2019). English Language Teaching: Historical Overview, Current Issues, and Suggestions for Enhancing Speaking Proficiency in EFL Contexts. Arab World English Journal, 10(2), 270-283. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no2.21

Astriningsih, N., & Mbato, C. L. (2019). Motivation to Learn English: Why Indonesian Adult Learners Join a Community of Interest. ANIMA Indonesian Psychological Journal, 34(2). https://doi.org/10.24123/aipj.v34i2.2202

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Prentice-Hall.

Bozkurt, A. (2023). Generative artificial intelligence (AI) powered conversational educational agents: The inevitable paradigm shift. Asian Journal of Distance Education, 18(1), 198-204.

Mbato, C. L. (2021). Empowering Indonesian students' regulation of feelings and attitudes in EFL learning through action-oriented reflections. *Educational Action Research*, *31(3)*, 490-509. https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2021.2002169

Bruning, R., & Kauffman, D. F. (2016). Self-efficacy beliefs and motivation in writing development. In C. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), Handbook of writing research (2nd ed., pp. 160–173). Guilford.

Cacicio, S., & Riggs, R. (2023). Bridging Resource Gaps in Adult Education: The role of Generative AI. Adult Literacy Education: The International Journal of Literacy, Language, and Numeracy, 5(3), 80-86. https://doi.org/10.35847/scacicio.rriggs.5.3.80

Celce-Murcia, M. (2014). An Overview of Language Teaching Methods and Approaches. In D. M. Brinton, M. Celce-Murcia, & M. A. Snow (Eds.). Teaching English as a second or foreign language. (4th ed.). (pp. 2-14). Florence, KY: Heinle and Heinle.

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. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8

Chan, C. K., & Zhou, W. (2023). An Expectancy Value Theory (EVT) Based Instrument for Measuring Student Perceptions of Generative AI. Smart Learning Environments, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00284-4

Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. (2017). Designing and conducting mixed methods research. SAGE Publications.

Dai, Y., Liu, A., & Lim, C. P. (2023). Reconceptualizing ChatGPT and Generative AI as A Student-Driven Innovation in Higher Education. https://doi.org/10.35542/osf.io/nwqju

Dawadi, S., Shrestha, S. ., & Giri, R. A. . (2021). Mixed-Methods Research: A Discussion on its Types, Challenges, and Criticisms . Journal of Practical Studies in Education , 2(2), 25-36. https://doi.org/10.46809/jpse.v2i2.20

Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. Macmillan.

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). Motivational Strategies in The Language Classroom. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511667343

Evans, J. D. (1996). Straight forward statistics for the behavioural sciences. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, W. E. (1972). Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Holmes, W., & Tuomi, I. (2022). State of the art and practice in AI in education. European Journal of Education. 57. 10.1111/ejed.12533. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7716416

Mbato, C. L., & Kharismawan, P. Y. (2018). A Correlational Study between Language Attitudes and English Language Orientation of Indonesian EFL Learners. LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network Journal, 11 (1). pp. 148-166. ISSN 2630-0672

Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2021). AI and education: Guidance for policy--makers. UNESCO. https://unesd oc.unesco.org/ ark:/48223/ pf000 0376709

Molenaar, I. (2022). Towards hybrid human--AI educational scenarios. European Journal of Education, 57(4).

Moybeka, A., Syariatin, N., Tatipang, D., Mushthoza, D. A., Dewi, N. P. J. L., & Tineh, S. (2023). Artificial Intelligence and English Classroom: The Implications of AI Toward EFL Students' Motivation. Edumaspul: Jurnal Pendidikan, 7(2), 2444-2454. https://doi.org/10.33487/edumaspul.v7i2.6669

Nuristama, R. U. (2025). Mythological reinterpretation of persephone as a symbol of empowerment in amanda lovelace's flower crowns and fearsome things. Sigeh elt : Journal of Literature and Linguistics, 5(2), 631-644. https://journal.uml.ac.id/index.php/ELt/index

Nurmaisyah, & Hasriani. (2025). Exploring cultural and intercultural dimensions in english language teaching: a systematic review of teacher and learner perspectives. Sigeh elt : Journal of Literature and Linguistics, 5(2), 679-695. https://journal.uml.ac.id/index.php/ELt/index

Ongkosaputri, B. P., & Kendenan, E. S. (2025). An Analysis of Idiom Translation Strategies in The Life of Pi By Yaan Martel. SIGEH ELT : Journal of Literature and Linguistics, 5(2), 558-570. https://journal.uml.ac.id/index.php/ELt/index

Santelmann, L. M., Stevens, D. D., & Martin, S. B. (2018). Fostering Master's Students' Metacognition and Self-Regulation Practices for Research Writing. College Teaching, 66(3), 111–123. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2018.1446898

Qamili, S. (2023). Teaching English as A Foreign Language Via Four Language Skills, Vol.13, No.3, 2023, 422-429

Rahman, D. S., & Sahayu, W. (2020). How do foreign language teachers motivate students in language learning?. Studies in English Language and Education, 7(1), 181-193

Russell, S. J., & Norvig, P. (2016). Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach. Pearson.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being. American Psychologist, 55(1), 68-78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.55.1.68

Sicam, F. P. M., & Lucas, R. I. G. (2016). Language attitudes of adolescent Filipino bilingual learners towards English and Filipino. Asian Englishes, -, 1-19. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2016.1179474

Sumakul, D.T.Y.G. & Hamied, Fuad & Sukyadi, Didi. (2022). Artificial Intelligence in EFL Classrooms: Friend or Foe?. LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network. 15. 232-256.

Sumiyoshi, H., & Svetanant, C. (2017). Motivation and Attitude Towards Shadowing: Learners Perspectives in Japanese as A Foreign Language. Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 2(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-017-0039-6

Tuomi, I. (2018). The impact of artificial intelligence on learning, teaching, and EDUCATION. European Union Joint Research Centre. Publications Office of the European Union. https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/JRC113226/jrc113226_jrcb4_the_impact_of_artificial_intelligence_on_learning_final_2.pdf

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.

Wright, K. L., Hodges, T. S., & McTigue, E. M. (2019). A validation program for the Self-Beliefs, Writing-Beliefs, and Attitude Survey: A measure of adolescents' motivation toward writing. Assessing Writing, 39, 64–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.12.004

Zimmerman, B. J., & Bandura, A. (1994). Impact of self-regulatory influences on writing course attainment. American Educational Research Journal, 31, 845–862. https://doi.org/10.3102/2F00028312031004845