

Proposed Pedagogical Framework for Positioning Generative AI as a Thinking Companion in Recount Writing

Jasmine Farizqi Fajri^{1*}, Ahmad Husein Rofi'udin², Titik Harsiaty³
^{1*,2,3}State University of Malang, Malang, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Recieved :

Revised :

Accepted :

Keyword:

generative artificial intelligence; recount text; writing instruction; design-based learning; thinking companion

*Correspondence Author:
jasmine.farizqi.2402118
@students.um.ac.id

Kata Kunci:

generative artificial intelligence; teks rekon; pembelajaran menulis; design-based learning; mitra berpikir

ABSTRACT

Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) can provide feedback, questions for reflection, and language support in writing instruction. However, without clear guidance, students may delegate idea generation, drafting, and revision to the technology. This study identifies local needs in Grade IX recount-writing instruction and proposes a preliminary framework for positioning GenAI as a thinking companion. It draws on content analysis of the Grade IX Indonesian Language Student's Book and Teacher's Book, a semi-structured interview with one Indonesian language teacher, and descriptive analysis of six selected questionnaire items answered by 56 students. The materials examined provide model texts and initial writing activities but lack systematic revision guidance and recount-specific criteria in the final assessment rubric. Student responses indicate reported use of AI as a thinking companion, reported submission of assignments containing content partly or entirely copied from GenAI, and an expectation for appropriately integrated teaching materials. Considered alongside relevant literature, these findings inform six proposed principles: student ownership of ideas, independent work before AI use, limited AI assistance, guided prompts, critical evaluation of AI output, and transparency about AI use. The framework has not undergone expert validation or classroom testing. It should therefore be regarded as a context-specific design proposal, not an established guideline or evidence of instructional effectiveness.

ABSTRAK

Kehadiran generative artificial intelligence dalam pembelajaran menulis membuka peluang pemberian umpan balik, pertanyaan reflektif, dan bantuan kebahasaan secara cepat, tetapi juga berisiko mengalihkan proses berpikir peserta didik apabila digunakan untuk menentukan gagasan, menyusun draf, atau merevisi teks secara otomatis. Penelitian ini bertujuan merumuskan prinsip integrasi generative artificial intelligence sebagai mitra berpikir dalam pembelajaran menulis teks rekon dengan kerangka design-based learning. Penelitian menggunakan pendekatan deskriptif kualitatif melalui analisis Buku Siswa dan Buku Guru Bahasa Indonesia kelas IX, serta wawancara dengan seorang guru Bahasa Indonesia. Data dianalisis melalui reduksi data, kategorisasi temuan, dan sintesis

kebutuhan pembelajaran dengan literatur terkait untuk merumuskan rancangan pedagogis. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa pembelajaran telah memanfaatkan teks model, lembar kerja peserta didik, media visual, dan penugasan draf awal, tetapi belum didukung panduan revisi sistematis, rubrik penilaian khusus teks rekon, serta pedoman penggunaan kecerdasan buatan yang eksplisit. Penelitian ini menghasilkan enam prinsip integrasi, yaitu kepemilikan gagasan siswa, aktivitas mandiri sebelum menggunakan kecerdasan buatan, bantuan kecerdasan buatan yang terbatas, perintah terpandu, evaluasi kritis terhadap keluaran kecerdasan buatan, dan transparansi penggunaan kecerdasan buatan. Prinsip tersebut menempatkan siswa sebagai pengembang gagasan, penyusun draf, penyunting, dan pengambil keputusan revisi, sedangkan kecerdasan buatan berfungsi sebagai pemantik refleksi dan pemberi masukan terbatas. Rancangan ini menyediakan acuan bagi guru untuk mengintegrasikan kecerdasan buatan secara terarah tanpa menggantikan kepemilikan gagasan dan proses menulis siswa.

How to Cite:

Fajri, J., Rofi'udin, A. H., & Harsiati, T. (2026). Proposed Pedagogical Framework for Positioning Generative AI as a Thinking Companion in Recount Writing. *Paedagogia: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 15(2), 245-266. <https://doi.org/10.24239/pdg.Vol15.Iss2.1477>

INTRODUCTION

The use of generative AI in writing instruction presents both opportunities and pedagogical challenges. Language-model-based systems can answer questions, suggest alternative vocabulary, provide preliminary feedback, and help users review a text's structure ¹. Such assistance may benefit students who have difficulty organising ideas and revising their writing ². In education, the potential value of generative AI lies not only in producing text but also in supporting discussion, reflection, and evaluation of writing choices.

However, the ease of obtaining AI-generated content may lead students to delegate idea generation, drafting, or revision to the technology. Without pedagogical guidance, this may encourage cognitive off-loading: shifting some of the thinking involved in writing to an external tool. Students may have fewer opportunities to practise evaluating ideas and revisions if they accept AI output without checking its accuracy, relevance, or rationale ³. The challenge for writing

¹ Özlem Alpar, "Evaluating Generative AI Tools for Improving English Writing Skills: A Preliminary Comparison of ChatGPT-4, Google Gemini, and Microsoft Copilot," *European Journal of Educational Research* 14, no. 4 (October 1, 2025): 1291–1308, <https://doi.org/10.12973/eujer.14.4.1291>.

² M. Borge, B. K. Smith, and T. Aldemir, "Using Generative Ai as a Simulation to Support Higher-Order 'Thinking,'" *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning* 19, no. 4 (December 1, 2024): 479–532, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-024-09437-0>.

³ Tamara P. Tate et al., "Incorporating Generative AI into a Writing-Intensive Undergraduate Course without off-Loading Learning," *Discover Computing* 28, no. 1 (December 1, 2025), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10791-025-09563-9>.

instruction is therefore to use AI in ways that support students' thinking without replacing the work they are expected to learn to do ⁴.

Delegating a task to AI is not necessarily problematic. AI may serve as a thinking scaffold when it poses reflective questions, highlights unclear passages, suggests alternative wording, or provides brief feedback on a section of a student's draft. By contrast, it may replace a central learning task if it selects students' experiences, chooses facts, organises the chronology, creates an outline or first draft, or makes revision decisions on their behalf. Instructional design therefore needs to distinguish bounded assistance from replacement of the writing process.

This distinction is relevant to Indonesian language instruction, particularly recount-text writing. Recount texts typically organise past experiences or events through an orientation, a sequence of events, and a reorientation. Writers select relevant information, arrange events chronologically, and use linguistic features such as action verbs, temporal conjunctions, and expressions of time and place ⁵. In personal recounts, students select and reflect on their own experiences. In factual recounts, they also need to consider whether the information presented is verifiable. Both forms require students to make decisions about content, sequence, and language. GenAI assistance should therefore be designed to support, rather than automatically take over, those decisions.

Previous research on AI-assisted writing has examined how these tools can provide preliminary feedback on text organisation and language choices, giving students opportunities to review their drafts ⁶. Studies of students' writing experiences have also explored how they use AI to ask questions, consider alternative expressions, and develop existing ideas ⁷. Studies of students' writing experiences have also explored how they use AI to ask questions, consider alternative expressions, and develop existing ideas

AI assistance, however, does not necessarily improve learning. A systematic review has raised concerns about over-reliance on AI dialogue systems, particularly when users accept generated responses without critically evaluating them ⁸. Research on students' perceptions of AI in higher education offers insight

⁴ Peter Cardon et al., "The Challenges and Opportunities of AI-Assisted Writing: Developing AI Literacy for the AI Age," *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly* 86, no. 3 (September 1, 2023): 257–95, <https://doi.org/10.1177/23294906231176517>.

⁵ Mark Anderson and Kathryn Anderson, *Text Types in English*, vol. 1 (Macmillan Education AU, 1997); Yuzaki Adam Alwasilah and Wawan Gunawan, "A Systemic Functional Linguistic Study on Language Use of Indonesian Students in Writing," *JOMANTARA: Indonesian Journal of Art and Culture* 3, no. 2 (2023): 110–24.

⁶ Alpar, "Evaluating Generative AI Tools for Improving English Writing Skills: A Preliminary Comparison of ChatGPT-4, Google Gemini, and Microsoft Copilot."

⁷ Chaoran Wang, "Exploring Students' Generative AI-Assisted Writing Processes: Perceptions and Experiences from Native and Nonnative English Speakers," *Technology, Knowledge and Learning* 30, no. 3 (2024): 1825–46, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-024-09744-3>.

⁸ Chunpeng Zhai, Santoso Wibowo, and Lily D. Li, "The Effects of Over-Reliance on AI Dialogue Systems on Students' Cognitive Abilities: A Systematic Review," *Smart Learning Environments* 11, no. 1 (December 1, 2024), <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7>.

into how learners view its benefits and risks, but perceptions should not be treated as direct evidence of changes in their cognitive abilities⁹. Research on students' perceptions of AI in higher education offers insight into how learners view its benefits and risks, but perceptions should not be treated as direct evidence of changes in their cognitive abilities

Previous research has explored AI as a conversational tool, a source of feedback, and a linguistic aid. Yet the studies discussed here do not directly specify how these functions should be organised for Grade IX recount-writing instruction in the setting examined. This study therefore addresses a context-specific design question: which tasks should students complete independently, when might limited AI assistance be introduced, and how can teachers examine students' responses to AI suggestions? Evidence of planning, drafting, and revision may help make those writing decisions visible. Research showing the limits of judging AI involvement from finished student essays further supports the need not to rely on the final text alone¹⁰.

An initial examination of the Grade IX Indonesian Language Student's Book and Teacher's Book identified model texts and preliminary recount-writing activities, but did not find systematic revision guidance or recount-specific criteria in the final assessment rubric examined. An interview with one Grade IX Indonesian language teacher provided information about teaching practices, digital-media constraints, and views on AI use. A questionnaire completed by 56 students from two Grade IX classes added their reported experience of recount-writing instruction, GenAI use, awareness of potential risks, and expectations for teaching materials. Together, these sources provide a context-specific basis for identifying instructional needs; they do not establish the effectiveness of a teaching framework.

This study examines two Grade IX Indonesian language textbooks, one teacher's account, and questionnaire responses from 56 students to identify context-specific needs in recount-writing instruction. It compares findings from these sources and considers them alongside literature on recount writing, AI-assisted writing, AI literacy, cognitive off-loading, academic integrity, and design-based learning (DBL). On this basis, the study proposes a preliminary pedagogical framework that distinguishes student-led writing tasks from limited GenAI assistance and specifies possible prompts and process evidence, including notes, timelines, drafts, AI interactions, and revision decisions. DBL is used to organise the proposed activities; neither a DBL intervention nor the framework was

⁹ Yi Yan et al., "Perceptions of AI in Higher Education: Insights from Students at a Top-Tier Chinese University," *Education Sciences* 15, no. 6 (June 1, 2025), <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15060735>.

¹⁰ Johanna Fleckenstein et al., "Do Teachers Spot AI? Evaluating the Detectability of AI-Generated Texts among Student Essays," *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* 6 (June 1, 2024), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100209>.

implemented or evaluated. The framework therefore requires expert review and classroom testing

METHODS

This study conducted a qualitative needs analysis supplemented by a descriptive student questionnaire. The qualitative component comprised a semi-structured interview with one Grade IX Indonesian language teacher and qualitative content analysis of instructional materials. The questionnaire provided students' reports of their experience with recount-writing instruction, GenAI use, perceived risks, and expectations for teaching materials. Findings from these sources were compared to identify context-specific instructional needs. Qualitative content analysis was used to code, group, and interpret the document and interview data ¹¹.

The study was conducted in the context of Grade IX Indonesian language instruction at one public junior high school. One Grade IX Indonesian language teacher served as the interview informant because of their direct involvement in planning, teaching, and assessing recount-writing instruction. The Grade IX Indonesian Language Student's Book and Teacher's Book of the Merdeka Curriculum, particularly Chapter III, "Komunikasi Ujung Jari," were selected for document analysis because they contain learning objectives, model texts, activities, writing tasks, media, and assessment guidance relevant to recount texts. The questionnaire yielded 56 valid responses: 28 from class IX KI-5 and 28 from class IX KI-6. The two classes were designated by the teacher for questionnaire administration; they were not randomly selected.

Data were collected through a semi-structured interview, document analysis, and printed questionnaire sheets. The document-review sheet covered learning objectives and outcomes, text types and examples, recount-text structure and linguistic features, modelling, prewriting, drafting, feedback, revision, digital media, and assessment rubrics. The interview guide covered teaching strategies, instructional materials, digital media, implementation challenges, supervision of AI use, approaches to checking writing authenticity, and teaching-material needs. The interview was documented in interview notes. The questionnaire contained 11 items; this article reports six selected items (Q1, Q3, Q5, Q6, Q10, and Q11) addressing recount-writing experience and interest, AI use as a thinking companion, reported copying of AI-generated content, perceived risks, and expectations for teaching materials. P1, P3, and P5 used a four-point frequency scale ranging from never (1) to very often (4). Q6, Q10, and Q11 used a four-point agreement scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4).

The documents and interview documented were analysed through repeated reading, identification of meaning units, coding, categorisation, cross-source comparison,

¹¹ Hsiu Fang Hsieh and Sarah E. Shannon, "Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis," *Qualitative Health Research* 15, no. 9 (2005): 1277–88, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687>.

and theme identification . Units of analysis included sentences, activity instructions, model texts, tables, rubrics, and statements made by the interviewed teacher about recount-text instruction and AI use. Initial codes reflected the research focus: learning objectives, model texts, the writing process, digital media, implementation barriers, AI use, assessment, and teaching-material needs. Additional codes were developed from the data, including the absence of recount-specific criteria in the final assessment rubric examined, the shift from recount writing to a letter or email as the final task, a difference in themes between the two books, and the absence of systematic revision guidance. The resulting learning-needs themes informed the proposed framework.

The six selected questionnaire items were analysed descriptively. Frequencies, percentages, means, and sample standard deviations were calculated for each item using 56 valid responses. For Q1, Q3, and Q5, scores 3–4 represented the two higher frequency categories; for Q6, Q10, and Q11, they represented *agree* and *strongly agree*. Q5 was interpreted in its original direction: higher scores indicated more frequent reported submission of assignments containing content partly or entirely copied and pasted from GenAI. No composite score was calculated because the selected items addressed different aspects of students' experiences and perceptions.

Findings from the Student's Book, Teacher's Book, teacher interview, and student questionnaire were compared by topic to identify convergences, complementary perspectives, and differences. Students' self-reports were not treated as direct evidence of observed writing behaviour. An analysis matrix recorded sources, meaning units, codes, categories, themes, and relevant questionnaire findings. The integrated findings were then considered alongside literature on recount texts, GenAI in writing instruction, AI literacy, cognitive off-loading, academic integrity, and design-based learning. This synthesis informed provisional principles for GenAI assistance, learning activities, and process-evidence-based assessment. Source comparison and documentation of the analysis trail were used to support the trustworthiness of the interpretation . The proposed framework was not implemented or evaluated in this study ¹².

Table 1 Research Stages

Stage	Activity	Output
Focus setting	Setting the analysis focus on recount text instruction, use of generative AI, the writing process, and teaching material needs	Focus, scope, and initial categories of analysis
Data collection	Collecting the Grade IX Indonesian Language Student's Book and Teacher's Book in Chapter III	Corpus of learning documents
Teacher interview	Collecting data on teaching practices, media, barriers, AI use, and teaching material needs	Interview notes
Student questionnaire	Collecting responses to 11 items from 56 students in classes IX	Valid student questionnaire responses
Repeated reading	Reading documents and interview results thoroughly	Initial codes and emerging codes
Categorization	Grouping codes with similar meanings	Categorization and learning needs themes

¹² Andrew K. Shenton, "Strategies for Ensuring Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research Projects," *Education for Information* 22 (2004): 63–75.

Stage	Activity	Output
Descriptive questionnaire analysis	Calculating item level frequencies, percentages, means, and sample standard deviations	Descriptive findings for the six reported items
Integration of findings	Comparing document, teacher interview, and students questionnaire findings by topic	Converging, complementary, or differing findings
Conceptual synthesis	Linking needs themes with relevant literature	Provisional principles for GenAI assistance, learning activities, and process evidence based assessment

RESULTS

The findings were drawn from three sources: the Grade IX Indonesian Language Student's Book and Teacher's Book, an interview with one Grade IX Indonesian language teacher, and questionnaire responses from 56 students in two Grade IX classes. The document and interview findings are presented under five themes: (1) learning outcomes and the scope of recount-text instruction; (2) writing activities and revision; (3) alignment and assessment in the two books; (4) teaching practices and digital technology; and (5) AI use and teaching-material needs. Results from six selected questionnaire items are then presented and compared with the document and interview findings.

Learning Outcomes and Scope of Recount Texts

Analysis of the Grade IX Indonesian Language Student's Book and Teacher's Book shows that recount-text instruction appears in Chapter III, "Komunikasi Ujung Jari"¹³. The chapter's learning objectives address understanding information in recount texts; distinguishing facts, opinions, and assumptions; discussing texts; listening to video-based recounts; examining social-media vocabulary; using dictionaries; identifying loanwords; and writing response letters or emails based on recount texts.

One learning objective in the Student's Book asks students to use recount texts when writing emails or replying to letters. The Teacher's Book organises instruction around four Phase D language-skill components: reading and viewing, speaking and presenting, listening, and writing. Activities within the writing component include short recount texts and formal response letters or emails

Factual recounts predominate among the sample texts in the Student's Book. The news article "Muncul dan Hilangnya Kosakata Baru" and the historical text "Perkembangan Teknologi Komunikasi" are examples. The latter presents an orientation to the development of communication devices, a chronological

¹³ Eva Y. Nukman, Anna Farida Kurniasari, and Helva Nurhidayah, "Komunikasi Ujung Jari," in *Bahasa Indonesia SMP/MTs Kelas IX*, ed. Herry Prasetyo, pertama (Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Badan Standar, Kurikulum, dan Asesmen Pendidikan, 2022), 65–98, <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/>; Eva Y. Nukman, Anna Farida Kurniasari, and Helva Nurhidayah, "Komunikasi Ujung Jari," in *Buku Panduan Guru Bahasa Indonesia SMP/MTs Kelas IX*, ed. Herry Prasetyo, Pertama (Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Badan Standar, Kurikulum, dan Asesmen Pendidikan, 2022), 121–56.

account of events, and a reorientation addressing the effects of technological change. The document analysis did not identify a complete example of an imaginative recount in Chapter III.

The materials also address mobile phones, online communication, the internet, social media, hoaxes, and vocabulary used by internet users. These topics connect the chapter's activities to students' experiences with communication technology.

Table 2 Learning Outcomes and Scope of Recount Text Instruction in the Student's Book and Teacher's Book

Aspect	Document analysis findings
Learning objectives	Students are directed to understand recount texts, distinguish facts, opinions, and assumptions, and write response letters or emails using recount texts
Phase D Learning Outcome elements	Reading and viewing, speaking and presenting, listening, and writing
Sample texts	Factual recount texts in the form of a history of communication technology development and news articles
Text structure	Sample texts contain an orientation, a series of chronological events, and a reorientation
Material context	Communication technology, the internet, social media, hoaxes, and netizen vocabulary
Text types	Factual recounts are available; an imaginative recount example was not found in full

Writing Activity Flow and Writing Process Gaps

According to the document analysis, instruction begins with reading model texts. The first activity in the Student's Book, "Understanding Factual Recount Texts," asks students to read independently. The book also introduces brainstorming in the "Getting Ready to Learn" section and prompts students to explore personal experiences before writing.

These activities provide an initial prewriting stage. Students are then asked to write a personal recount of approximately 300 words about their experiences with social media or the internet. The sequence therefore moves from reading model texts and exploring experiences to producing an initial draft.

The sections of the Student's Book and Teacher's Book examined did not provide a systematic procedure for revising drafts. They did not include an editing checklist, content-revision criteria, instructions for checking recount-text structure, or a sequenced approach to revising language. One activity asks students to share sentences they have written with peers to improve their texts, but it does not set out a structured revision process.

The documents also ask students to write short recount texts. In a subsequent final performance task, however, students are asked to write a formal letter or email in response to an editor or book publisher. Thus, the final task produces a letter or reply email rather than a standalone recount text.

Table 3 Recount Text Writing Instruction Flow and Gaps Found

Instructional stage	Evidence in the Student's Book/Teacher's Book	Findings
Modeling	Students read the text "The Development of Communication Technology"	A factual recount model text is available
Brainstorming	The "Getting Ready to Learn" rubric and exploration of personal experiences	An initial prewriting stage is available
Drafting	Students write a personal recount text of about 300 words about their experience using the internet or social media	An initial draft is available as a writing activity
Feedback	Exchange of sentences with peers	Feedback is available to a limited extent
Revision	No revision guidelines, checklist, or systematic editing procedure were found	The revision stage is not yet structured
Final product	Writing a formal letter or response email	The final product is a formal letter or response email

Source: Analysis of the Grade IX Indonesian Language Student's Book and Teacher's Book, particularly Activity 1, Activity 8, Activity 9a, and Activity 13.

Synchronisation of the Teacher's and Student's Books

The Teacher's Book supports some activities in the Student's Book. For example, it provides "Social Media and Our Youth" as an alternative text that the teacher and students can use when digital devices or internet access are unavailable.

The document analysis also identified a difference in topic between the two books. Chapter III of the Student's Book addresses social media, the internet, and communication technology under the theme "Komunikasi Ujung Jari." By contrast, page 122 of the Teacher's Book refers to volunteer activities related to a reading garden.

The final-task assessment rubric examined in the Teacher's Book focuses on the format and content of a letter or email, including the accuracy of its content, letter format, and courteous language. It does not explicitly list orientation, a sequence of events, or reorientation as criteria for assessing recount-text structure. Recount-text language features, such as action verbs, temporal conjunctions, and expressions of time and place, are also not explicitly listed in this rubric.

Table 4 Synchronization and Assessment in the Student's Book and Teacher's Book

Aspect	Findings	Description
Theme synchronization	The Student's Book theme is "Fingertip Communication," while the Teacher's Book contains a volunteerism/reading garden theme	There is a theme difference between the Student's Book and Teacher's Book
Offline alternative	The Teacher's Book provides the text "Social Media and Our Youth"	The material can be used when internet access is limited
Assessment rubric	No specific recount text rubric is available	The final rubric focuses on letter/email format

Text structure	Orientation, series of events, and reorientation are not listed in the final rubric	Recount text structure does not appear as criteria in the final assessment
Language features	Temporal conjunctions, action verbs, and time/place adverbials are not listed in the final rubric	Language features of recount texts do not appear as final assessment criteria

Source: Analysis of the Grade IX Indonesian Language Teacher's Book, including Table 3 and Chapter III material.

Teaching Methods for Recount Text Writing

According to the interview, the teacher begins recount-text instruction with a question-and-answer session. Students then read recount texts from the textbook, discuss them in groups, present their findings, and receive further explanation from the teacher. The teacher reported using textbooks, student worksheets (LKPD), newspapers, and recount-text videos from YouTube as instructional resources.

The teacher identified LKPD, model recount texts, and motivational YouTube videos featuring young entrepreneurs as particularly helpful resources. According to the teacher, the videos help students visualise the content, LKPD guide learning activities, and model texts illustrate the form of recount writing. The teacher considered newspapers less engaging for students because they contain few illustrations and are predominantly printed in black and white.

The teacher also reported using YouTube to present inspirational stories or model recount texts and Canva to create infographics. Limited internet access, an insufficient number of projectors, and students playing games on their phones during lessons were challenges identified in the interview.

Table 5 Interview Findings on Teaching Practice and Technology

Aspect	Teacher interview findings
Teaching methods	Question and answer, reading texts, group discussion, presentation, teacher explanation, and assignments
Teaching materials	Textbooks, LKPD, newspapers, and recount texts from YouTube
Media considered helpful	LKPD, sample recount texts, and inspirational story videos
Less preferred media	Newspapers, because they have few illustrations and black-and-white visuals
Digital technology	Canva is used for infographics; YouTube is used as a source of videos or sample texts
Obstacles	Limited internet access, few projectors, and distraction from mobile phone use for gaming

Source: Interviews with Grade IX Indonesian Language teachers.

AI Use and the Need for Educational Materials

The findings of the interviews indicate that instructors have not explicitly taught recount text writing using The interviewed teacher reported that generative artificial intelligence (AI) had not been explicitly incorporated into recount-writing instruction. According to the teacher, students had encountered AI in

Informatics and KKA classes, but its use had not been revisited in Indonesian language lessons.

The teacher reported occasionally using AI when reviewing students' writing. In most cases, however, the teacher examined students' usual writing styles. Writing perceived as unusually flat, repetitive, overly formal, or lacking personal perspective prompted closer examination for possible AI assistance. These features reflect the teacher's concerns; they do not establish that a text was produced with AI. The teacher also reported occasionally using AI as an additional aid when examining a student's work.

The teacher stated that AI use in writing assignments should be limited and monitored. In the teacher's view, students should develop the content and wording of their texts themselves, while AI may help them explore ideas, concepts, or examples. When the teacher suspected that AI use was inconsistent with an assignment's learning objectives, the reported responses included explaining the purpose of the writing task again, asking the student to rewrite the text, or reducing the grade.

The teacher expressed a need for materials that explain types of recount texts, clarify their writing components, and guide students through writing activities. The teacher also hoped that digital resources and AI could support students' writing without replacing their creativity or responsibility for developing ideas.

Table 6 Interview Findings on AI Use and Teaching Material Needs

Aspect	Teacher interview findings
AI instruction	Not yet specifically taught in recount text writing instruction
Reason not yet taught	Teachers consider that material on AI use has been provided in Informatics and KKA subjects
Checking for AI assistance	Done mainly through observation of students' language style; occasionally uses AI
Indications of writing that need to be checked	Flat, monotonous, overly formal language that lacks subjectivity
Limits of AI use	AI can be used to seek ideas or examples; content and language style are developed by students
Response to indications of inappropriate use	Re-explaining the purpose of creative writing, grade reduction, or rewriting
Teaching material needs	Explanation of text types, writing elements, and more directed writing practice guidance
Expectations for AI use	AI supports ideas and writing skills without stifling students' imagination

Source: Interviews with Grade IX Indonesian Language teachers

Student Questionnaire Findings

Table 7 presents the results of the six questionnaire items selected for this article. Three items (Q1, Q3, and Q5) used a frequency response format, whereas Q6, Q10, and Q11 used an agreement response format. For Q1, 19 students (33.9%) selected scores 3–4 for experience of recount-writing instruction or assignments; 37 students (66.1%)

selected scores 1–2. For Q6, 35 students (62.5%) agreed or strongly agreed that they were interested and motivated to participate in recount-writing activities.

For Q3, 49 students (87.5%) selected scores 3–4 for using AI as a thinking companion, such as to seek ideas, ask questions, or discuss. For Q5, 24 students (42.9%) selected scores 3–4 for having submitted a writing assignment containing content partly or entirely copied and pasted from GenAI, while 32 (57.1%) selected scores 1–2. P5 does not distinguish partial from complete copying.

For Q10, 53 students (94.6%) agreed or strongly agreed that inappropriate GenAI use could reduce their thinking and writing abilities. For Q11, 55 students (98.2%) agreed or strongly agreed that they hoped for appropriately integrated GenAI recount-writing materials that would help them learn independently. These are students' responses to questionnaire statements; they are not direct measures of writing proficiency or observed AI use.

Table 7 Selected Student Questionnaire Findings (N=56)

Item	Questionnaire statement	Response format	Mean	SD	Score 3-4 n/N (%)
Q1	I have experience participating in recount-writing instruction, through learning activities or writing assignments.	Frequency	2.32	0.79	19/56 (33.9%)
Q3	I have used AI as a thinking companion, for example, to seek ideas, ask questions, or discuss.	Frequency	3.27	0.77	49/56 (87.5)
Q5	I have submitted a writing assignment containing content partly or entirely copied and pasted from GenAI.	Frequency	2.38	0.89	24/56 (42.9%)
Q6	I am interested and motivated to participate in recount-writing activities.	Agreement	2.75	0.72	35/56 (62.5%)
Q10	I am aware that inappropriate GenAI use may reduce my thinking and writing abilities.	Agreement	3.70	0.63	53/56 (94.6%)
Q11	I hope that appropriately GenAI-integrated recount-writing materials will be available and help me learn to write independently.	Agreement	3.50	0.60	55/56 (98.2%)

DISCUSSION

The Requirement of Scaffolds for Recount Text Writing

The Student's Book includes model texts, brainstorming activities, opportunities to explore personal experiences, and initial recount-writing tasks (Table 3). However, the sections of the Student's Book and Teacher's Book examined do not provide systematic revision guidance. The final-task rubric examined also does not explicitly assess recount-text structure or its linguistic features (Table 4). Together, these findings provide a rationale for proposing

writing scaffolds that connect prewriting, drafting, feedback, revision, and reflection, rather than focusing solely on additional media.

The student questionnaire adds a complementary perspective to the document findings. For Q1, 37 of 56 students (66.1%) selected the two lower frequency categories for experience of recount-writing instruction or assignments. Meanwhile, 35 students (62.5%) agreed or strongly agreed that they were interested and motivated to participate in recount-writing activities (Q6). These responses do not identify which writing stage students find difficult. Considered alongside the document findings, however, they support the relevance of exploring more explicit guidance from planning through revision. The form and usefulness of such guidance remain to be evaluated.

Recount writing requires students to select relevant experiences or facts, organise events chronologically, and develop a text with an orientation, a sequence of events, and a reorientation. Students also need to use action verbs, temporal conjunctions, and expressions of time and place to make relationships between events clear¹⁴. In this context, assessment of the final text alone cannot show how students selected material, planned the chronology, or revised their draft.

The materials examined include initial drafting activities but do not set out a structured revision procedure. Revision can address the completeness of information, the sequence of events, consistency of content, text structure, and use of linguistic features not only spelling and punctuation. The proposed materials therefore include process artefacts such as 5W+1H notes, timelines, outlines, initial drafts, peer feedback, revision checklists, revision decision logs, and final texts. These are proposed components, not materials whose effectiveness was tested in this study.

The shift from a recount text to a response letter or email in the final task also needs to be considered. Letters and emails may serve their own communication objectives, but the final-task rubric examined does not explicitly assess the structure and linguistic features of a standalone recount text. For that reason, the proposed design uses a recount text as the primary assessment product when the learning objective is to assess students' recount-writing skills.

Adaptable Digital Educational Resources for Implementation Situations

Table 5 summarises the interviewed teacher's use of student worksheets (LKPD), model texts, YouTube videos, Canva infographics, and newspapers in recount-text instruction. The teacher considered LKPD, model texts, and videos helpful because they provide concrete examples and guide learning activities. The interview also identified limited internet access, an insufficient number of projectors, and students playing games on their phones during lessons as implementation challenges. These findings suggest that a proposed digital resource should not assume reliable connectivity or classroom access to projection equipment.

¹⁴ Anderson and Anderson, *Text Types in English*.

The proposed materials therefore allow core writing activities to be completed using LKPD or printed resources. These activities include analysing model texts, exploring personal experiences or checking facts, constructing timelines, preparing outlines, and drafting recount texts. The alternative text “Media Sosial dan Remaja Kita” in the Teacher’s Book illustrates an existing option for lessons without internet access. Digital resources, including videos, infographics, a learning management system, and GenAI, are positioned as optional supports rather than requirements for completing the core writing tasks.

Access to an application alone does not determine how it should be integrated into writing instruction. The proposed design also considers learning objectives, opportunities for students to evaluate AI output, and their responsibility for writing decisions ¹⁵. It positions GenAI as a possible source of reflective questions, feedback on the clarity of an event sequence, alternative wording, or suggestions on spelling and punctuation. Students would still select their content, plan the chronology, prepare an outline, and write an initial draft independently. Cardon et al. discuss AI literacy in relation to application, authenticity, accountability, and agency; their study provides a conceptual point of comparison here, not evidence that this proposed Grade IX design is effective. This arrangement offers an offline route through the proposed writing activities and an optional digital route when devices and connectivity are available. The study did not implement either route, so it cannot establish whether the arrangement would resolve access constraints or improve learning outcomes.

Generative AI as a Thinking Companion: The Boundaries of Support and Process Replacement

According to Table 6, the interviewed teacher supports limited AI use to explore concepts, ideas, or examples while expecting students to develop the content and language of their own texts. This view informs the proposed distinction between GenAI as an aid to thinking and GenAI as a replacement for core writing tasks. Research on AI-assisted writing likewise emphasises preserving students’ role in the writing process ¹⁶.

The student questionnaire adds a further reason to examine this distinction. For Q3, 49 of 56 students (87.5%) selected the two higher frequency categories for using AI as a thinking companion. For Q5, 24 students (42.9%) selected the two higher frequency categories for submitting writing assignments containing content partly or entirely copied and pasted from GenAI. These items do not show whether the same students gave both responses, nor does Q5 distinguish partial from complete copying. Thus, the results show that both types of use were reported in the surveyed classes; they do not establish a relationship

¹⁵ Cardon et al., “The Challenges and Opportunities of AI-Assisted Writing: Developing AI Literacy for the AI Age.”

¹⁶ Wang, “Exploring Students’ Generative AI-Assisted Writing Processes: Perceptions and Experiences from Native and Nonnative English Speakers”; Tate et al., “Incorporating Generative AI into a Writing-Intensive Undergraduate Course without off-Loading Learning.”

between the two. The proposed framework specifies which writing decisions remain with students and which forms of AI assistance may be considered.

In the proposed framework, *productive assistance* refers to AI support for a specific task while students retain responsibility for evaluating its output and making writing decisions. Examples include asking questions based on students' notes, identifying an unclear event sequence, flagging repeated temporal conjunctions, suggesting alternative words, and checking spelling or punctuation. Students remain responsible for their ideas, initial drafts, and decisions about revision.

By contrast, AI would replace a core learning task if it selected a student's personal experience, chose facts without verification, created a timeline or outline from scratch, or generated a complete recount-text draft. Such uses could reduce opportunities to practise selecting information, organising events, and developing a personal voice. Concerns about over-reliance on AI provide a rationale for examining these boundaries, but this study did not measure a decline in students' cognitive abilities¹⁷.

The proposed sequence therefore asks students to prepare experience notes or factual information, a timeline, an outline, and an initial draft independently before using AI for targeted questions or feedback. This is a design choice, not a sequence shown by this study to be more effective than earlier AI use. It is informed by writing-instruction research that encourages students to think before using AI and to reflect on its contribution¹⁸.

The interviewed teacher's expressed need for more directed writing materials is complemented by Q11: 55 of 56 students (98.2%) agreed or strongly agreed that they hoped for appropriately integrated GenAI recount-writing materials that would help them learn independently. This correspondence supports the local relevance of developing such materials. It does not mean that the students assessed or approved the specific framework proposed here.

Table 8 Classification of GenAI Assistance in the Recount Text Writing Process

Form of GenAI use	Category	Position in the design	Pedagogical basis
Asking AI to determine personal experiences	Replacement of core process	Not allowed	Experiences and ownership of ideas must come from students
Asking AI to select facts without verification	Replacement of core process	Not allowed	Risks producing inaccurate or unjustifiable information
Asking AI to construct a timeline or outline from scratch	Replacement of core process	Not allowed	Replaces practice in organizing ideas and chronology

¹⁷ Zhai, Wibowo, and Li, "The Effects of Over-Reliance on AI Dialogue Systems on Students' Cognitive Abilities: A Systematic Review."

¹⁸ Tate et al., "Incorporating Generative AI into a Writing-Intensive Undergraduate Course without off-Loading Learning."

Asking AI to create a recount text or a complete draft	Replacement of core process	Not allowed	Replaces students' core writing activities
Asking AI to pose 5W+1H questions based on students' notes	Productive assistance	Allowed to a limited extent	Helps elaboration without producing the main content
Asking AI to check the clarity of the chronology of one paragraph	Productive assistance	After the initial draft is available	Supports reflection and revision
Asking AI to flag repeated temporal conjunctions	Productive assistance	Allowed to a limited extent	Supports language editing
Asking AI to provide alternative word choices	Productive assistance	With student evaluation	Final decisions remain with students

Guidelines for Using Generative AI as a Thinking Companion

This study proposes six provisional principles for positioning GenAI as a thinking companion in recount writing. They were formulated by considering the document analysis, an interview with one teacher, selected student questionnaire responses, and relevant literature. The principles distinguish support for students' writing decisions from AI use that replaces those decisions. They have not been tested as instructional guidelines.

The first principle is student ownership of ideas. Students determine the content, purpose, and sequence of their texts. They select personal experiences for personal recounts and check the facts included in factual recounts. This principle is intended to keep substantive writing decisions with students.

The second principle is independent work before AI use. In the proposed sequence, students prepare notes, answer 5W+1H questions, construct a timeline and outline, and write an initial draft before seeking AI feedback. These artefacts give students a basis for evaluating whether AI suggestions fit their experiences, information, and writing purpose. The sequence is a design choice informed by research that encourages students to think before using AI; it has not been tested in this Grade IX setting ¹⁹.

The third principle is limited AI assistance. After students have produced an initial draft, AI may pose reflective questions, identify an unclear sequence of events, suggest alternative wording, or help check spelling and grammar. It is not used to produce the complete text in this proposed design. Students evaluate any suggestions before revising their work. ²⁰

The fourth principle is guided prompting. A prompt specifies the writing context, the purpose of the request, the part of the student's text under review, and the limits of the assistance requested. This structure aims to direct AI interaction toward a specific writing decision rather than a request to generate a

¹⁹ Wang, "Exploring Students' Generative AI-Assisted Writing Processes: Perceptions and Experiences from Native and Nonnative English Speakers"; Tate et al., "Incorporating Generative AI into a Writing-Intensive Undergraduate Course without off-Loading Learning."

²⁰ Fleckenstein et al., "Do Teachers Spot AI? Evaluating the Detectability of AI-Generated Texts among Student Essays."

complete recount. Formulating requests and evaluating responses are relevant to AI literacy ²¹.

For example, a student could use the following prompt:

"I am writing a recount of my experience in a scouting activity. Here is one paragraph from my draft. Do not rewrite it. Ask me no more than three questions that could help me clarify the sequence of events and add relevant details."

The fifth principle is critical evaluation of AI output. Students decide whether to accept, modify, or reject a suggestion by checking it against their experiences or sources, the text's chronology and structure, and the needs of the reader. The sixth principle is transparency about AI use. The proposed activities ask students to document relevant prompts, AI responses, and revision decisions so that the teacher can examine how the text developed, rather than relying only on the final product. Research on assessment design provides a rationale for making students' contributions and the permitted role of AI explicit.

Student responses support the relevance of addressing evaluation and transparency, but they do not demonstrate that these principles work. For Q10, 53 of 56 students (94.6%) agreed or strongly agreed that inappropriate GenAI use might reduce their thinking and writing abilities. This is a report of perceived risk, not a measured decline in either ability. The six principles therefore remain provisional design decisions requiring expert review and classroom testing²².

Table 9 Principles for Integrating GenAI as a Thinking Companion

Principle	Operational rule	Learning evidence
Ownership of ideas	Experience, facts, purpose, chronology, and text meaning are determined by students	Notes on experience or sources of facts
Independent before AI	Students create notes, timelines, outlines, and initial drafts before using AI	5W+1H sheet, timeline, outline, and initial draft
Limited assistance	AI is used for questions, feedback, vocabulary, or language checking	<i>Prompts with specific assistance purposes</i>
<i>Guided prompts</i>	<i>Prompts include context, purpose, text section, and limits of assistance</i>	Student prompt documents
Critical evaluation	Students accept, modify, or reject suggestions with reasons	Revision decision log
Transparency	AI use traces are recorded and attached	Relevant AI responses, revised drafts, and reflection

DBL as a Writing Process Organization Framework

In this study, design-based learning (DBL) is used to organise the proposed recount-writing activities, not as an intervention whose effectiveness is tested. DBL emphasises inquiry, the creation and refinement of a product, teacher

²¹ Cardon et al., "The Challenges and Opportunities of AI-Assisted Writing: Developing AI Literacy for the AI Age."

²² Martine Peters and Dimitar Angelov, "Redefining Assessment Tasks to Promote Students' Creativity and Integrity in the Age of Generative Artificial Intelligence," *International Journal for Educational Integrity* 21, no. 1 (2025), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-025-00201-x>.

scaffolding, and attention to both the process and the resulting product²³. These features provide a rationale for adapting a design-oriented sequence to recount writing, in which students develop a text from selected facts or personal experiences through drafting and revision.

The proposed sequence begins with identifying the writing task and examining model texts. During inquiry, students explore personal experiences or check factual information. During ideation, they prepare a timeline and outline. They then write an initial draft independently. The evaluation and improvement stage involves peer feedback, limited AI feedback, revision, and reflection. Positioning AI feedback after the initial draft is a choice made in this proposed design so that students first undertake the central planning and drafting tasks themselves; this study did not test whether that sequence is more effective than other approaches.

DBL is not intended to replace the Indonesian language learning outcomes for Phase D. Rather, the proposed activities are intended to support students in understanding model texts, selecting content, organising events, drafting, and revising their recounts²⁴. The suggested process artefacts would allow a teacher to examine both the final text and the decisions made during writing. The extent to which this design supports the intended learning outcomes remains to be evaluated.

Table 10 Mapping of DBL Stages, GenAI Position, and Process Evidence in Recount Text Writing

DBL stage	Student activities	GenAI position	Process evidence
Problem identification	Identifying writing difficulties and analyzing model texts	Not used	Notes on difficulties and text analysis sheets
Inquiry	Exploring experiences or verifying facts through WH-questions	Not used	Notes on events or sources of facts
Ideation	Determining focus, creating a timeline, and preparing an outline	Not used	Timeline and outline
Construction	Writing an initial draft of a recount text	Not used	Independent initial draft
Evaluation	Peer review, language checking, limited feedback, revision, and reflection	Used in a limited way	Prompts, AI responses, revision log, final draft, and reflection

Transparency in AI Use and Process Evidence-Based Assessment

The proposed assessment approach considers both the writing process and the final recount text. The final text allows a teacher to examine its content, chronology, structure, and language, but it cannot by itself show how students

²³ Puente, Eijk, and Jochems, "A Sampled Literature Review of Design-Based Learning Approaches: A Search for Key Characteristics."

²⁴ Kementerian Pendidikan et al., *Bahasa Indonesia SMP/MTs Kelas IX*, 2022, <https://buku.kemdikbud.go.id>.

developed ideas or made revision decisions. Peters and Angelov's Academic Integrity and Creativity in the Age of Artificial Intelligence (AICAI) model is relevant here because it draws attention to authentic tasks, students' ownership of their work, decisions about cognitive off-loading, and clear instructions and assessment criteria for GenAI use²⁵. Their model concerns higher education; its relevance to this Grade IX proposal is conceptual rather than evidence that the proposed assessment will work in this setting.

The proposed process evidence comprises 5W+1H notes, timelines, outlines, initial drafts, relevant prompts and AI responses, revision decision logs, reflections, and final texts. Such records could help a teacher discuss students' writing decisions and the role of AI in revision. If a final text appears inconsistent with the available drafts or process records, the teacher could ask the student to explain specific revisions or complete a short independent writing task. These steps are proposed procedures; this study did not test whether they accurately establish authorship or improve assessment.

AI-detection tools are not proposed as the sole basis for judging a student's work. Fleckenstein et al. found that distinguishing AI-generated from student-written essays can be difficult even for teachers²⁶. A teacher could instead examine the relationship between a student's drafts, recorded AI interactions, revisions, and explanation of their writing decisions. This evidence may provide a fuller basis for discussion, but it should not be treated as conclusive proof that AI was or was not used.

Table 11 Process Evidence for Assessing GenAI-Assisted Recount Text Writing

Stage	Evidence collected	Assessment function
Before using AI	5W+1H notes, sources of facts, timeline, outline, and initial draft	Assessing ownership of ideas and independent planning
When using AI	<i>Prompts and relevant AI responses</i>	Assessing the purpose and limits of AI assistance
After using AI	Revision decision log, final draft, and reflection	Assessing critical evaluation and student decisions
Clarification	Brief teacher–student conference if needed	Confirming understanding of content, information sources, and reasons for revision

Contributions, Limitations, and Future Research Paths

The study's conceptual contribution is a set of proposed principles for positioning GenAI as a thinking companion in recount writing: student ownership of ideas, independent work before AI use, limited AI assistance, guided prompts, critical evaluation of AI output, and transparency about AI use. Its operational contribution is a proposed sequence for AI use, a classification of

²⁵ Peters and Angelov, "Redefining Assessment Tasks to Promote Students' Creativity and Integrity in the Age of Generative Artificial Intelligence."

²⁶ Fleckenstein et al., "Do Teachers Spot AI? Evaluating the Detectability of AI-Generated Texts among Student Essays."

possible forms of assistance, and examples of process evidence that could be collected during writing.

The framework offers a starting point for designing recount-writing activities in which students retain responsibility for their experiences, factual choices, chronology, content, and revisions. It also includes offline activities so that the proposed writing sequence does not depend entirely on digital devices or internet access. Neither feature has been tested in classroom implementation.

This study drew on two instructional books, an interview with one teacher, and questionnaire responses from 56 students in two classes at one school. The six questionnaire items reported here address different aspects of students' experiences and perceptions rather than forming a single validated scale. As self-reports, the responses do not directly document students' AI use or writing performance. The framework has not undergone expert validation or classroom implementation. The findings therefore describe local needs and inform a provisional design; they do not establish its practicality, effectiveness, or applicability to other schools.

Further research should review the framework with relevant experts, examine its feasibility and practicality in Grade IX classrooms, and evaluate its effects on students' writing processes and recount texts. Future studies could also assess students' evaluation of AI output, transparency about AI use, and teacher and student responses to the materials.

CONCLUSION

This study identified context-specific needs for Grade IX recount-writing instruction through analysis of the Student's Book and Teacher's Book, an interview with one Indonesian language teacher, and questionnaire responses from 56 students. The materials examined included model texts and initial writing activities, but did not provide systematic revision guidance or recount-specific criteria in the final assessment rubric examined. Students also reported using AI as a thinking companion and, in some cases, submitting writing assignments containing content partly or entirely copied from GenAI. Their responses indicated an expectation for appropriately integrated GenAI teaching materials. In response to these findings, the study proposes a preliminary pedagogical framework that distinguishes student-led writing tasks from limited AI assistance and uses process evidence to make writing decisions visible. This framework is an unvalidated design proposal, not an established instructional guideline. Because it has not undergone expert review or classroom implementation, its practicality and effects on students' recount writing remain unknown.

REFERENCES

- Alpar, Özlem. "Evaluating Generative AI Tools for Improving English Writing Skills: A Preliminary Comparison of ChatGPT-4, Google Gemini, and Microsoft Copilot." *European Journal of Educational Research* 14, no. 4 (October 1, 2025): 1291–1308. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.14.4.1291>.
- Alwasilah, Yuzaki Adam, and Wawan Gunawan. "A Systemic Functional Linguistic Study on Language Use of Indonesian Students in Writing." *JOMANTARA: Indonesian Journal of Art and Culture* 3, no. 2 (2023): 110–24.
- Anderson, Mark, and Kathryn Anderson. *Text Types in English*. Vol. 1. Macmillan Education AU, 1997.
- Andrew K. Shenton. "Strategies for Ensuring Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research Projects." *Education for Information* 22 (2004): 63–75.
- Borge, M., B. K. Smith, and T. Aldemir. "Using Generative Ai as a Simulation to Support Higher-Order Thinking." *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning* 19, no. 4 (December 1, 2024): 479–532. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-024-09437-0>.
- Cardon, Peter, Carolin Fleischmann, Jolanta Aritz, Minna Logemann, and Jeanette Heidewald. "The Challenges and Opportunities of AI-Assisted Writing: Developing AI Literacy for the AI Age." *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly* 86, no. 3 (September 1, 2023): 257–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23294906231176517>.
- Elo, Satu, and Helvi Kyngäs. "The Qualitative Content Analysis Process." *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 62, no. 1 (2008): 107–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x>.
- Fleckenstein, Johanna, Jennifer Meyer, Thorben Jansen, Stefan D. Keller, Olaf Köller, and Jens Möller. "Do Teachers Spot AI? Evaluating the Detectability of AI-Generated Texts among Student Essays." *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence* 6 (June 1, 2024). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100209>.
- Hsieh, Hsiu Fang, and Sarah E. Shannon. "Three Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis." *Qualitative Health Research* 15, no. 9 (2005): 1277–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687>.
- Nukman, Eva Y., Anna Farida Kurniasari, and Helva Nurhidayah. "Komunikasi Ujung Jari." In *Bahasa Indonesia SMP/MTs Kelas IX*, edited by Herry Prasetyo, Pertama., 65–98. Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Badan Standar, Kurikulum, dan Asesmen Pendidikan, 2022. <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/>.
- Nukman, Eva Y., Anna Farida Kurniasari, and Helva Nurhidayah. "Komunikasi Ujung Jari." In *Buku Panduan Guru Bahasa Indonesia SMP/MTs Kelas IX*, edited by Herry Prasetyo, Pertama., 121–56. Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Badan Standar, Kurikulum, dan Asesmen Pendidikan, 2022.
- Pendidikan, Kementerian, Dan Teknologi, Badan Standar, Dan Asesmen Pendidikan, Pusat Perbukuan, Eva Y Nukman, Anna Farida Kurniasari, and Helva Nurhidayah.

Bahasa Indonesia SMP/MTs Kelas IX, 2022. <https://buku.kemdikbud.go.id>.

- Peters, Martine, and Dimitar Angelov. "Redefining Assessment Tasks to Promote Students' Creativity and Integrity in the Age of Generative Artificial Intelligence." *International Journal for Educational Integrity* 21, no. 1 (2025). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-025-00201-x>.
- Puente, Sonia M Gómez, Michiel van Eijk, and Wim Jochems. "A Sampled Literature Review of Design-Based Learning Approaches: A Search for Key Characteristics." *Int J Technol Des Educ* 23, no. 3 (2013): 717–32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10798-012-9212-x>.
- Tate, Tamara P., Beth Harnick-Shapiro, Daniel Robert Ritchie, Waverly Tseng, Michael Dennin, and Mark Warschauer. "Incorporating Generative AI into a Writing-Intensive Undergraduate Course without off-Loading Learning." *Discover Computing* 28, no. 1 (December 1, 2025). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10791-025-09563-9>.
- Wang, Chaoran. "Exploring Students' Generative AI-Assisted Writing Processes: Perceptions and Experiences from Native and Nonnative English Speakers." *Technology, Knowledge and Learning* 30, no. 3 (2024): 1825–46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-024-09744-3>.
- Yan, Yi, Bin Wu, Jiaqi Pi, and Xiaowen Zhang. "Perceptions of AI in Higher Education: Insights from Students at a Top-Tier Chinese University." *Education Sciences* 15, no. 6 (June 1, 2025). <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15060735>.
- Zhai, Chunpeng, Santoso Wibowo, and Lily D. Li. "The Effects of Over-Reliance on AI Dialogue Systems on Students' Cognitive Abilities: A Systematic Review." *Smart Learning Environments* 11, no. 1 (December 1, 2024). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7>.