Foreign Language Instruction Probe
Vol. 5, No. 2, November 2026
https://jurnal.stit-buntetpesantren.ac.id/index

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54213/flip
p-ISSN: 2830-5949
e-ISSN: 2830-4837

Integrating Artificial Intelligence into EFL Writing Activity Planning: A Teacher's Reflective Practice

Edy Waloyo[1*]
Universitas Islam Negeri Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon[1]
edywaloyo@uinssc.ac.id [1]

Ratih Puspa Maulida[2*]
Universitas Islam Negeri Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon[2]
ratihpuspa.maulida@uinssc.ac.id [2]

Received: 31 October 2026
Revised: 1 November 2026
Accepted: 13 November 2026

***Corresponding author:**
Edy Waloyo, English Language teaching Deparment, Universitas Islam Negeri Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon

Abstract

The growing use of artificial intelligence (AI) in education has encouraged English teachers to incorporate tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, and QuillBot into lesson planning. Although previous studies have examined students' writing outcomes and teachers' perceptions of AI, less attention has been paid to teachers' reflective engagement with AI-assisted EFL writing plans, particularly at the junior high school level. This study explored how an English teacher integrated AI tools into writing lesson planning through reflective practices. A qualitative case study involved one English teacher at SMP Negeri X Cirebon, selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, observations with field notes, and lesson plan (RPP) analysis. They were analyzed using Miles and Huberman's interactive model: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. Five themes emerged: AI supported rather than replaced professional judgment; AI-generated materials were evaluated before use; AI was mainly used to design writing activities and instructional methods; pedagogical decisions remained teacher-centered; and challenges included prompt formulation and the risk of overdependence. The findings indicate that effective AI integration in EFL lesson planning requires critical judgment and reflective engagement. Further research could examine these practices across multiple teachers and school contexts.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence; EFL Lesson Planning; Reflective Practice; Teacher Professional Judgment; Writing Instruction.*

To cite this article (APA 7th Edition): Waloyo and Maulida. (2026). Integrating Artificial Intelligence into EFL Writing Activity Planning: A Teacher's Reflective Practice. *Foreign Language Instruction Probe*. https://doi.org/10.54213/flip

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) International License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence is reshaping educational practice by expanding access to learning resources, supporting personalization, and streamlining instructional work (UNESCO, 2023). In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education, tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, and Quill Bot are increasingly available to teachers for preparing lessons, developing materials, and supporting writing instruction. Their growing presence creates opportunities to respond to learners' language needs while raising questions about the quality and appropriateness of AI-generated content. Understanding how teachers incorporate these tools into instructional planning is therefore increasingly important across diverse educational settings today.

Research on AI-supported writing has emphasized its potential to improve learners' performance. AI tools can assist with idea generation, drafting, grammatical accuracy, coherence, and revision Zhai, (2023), while studies have reported benefits for students' grammar, vocabulary, and text organization (Kasneci et al., 2023). These functions are particularly relevant to EFL learners, who develop language proficiency and writing competence concurrently (Alharthi, 2021). However, this learner-centered emphasis provides limited insight into teachers' planning practices. Existing studies also suggest that teachers may use AI to save time and generate materials without consistently evaluating their alignment with curriculum objectives, learner proficiency, and instructional contexts (Marzuki et al., 2023). Such concerns matter because writing instruction involves creativity, self-expression, and higher-order thinking (Tlili et al., 2023).

The limitation is especially evident in research contexts where teachers' professional reflective decisions during lesson planning remain underexamined. Studies have commonly investigated AI-supported writing outcomes Alharbi (2023) and Mekheimer, (2025), while Indonesian studies have described teachers' attitudes and patterns of tool use (Kurniawan, 2026; Mulkiyah, 2024). Neither focus sufficiently explains how teachers evaluate and adapt AI-generated materials before using them to design writing activities. Schön's (1983) concept of reflective practice offers a useful lens for examining this process through reflection-in-action, reflection-on-action, and reflection-for-action. This perspective foregrounds teachers' professional judgment rather than treating AI adoption as a purely technical decision.

Addressing this gap requires examining how teachers assess and adapt AI-generated content to instructional goals and learners' needs. Although AI may facilitate material production, its pedagogical value depends on teachers' capacity to exercise professional judgment and avoid uncritical dependence (Kasneci et al., 2023). Apoko (2025) found that AI use may prioritize rapid material creation over planning activities that develop higher-level writing skills. Accordingly, this study investigates how a school English teacher reflectively integrates AI tools into EFL writing activity planning, focusing on evaluation, modification, and pedagogical decision-making. It applies Schön's (1983) reflective practice framework to AI-assisted writing planning in an Indonesian junior high school context. Specifically, this research addresses the following research questions:

1. How does an English teacher reflectively integrate artificial intelligence tools into the planning of EFL writing activities?
2. What pedagogical considerations and challenges shape the teacher's evaluation, adaptation, and use of AI-generated suggestions in writing activity planning?

Research Methods

This study employed a systematic qualitative approach to examine how an English teacher reflectively integrated AI into EFL writing activity planning. The research procedures covered the selection of the research design and participant, identification of data sources, data collection, and systematic data analysis. Each stage was organized to obtain an in-depth understanding of the teacher's reflective practices, particularly in evaluating AI-generated materials, modifying instructional content, and making pedagogical decisions.

1. Research Design

This study employed a qualitative case study design to investigate how an English teacher reflectively integrated AI into EFL writing activity planning. A qualitative approach was selected because the study sought to understand the teacher's experiences, interpretations, and pedagogical decision-making processes rather than measure outcomes numerically (Creswell, 2018). The case study design was considered appropriate for examining a contemporary phenomenon within its actual educational context, particularly when the phenomenon and its context are closely interconnected (Yin, 2018). The case focused on one English teacher's reflective use of ChatGPT, Grammarly, and QuillBot when preparing EFL writing activities. This design enabled an in-depth examination of the teacher's practices and decisions within a specific instructional setting rather than seeking statistical generalization across a wider population (Fraenkel et al., 2023).

2. Research Data Sources

The study drew on three complementary data sources: interview transcripts, classroom observation records, and instructional documents, particularly the teacher's lesson plans (RPP). Interview data provided accounts of the teacher's experiences, considerations, and reasons for using or modifying AI-generated materials. Observation records documented relevant teaching practices, instructional decisions, and interactions during the implementation of writing activities. Meanwhile, lesson plan documents provided written evidence of how AI-generated suggestions were incorporated, adapted, or excluded from instructional planning. Using these sources enabled the researcher to examine the phenomenon from different perspectives and compare the teacher's reported practices with observable classroom activities and documented instructional decisions. This approach also supported methodological triangulation by bringing together different forms of qualitative evidence.

3. Research Population and Sample

The research was conducted at a public junior high school in Cirebon, West Java, Indonesia. The school was selected because its English teachers had begun incorporating AI tools into instructional planning, providing a relevant setting for examining reflective AI use in EFL writing instruction. One English teacher was selected through purposive sampling based on her direct experience with the phenomenon under investigation. Purposive sampling allows researchers to select information-rich participants who can provide relevant insights into the research problem (Creswell, 2018; Patton, 2014). The participant met four inclusion criteria: (1) actively using AI tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, or QuillBot to plan EFL writing activities; (2) having at least two years of teaching experience; (3) having at least six months of experience using AI for lesson planning; and (4) voluntarily agreeing to participate.

The minimum requirement of two years of teaching experience was established to ensure that the participant had sufficient practical experience in classroom instruction, curriculum implementation, and the adaptation of teaching strategies to learners' needs. This experience was considered important because evaluating AI-generated instructional suggestions requires pedagogical knowledge and an understanding of the classroom context. Similarly, the minimum requirement of six months of AI use was intended to ensure that the participant had developed sufficient familiarity with AI tools through repeated use in lesson planning, rather than relying solely on initial or occasional experimentation. These thresholds were therefore applied to identify a participant with relevant teaching experience and sustained practical engagement with AI-assisted instructional planning. Informed consent, confidentiality, and voluntary participation were maintained throughout the research process, following ethical considerations in qualitative inquiry (Aluwihare-Samaranayake, 2012).

4. Data Collection Techniques

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, observations supported by an observation checklist and field notes, and document analysis. Semi-structured interviews served as the primary technique for exploring the teacher's reflective thinking, experiences, and pedagogical considerations when using AI to plan writing activities. The interview protocol was developed with reference to the Interview Protocol Refinement (IPR) Framework proposed by Castillo-Montoya (2016) to ensure alignment between the research questions and interview questions. It covered seven areas: teacher roles and reflective practices in lesson planning, AI use, evaluation of AI-generated materials, writing activity design, alignment with learning objectives, perceived benefits and challenges, and reflective strategies. Interviews were conducted in Indonesian or English according to the participant's preference, audio-recorded with consent, and transcribed for analysis.

Observation was conducted using an observation checklist and descriptive and reflective field notes. The classroom observations were conducted in three sessions, with each session lasting approximately 45–60 minutes. The repeated observations allowed the researcher to document the teacher's instructional practices, classroom interactions, and pedagogical decisions across different writing activities. The observation focused on the teacher's use of AI during planning, pedagogical decision-making, instructional scaffolding, and teacher-student interactions during writing activities. Field notes were maintained to document classroom events and the researcher's reflections, following the qualitative observation procedures discussed by Creswell (2018). Document analysis examined the teacher's lesson plans (RPP), particularly the integration of AI-generated materials, modifications made by the teacher, the design of writing activities, and their alignment with learning objectives and curriculum requirements. This procedure followed the systematic examination and interpretation of documents as a source of qualitative evidence (Armstrong, 2021). Together, the three techniques provided complementary evidence for examining the teacher's reflective practices.

5. Data Analysis Techniques

The data analysis followed Miles and Huberman's (1994) interactive model, consisting of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. During data reduction, the researcher selected relevant information from the interview transcript, classroom observation notes, and lesson plan documents related to the research questions. The interview data served as the primary basis for identifying the

teacher's experiences, reflections, and pedagogical considerations, while observation and document data were used to provide contextual and supplementary evidence. During data display, the reduced data were organized into five thematic categories: teachers' perception of AI in lesson planning, reflective evaluation of AI-generated outputs, AI integration in writing activity design, pedagogical decision-making, and challenges and critical awareness. Finally, conclusions were drawn by interpreting the patterns within each theme and examining the consistency of the interview findings against the available observation and document evidence.

The analysis resulted in five overarching themes, which are presented in the Results section. To strengthen the credibility of the findings, the researcher compared evidence from interviews, observations, and lesson plan documents. Member checking was also conducted by inviting the participant to review the summaries of the findings and provide feedback on their accuracy. These procedures were guided by the trustworthiness criteria (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In this study, member checking was conducted after the preliminary data analysis had been completed. The researcher shared a written summary of the preliminary findings with the participant through WhatsApp for review. The participant was given approximately seven days to examine the summary, provide corrections, and clarify interpretations that might not accurately reflect her experiences. Any feedback received was considered in refining the final interpretation of the findings.

In this qualitative case study, the researcher served as the primary instrument for data collection and interpretation. The researcher's role involved conducting interviews, observing classroom activities, reviewing instructional documents, and interpreting the collected evidence. This involvement acknowledged the possibility that the researcher's prior knowledge, assumptions, and interpretations could influence the data collection and analytical process. To address this potential bias, the researcher maintained reflective field notes, systematically compared evidence across the three data sources, and considered the participant's feedback through member checking. These practices were intended to promote reflexivity, transparency, and credibility throughout the research process.

Results and Discussion

Result

The analysis of semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and lesson plan documents identified five themes concerning the teacher's reflective use of artificial intelligence (AI) in EFL writing activity planning. The themes concerned the teacher's perception of AI, evaluation of AI-generated outputs, integration of AI into writing activity design, pedagogical decision-making, and challenges associated with AI use. Evidence from the three data sources illustrates how the teacher incorporated AI tools into instructional planning while retaining responsibility for the suitability of the resulting materials.

Table 1. Thematic Findings and Triangulation of Data

No.	Theme	Data Sources and Selected Evidence	Interpretation of Findings
1	Teachers' Perception of AI in Lesson Planning	Interview (T1-INT): "I use it as a supporting tool, mainly to match the content with the materials and teaching methods. I still make the final decision."	The teacher perceived AI as a supporting resource for matching instructional content with teaching materials and methods while retaining

			responsibility for final instructional decisions.
2	Reflective Evaluation of AI-Generated Outputs	Interview (T1-INT): "The first thing I do is read it carefully and imagine whether it would be suitable for this particular class." / "If it is not suitable, then I have to modify it."	The teacher evaluated AI-generated outputs by considering their suitability for classroom conditions and modifying materials that did not meet instructional requirements.
3	AI Integration in Writing Activity Design	Interview (T1-INT): "The parts I develop most often are the learning activities, teaching models, and instructional methods." / "I usually use it to find activities, materials, sample texts, and student worksheets, but I modify them afterwards." / "Writing activities have become more varied, such as brainstorming, outlining, and peer review." Observation (T1-OBS): A ChatGPT prompt requesting alternative teaching methods and models generated suggestions including Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL) and Digital Learning. Document (T1-DOC): The lesson plan included expression writing, peer correction, Greeting Card creation, and oral presentation.	AI supported the development of writing activities, teaching methods, and instructional materials. The observation documented the generation of alternative teaching approaches, while the lesson plan showed a range of writing-related activities.
4	Pedagogical Decision-Making	Interview (T1-INT): "I know which suggestions I should take and which ones would be better left out." / "Everything has to be adjusted to the curriculum, the academic calendar, and the students' proficiency levels." Observation (T1-OBS): The teacher adapted classroom activities based on student conditions rather than implementing AI-generated suggestions directly.	The teacher maintained pedagogical authority by selectively adopting AI-generated suggestions and considering curriculum requirements, the academic calendar, and students' proficiency levels.
5	Challenges and Critical Awareness	Interview (T1-INT): "The biggest challenge occurs when we cannot get AI to produce what we actually want." / "AI has its limitations; sometimes it keeps producing the same kinds of suggestions." / "Sometimes I feel that I take things too lightly because AI makes everything easier."	The teacher experienced difficulties in formulating prompts, encountered repetitive AI-generated suggestions, and recognized the possibility of becoming less attentive to lesson preparation because of AI convenience.

1. Teachers' Perception of AI in Lesson Planning

The findings showed that the teacher regarded AI primarily as a supporting resource for lesson planning rather than a substitute for professional judgment. ChatGPT, Grammarly, and QuillBot were used to assist in matching instructional materials with

appropriate teaching methods. However, the teacher-maintained responsibility for determining which suggestions were suitable for classroom instruction. She explained:

"I use it as a supporting tool, mainly to match the content with the materials and teaching methods. I still make the final decision."

The teacher also identified time efficiency as one of the main reasons for using AI. According to her account, AI helped shorten the time needed to prepare instructional materials and identify possible teaching approaches.

"It is a matter of efficiency, to help shorten the time needed."

The interview data further indicated that AI provided alternative ideas and suggestions that could be considered during lesson planning. Nevertheless, these suggestions were treated as preliminary resources rather than completed instructional materials.

2. Reflective Evaluation of AI-Generated Outputs

The second finding concerned the teacher's evaluation of AI-generated materials before incorporating them into lesson plans. The teacher explained that she first read the generated content and considered whether the proposed activities were appropriate for her students and classroom conditions.

"The first thing I do is read it carefully and imagine whether it would be suitable for this particular class."

When the generated materials did not meet her expectations or instructional requirements, she modified them rather than adopting them directly.

"If it is not suitable, then I have to modify it."

The evaluation involved several considerations, including curriculum requirements, the academic calendar, students' proficiency levels, and the feasibility of classroom activities. Observation data provided an example of this process. AI suggested a peer-review activity accompanied by a detailed assessment rubric. However, because the students were not yet accustomed to structured peer evaluation, the teacher simplified the proposed task into a short paragraph-writing activity.

These findings demonstrate that the teacher's evaluation involved reading, assessing, contextualizing, and modifying AI-generated materials before their use in instruction.

3. AI Integration in Writing Activity Design

The third theme concerned the use of AI to develop writing activities, teaching methods, instructional materials, and student worksheets. The teacher reported that the activity and method components were the areas most frequently developed with AI assistance.

"The parts I develop most often are the learning activities, teaching models, and instructional methods."

She also described the types of materials she obtained through AI:

"I usually use it to find activities, materials, sample texts, and student worksheets, but I modify them afterwards."

The teacher further reported that AI-assisted planning allowed her to consider a wider range of writing activities, including brainstorming, outlining, peer review, and other stages of the writing process.

"Writing activities have become more varied, such as brainstorming, outlining, and peer review."

In addition to generating activity ideas, AI helped organize lesson plans by connecting learning objectives with classroom activities. The teacher described this contribution as follows:

"It helps me organize the lesson plan more systematically, from the learning objectives to the main activities."

The interview findings were further supported by classroom observation, which documented the teacher's use of ChatGPT to explore alternative teaching methods and instructional models. In the observed interaction, the teacher entered a prompt requesting various teaching methods or learning models. The generated suggestions included Contextual Teaching and Learning (CTL) and Digital Learning. This observation provides a practical illustration of how the teacher used AI to explore instructional alternatives when developing writing activities and selecting appropriate teaching approaches.

Furthermore, the lesson plan document provided additional evidence of the variety of activities included in the teacher's instructional planning. The RPP contained activities such as writing expressions, peer correction, creating greeting cards, and oral presentations. These activities illustrate the range of writing-related tasks represented in the documented lesson plan. Considered alongside the interview and observation findings, the document suggests that the teacher's use of AI was associated with exploring and organizing different instructional activities, while the resulting lesson plan reflected a variety of classroom tasks.

Taken together, the interview, observation, and document analysis indicate that AI supported the teacher in exploring instructional alternatives, developing writing activities, and organizing lesson plans. However, its contribution was not limited to generating instructional content; it also provided options that the teacher could consider and adapt when designing writing lessons.

4. Pedagogical Decision-Making

The fourth theme revealed that the teacher retained control over instructional decisions despite using AI throughout the planning process. She emphasized that professional experience helped her distinguish between suggestions that could be adopted and those that should be excluded.

"I know which suggestions I should take and which ones would be better left out."

The teacher explained that her decisions were guided by the curriculum, academic calendar, and students' abilities.

"Everything has to be adjusted to the curriculum, the academic calendar, and the students' proficiency levels."

Interview and observation data also showed that previous classroom experiences informed her evaluation of AI-generated suggestions. The teacher considered whether an activity would be manageable for her students and whether it corresponded to the learning objectives. Consequently, the use of AI did not eliminate her involvement in instructional design; rather, she continued to determine the content, methods, and activities appropriate for her classroom.

These statements indicate that the teacher's pedagogical decisions were not determined solely by the options generated by AI. Instead, she considered whether the suggested materials and activities were consistent with the learning objectives, appropriate for students' abilities, and feasible within the available instructional time. Her previous classroom experiences also informed these considerations, particularly

when determining whether a proposed activity could be implemented effectively with her students.

The classroom observation provided further insight into how this decision-making process was reflected in teaching practice. The teacher adapted the instructional activities in response to students' conditions rather than implementing AI-generated suggestions verbatim. This suggests that her pedagogical judgment continued to guide the implementation of planned activities, allowing her to make adjustments when the proposed instructional approach did not fully correspond to classroom needs. The lesson plan document provided additional evidence of the teacher's role in instructional decision-making. The documented RPP reflected alignment with curriculum requirements, the inclusion of assessment rubrics, and the organization of activities through a scaffolded instructional sequence. These elements indicate that the final instructional plan involved deliberate pedagogical considerations rather than the uncritical adoption of AI-generated recommendations.

The interview, observation, and document findings demonstrate that AI did not replace the teacher's professional role in instructional planning. Instead, the teacher used AI as a source of alternative suggestions while retaining responsibility for evaluating, selecting, and adapting instructional content, methods, and activities. Her pedagogical decisions remained grounded in curriculum expectations, students' learning needs, classroom conditions, and professional experience.

5. Challenges and Critical Awareness

The fifth theme concerned technical and pedagogical challenges associated with AI-assisted lesson planning. One difficulty involved formulating prompts that could generate the specific materials the teacher needed. She explained:

"The biggest challenge occurs when we cannot get AI to produce what we actually want."

She also noted that the suggestions generated by AI sometimes became repetitive or limited in scope.

"AI has its limitations; sometimes it keeps producing the same kinds of suggestions."

Other challenges included limited internet access at school and the need to correct AI-generated materials that did not adequately reflect the classroom context. These constraints occasionally affected the teacher's ability to use AI during instructional preparation.

An additional concern emerged from the teacher's reflection on her own planning habits. She acknowledged that the convenience of AI could sometimes make her less attentive to the effort required in preparing lessons.

"Sometimes I feel that I take things too lightly because AI makes everything easier."

She also expressed concern that students might become overly dependent on AI when completing writing assignments.

"Students might become dependent on it."

These statements reveal that the teacher recognized potential consequences of AI use for both her professional practices and students' learning. Her concerns extended beyond technical limitations to include the possibility of excessive reliance on AI-generated assistance.

Discussion

The five themes provide insight into how a teacher's professional judgment shapes the integration of AI into EFL writing activity planning. Rather than treating AI adoption as a matter of technological access or frequency of use, the findings demonstrate that the teacher's decisions involve evaluating generated content, adapting instructional suggestions, and considering their relevance to students' learning needs. These practices can be examined through Schön's (1983) concept of reflective practice, particularly the relationship between professional knowledge, reflection, and action.

1. Teachers' Perception of AI

The finding that the teacher positioned AI as a supporting resource rather than a replacement for professional judgment reflects an important distinction between technological assistance and pedagogical responsibility. Her statement, "I still make the final decision," indicates that the use of AI does not automatically transfer instructional authority to the technology. Instead, AI provides suggestions and possible instructional alternatives, while the teacher determines their suitability for the intended learning context. This distinction is consistent with Holmes et al. (2019), who discuss AI as a means of supporting educational processes while recognizing the continuing importance of human involvement in teaching. Similarly, Kasneci et al. (2023) explain that large language models offer opportunities to assist teachers in generating educational content and reducing routine workloads, although their outputs require human evaluation because of limitations in contextual understanding and accuracy. The present finding illustrates this relationship at the level of lesson planning: AI contributes to the preparation process, but pedagogical responsibility remains with the teacher.

The teacher's emphasis on efficiency also deserves consideration. Her use of AI to shorten preparation time suggests that technological assistance can reduce the time spent searching for materials and generating initial teaching ideas. This finding is consistent with Javahery et al. (2025), whose study of ten Iranian novice EFL teachers examined ChatGPT use in lesson planning through a critical digital literacy perspective. Their findings highlighted the usefulness of AI-generated suggestions while emphasizing the need for critical evaluation. Sirniawati and Azmee (2025) likewise reported that EFL teachers used ChatGPT to improve planning efficiency and obtain instructional ideas, although contextual relevance and accuracy remained important concerns.

However, efficiency should not be equated with improved instructional quality. Producing a lesson plan more quickly does not necessarily mean that its activities are appropriate, achievable, or responsive to learners' needs. The present study therefore suggests that the educational value of AI-assisted planning depends on how teachers use the time and alternatives provided by the technology. When AI reduces routine preparation, teachers still need to devote attention to evaluating instructional objectives, learner characteristics, and classroom feasibility. In this respect, the teacher's position reflects a form of professional agency in which technological assistance remains subordinate to pedagogical judgment.

2. Reflective Evaluation of AI Outputs

The second theme provides particularly important evidence of reflective practice. The teacher did not accept AI-generated materials immediately but first read the outputs, considered their suitability, and modified them when necessary. Her explanation that she imagined whether an activity would suit her particular class indicates that evaluation was grounded in knowledge of the students and their classroom conditions. This process

demonstrates that the teacher's engagement with AI involved more than checking the linguistic quality of generated content. Schön's (1983) concept of reflection-for-action provides a useful theoretical explanation for this finding. Reflection-for-action concerns anticipatory thinking in which professionals consider possible actions and their consequences before implementation. In this study, the teacher's examination of AI-generated activities before incorporating them into lesson plans represents this anticipatory dimension of reflection. She considered whether the suggested activities would be manageable, relevant, and consistent with her instructional objectives before deciding to use them.

The observation involving the peer-review activity illustrates this process more concretely. Although AI generated a structured peer-review task with an assessment rubric, the teacher recognized that her students were not yet prepared to undertake such an activity. She therefore replaced the proposed task with a shorter paragraph-writing activity. This decision is significant because the teacher did not evaluate the suggestion solely according to its instructional sophistication. Instead, she considered the relationship between task demands and students' existing abilities. The modification demonstrates how professional experience mediates the use of AI-generated instructional materials.

This interpretation is also consistent with Farrell's (2015) discussion of reflective practice in language teaching, which emphasizes examining teaching beliefs, principles, and classroom practices rather than following instructional procedures mechanically. Farrell and Ives (2015)further demonstrated how reflection can help teachers recognize the relationship between their beliefs and actual classroom practices. In the present study, the teacher's modification of the peer-review activity reflects a similar process: instructional decisions were informed by an understanding of learners rather than by the apparent completeness of AI-generated materials. Recent research also supports the importance of this evaluative process. Javahery et al. (2025)found that novice EFL teachers needed to examine and adapt ChatGPT-generated suggestions in relation to their teaching requirements. Sirniawati and Azmee (2025) similarly reported concerns about the contextual relevance of AI-generated content and the need for teachers to modify suggestions according to local curricula and student needs. The current study extends these findings by illustrating a specific instance of adaptation at the junior high school level, where students' readiness determined whether a proposed writing activity could be implemented.

The findings therefore suggest that reflective evaluation should be understood as an integral part of AI-assisted lesson planning. Reading, assessing, contextualizing, and modifying generated materials constitute a sequence of professional judgments through which teachers retain responsibility for instructional quality. This process also indicates that effective AI integration requires more than the ability to operate digital tools; teachers need sufficient pedagogical knowledge to determine when an AI suggestion is appropriate, when it requires modification, and when it should be rejected.

3. AI Integration in Writing Activity Design

The third theme shows that AI was primarily used to develop writing activities, instructional methods, sample texts, and student worksheets. The teacher's account suggests that AI provided alternative ideas for organizing classroom writing tasks, including brainstorming, outlining, and peer review. These activities are relevant because writing instruction involves several interconnected stages rather than the production of a final text alone.

The use of AI to generate different writing activities can be interpreted through process-oriented approaches to writing instruction. Harmer (2007) explains that writing development involves processes such as planning, drafting, editing, and revising. These stages provide opportunities for learners to develop ideas, organize information, and improve their written expression. In the present study, the teacher's use of AI-generated suggestions for brainstorming, outlining, and peer review indicates an effort to incorporate activities associated with different stages of writing development. Nevertheless, the presence of these activities in lesson planning should not automatically be interpreted as evidence that students have achieved improved writing competence. The findings establish that AI helped the teacher develop a wider range of instructional alternatives; they do not establish the actual effect of these activities on students' writing performance. This distinction is important because the research examines the teacher's reflective planning practices rather than measuring learning outcomes.

The teacher's use of AI for instructional material development also corresponds with Marzuki et al. (2023), who examined AI writing tools from Indonesian EFL teachers' perspectives. Their research identified the potential of AI tools to support students' writing, particularly in relation to content and organization. However, their focus was primarily on the influence of AI writing tools on student writing quality, whereas the present study examines how teachers use AI to prepare the activities through which writing instruction is organized. The difference places the current findings at the level of instructional planning rather than student performance. Another important aspect concerns the organization of lesson plans. The teacher explained that AI helped connect learning objectives with the main instructional activities. This suggests that AI was also used as a planning resource to organize the relationship between intended learning outcomes and classroom tasks. However, such organizational assistance does not guarantee curricular alignment. The teacher must still examine whether the generated activities correspond to the expected competencies, students' proficiency levels, and available instructional time.

Thus, the contribution of AI to writing activity design lies in its capacity to provide instructional alternatives and support the initial organization of teaching materials. Its pedagogical value, however, depends on the teacher's ability to select activities that reflect the developmental needs of learners. The findings suggest that AI can broaden the range of activities considered during lesson planning, while the teacher remains responsible for determining their instructional purpose and feasibility.

4. Pedagogical Decision-Making

The finding demonstrates that the teacher retained control over pedagogical decisions throughout the AI-assisted planning process. It can be interpreted through Schön's (1983) conception of the reflective practitioner. For Schön, professional knowledge is not limited to the application of established procedures; it also involves the capacity to interpret situations, reconsider assumptions, and respond to specific practical circumstances. In this study, the teacher demonstrated such professional reasoning when deciding whether AI-generated suggestions were compatible with the requirements of her classroom. Her decisions involved balancing the possibilities offered by AI with the practical knowledge acquired through teaching experience. The findings also relate to the concept of teacher agency. Teacher agency involves the capacity to make informed professional decisions within particular institutional, curricular, and classroom conditions. The teacher's ability to adopt, modify, or reject AI-generated content indicates that she did not surrender instructional authority to the technology. Rather, AI

functioned as an additional resource within a decision-making process that remained guided by her professional responsibilities.

Holmes et al. (2019)emphasize the importance of understanding AI in education in relation to the roles and responsibilities of human educators. Similarly, Kasneci et al. (2023)highlight the need for human oversight when using large language models because generated responses may contain inaccuracies or fail to reflect specific educational contexts. The present study provides empirical support for these concerns by showing how a teacher's curricular knowledge and familiarity with students informed the acceptance or rejection of AI-generated suggestions.

The findings also have relevance to the research conducted by Javahery et al. (2025)which identified critical digital literacy as an important consideration in teachers' use of ChatGPT for lesson planning. Their study emphasized the need for teachers to examine AI-generated suggestions rather than treating them as authoritative instructional resources. The present study complements this perspective by showing how such evaluation operates through concrete pedagogical decisions involving activity selection, task modification, and curricular alignment. An important implication is that teacher autonomy should not be understood as the rejection of technological assistance. Instead, it involves maintaining the capacity to determine the purposes, conditions, and limits of technology use. In this case, the teacher's professional agency was reflected in her ability to use AI without relinquishing responsibility for instructional decisions. Reflective engagement therefore represents an important condition for ensuring that AI supports rather than displaces teachers' professional roles.

5. Challenges and Critical Awareness

The finding reveals that the teacher's experience with AI involved both practical difficulties and concerns about professional responsibility. Prompt formulation was identified as a major challenge because the quality and relevance of generated materials depended partly on how instructional requirements were communicated to the AI system. The teacher's observation that AI sometimes produced repetitive suggestions also indicates that the technology did not always provide the variety or specificity required for her planning purposes. These findings are consistent with Kasneci et al. (2023), who identify limitations in large language models, including contextual inaccuracies, bias, and the need for human oversight. Their discussion emphasizes that teachers and learners require appropriate competencies to evaluate AI-generated information critically. The teacher's difficulty in obtaining suitable responses demonstrates this issue in an instructional setting: using AI effectively requires the ability to formulate clear prompts and assess whether the resulting content addresses the intended pedagogical purpose.

The teacher's concerns about limited internet access and contextual inaccuracies further demonstrate that AI integration is influenced by institutional and technological conditions. Although AI may provide instructional alternatives, its practical use depends on reliable access and the teacher's ability to verify generated materials. Savitri et al. (2026), in their study of teachers' perspectives on AI integration in EFL teaching in Indonesia, also identified benefits and challenges associated with the use of AI tools. Their findings provide a relevant comparison because they address teachers' experiences within the Indonesian educational context.

A more substantial finding concerns the teacher's awareness of possible professional dependency. Her admission that AI sometimes makes her take lesson preparation less seriously reveals a tension between efficiency and professional

engagement. This statement is important because it shows that the teacher did not view AI convenience as entirely beneficial. She recognized that frequent reliance on generated suggestions could influence her own planning habits and potentially reduce the effort devoted to independent instructional thinking. Schön's (1983) reflective practice framework helps explain the significance of this concern. Reflective practice requires professionals to examine not only the outcomes of their actions but also the assumptions and habits that shape their decisions. By questioning whether AI convenience might reduce her own preparation effort, the teacher was examining the implications of technology use for her professional practice. This awareness is particularly relevant to reflection-on-action, in which practitioners reconsider previous actions and their consequences.

The concern also corresponds with Kasneci et al. (2023), who discuss the risks of over-reliance on large language models and the importance of maintaining critical thinking and human oversight. Tlili et al. (2023) likewise emphasize that the integration of ChatGPT into education raises questions concerning responsible use, academic integrity, and the relationship between human and artificial intelligence. These studies provide a basis for understanding why the teacher's concern about dependency deserves attention beyond the immediate issue of lesson preparation. The teacher's concern about students becoming dependent on AI further extends this issue to the learning process. Her statement, "Students might become dependent on it," indicates awareness that unrestricted AI use could affect students' engagement with writing tasks. This concern is relevant to EFL writing instruction because students need opportunities to formulate ideas, organize arguments, select vocabulary, and develop their own written expression. If AI performs too much of this work, students may have fewer opportunities to exercise these abilities independently. Hossain (2025), in their study of teachers' perspectives on ChatGPT integration into EFL writing instruction, also examined the benefits and challenges associated with AI-supported writing. Their research provides a relevant comparison for understanding teachers' concerns about the pedagogical consequences of AI use. However, the present study adds a different perspective by showing that concerns about dependency emerge not only in relation to students' writing practices but also in teachers' own professional preparation.

In sum, these findings suggest that critical awareness is an essential dimension of reflective AI integration. The teacher's ability to identify technical limitations, question the convenience of AI, and consider the consequences of student dependency demonstrates that her reflection extends beyond the selection of instructional materials. It also involves examining how technology may influence professional habits and learning responsibilities. AI integration, therefore, requires not only technical competence but also sustained professional awareness of its pedagogical and ethical implications.

Conclusion

This study examined how an English teacher reflectively integrated artificial intelligence (AI) into EFL writing activity planning at a junior high school in Indonesia. The findings revealed five interconnected aspects of this practice: the teacher perceived AI as a supporting resource rather than a substitute for professional judgment, critically evaluated AI-generated materials before adoption, used AI to develop writing activities and instructional methods, retained control over pedagogical decisions, and recognized technical limitations and the risks of overdependence. These findings indicate that AI

integration in writing lesson planning involves more than generating instructional materials; it requires teachers to examine, adapt, and determine the suitability of AI-generated suggestions in relation to their students and instructional contexts.

Conceptually, this study highlights reflective practice as an important element of teachers' engagement with AI in EFL instruction. By applying Schön's reflective practice framework, the study demonstrates how professional reflection informs the evaluation of AI-generated content and supports context-sensitive pedagogical decisions. Its contribution lies in extending discussions of AI in EFL education beyond students' writing performance and teachers' general perceptions toward the reflective processes underlying instructional planning. The findings also emphasize that AI can support the development of writing activities without displacing teachers' professional agency, provided that its outputs remain subject to critical evaluation and pedagogical judgment.

Despite these contributions, the study was limited to one English teacher in a single junior high school, which restricts the transferability of its findings to other educational contexts. Further research could involve multiple teachers and schools to examine variations in reflective AI integration across different instructional settings. Longitudinal studies could also investigate how teachers' reflective practices, professional judgment, and approaches to AI-assisted writing instruction develop over time.

References

Alharbi, M. A. (2023). Artificial intelligence in EFL writing instruction: Opportunities and pedagogical challenges. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00398-4

Alharthi, S. A. (2021). Teachers into the unknown: AI tools for English teaching in the modern classroom. *Journal of Education and E-Learning Research*, *8*(1), 33–40. https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.509.2021.81.33.40

Aluwihare-Samaranayake, D. (2012). Ethics in qualitative research: A view of the participants' and researchers' world from a critical standpoint. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *11*(2), 64–81. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940691201100208

Apoko, T. (2025). Generative Artificial Intelligence in English Instruction: Indonesian EFL Vocational High School Teachers' Perspectives. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, *13*(3), 1432. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v13i3.14190

Armstrong, P. (2021). *Qualitative research design: Data collection, analysis, and interpretation*. SAGE Publications.

Castillo-Montoya, M. (2016). Preparing for interview research: The interview protocol refinement framework. *The Qualitative Report*, *21*(5), 811–831. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2016.2337

Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Farrell, Thomas S C, & Ives, Jessica. (2015). Exploring teacher beliefs and classroom practices through reflective practice: A case study. *Language Teaching Research*, *19*(5), 594–610. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814541722

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2023). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (11th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English*. Longman.

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning*. Center for Curriculum Redesign.

Hossain, M. A. (2025). Teachers' perceptions of ChatGPT in EFL writing instruction:

Benefits and concerns. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *65*, 101186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2024.101186

Javahery, P., Alpat, M. F., & Kamali, J. (2025). Exploring Iranian novice EFL trainees' perceptions of ChatGPT use for lesson planning through a critical digital literacy lens. *Discover Computing*, *28*(1), 194. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10791-025-09720-0

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., … Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *103*, 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Kurniawan, D. (2026). Teachers' perceptions and experiences in integrating generative AI into learning: A phenomenological inquiry in Indonesian secondary schools. *EDUKASIA Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran*, *7*(1), 441–450. https://doi.org/10.62775/edukasia.v7i1.1819

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.

Marzuki, , Widiati, U., Rusdin, D., Darwin, , & Indrawati, I. (2023). The impact of AI writing tools on the content and organization of students' writing: EFL teachers' perspective. *Cogent Education*, *10*(2), 2236469. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2236469

Mekheimer, M. A. (2025). Effective technology integration in higher education: a mixed-methods study of professional development. *Education and Information Technologies*, *30*(17), 25013–25058. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13750-y

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Mulkiyah, U. (2024). Integrating artificial intelligence in EFL classrooms: Opportunities and challenges for Indonesian teachers. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, *4*(1), 765–773. https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v4i001.507

Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*. Sage Publications.

Savitri, Y., Nurhayati, L., & Hidayati, S. (2026). The use of AI-powered writing tools in EFL academic writing in Indonesia: A meta-synthesis. *Celtic : A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, *13*(10), 213–233. https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v13i1.43324

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.

Sirniawati, S., & Azmee, A. (2025). Teachers' Experiences Using ChatGPT for Lesson Planning in EFL Classrooms. *MATCHA: Journal of Modern Approaches to Communication, Humanities, and Academia*, *1*(2), 40–58. https://doi.org/10.70152/matcha.v1i2.193

Tlili, A., Shehata, B., Adarkwah, M. A., Bozkurt, A., Hickey, D. T., Huang, R., & Agyemang, B. (2023). What if the devil is my guardian angel: ChatGPT as a case study of using chatbots in education. *Smart Learning Environments*, *10*, 15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00237-x

UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance on generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO Publishing. https://www.unesco.org

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods* (6th ed.). SAGE.

Zhai, X. (2023). *ChatGPT user experience: Implications for education*. Available at SSRN 4312418. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4312488