

Rewriting The Future: Perceived Usefulness and Attitudes of Senior High School Students on Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Language Writing

Joshua David A. Cruz
Philippine Women's University
Manila, Philippines
Jsh1998david@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examined the perceived usefulness of and attitudes of Senior High School students toward the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing. Specifically, it investigated students' perceptions of AI in terms of improvement of writing quality, writing efficiency, organization of ideas, and support in academic writing, as well as their attitudes regarding comfort in using AI tools, perceived appropriateness of AI in academic writing, and habitual use of AI in writing tasks. Anchored in the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology 2 (UTAUT2), the study employed a quantitative descriptive nonexperimental research design to describe and analyze students' perceptions and attitudes toward AI-assisted writing. Data were gathered through a researcher developed survey questionnaire that underwent expert validation and reliability testing prior to administration. The respondents were grouped according to age, gender, and academic track to determine whether significant differences existed in their perceptions and attitudes toward AI use in English language writing. Statistical tools such as frequency and percentage distribution, weighted mean, t-test, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were utilized in the analysis of the data. The study was conducted in response to the increasing integration of AI tools in educational settings and the need to better understand how students evaluate their usefulness and appropriateness in academic writing. The findings also informed the formulation of school-based recommendations that encourage responsible AI utilization, foster ethical decision making, strengthen authorship awareness, support writing development, and promote balanced engagement between technological assistance and independent learning.

Keywords: *Artificial intelligence; English language writing; ethical guidelines*

Bio-profile

Joshua David A. Cruz is a licensed professional teacher and Senior High School English educator who is passionate about teaching, research, and lifelong learning. A graduate of Jesus Reigns Christian College, he actively promotes research as a tool for growth and social responsibility while continuously pursuing opportunities to improve his professional practice. Beyond education, he also serves as a church leader committed to sharing the gospel through compassion and meaningful service.



Introduction

Rationale

Artificial Intelligence, in many forms, has contributed and supported students in writing—through receiving assistance in drafting, organizing thoughts, rephrasing, paraphrasing, and other writing tasks, it can really be attested that AI has been transformative. A study conducted by Galang et al. (2025) shows that it has created a significantly positive impact in improving vocabulary, writing skills, and accomplishing academic tasks using ChatGPT.

While artificial intelligence is being widely used by students, this does not mean that they are using it effectively and appropriately in academic contexts. In education setup, students tend to decide on the usage of a technological tool if they perceived it to be very useful and how they feel when using it, resulting in the adoption, reliance, or rejection of the said tool. As such, understanding how students respond—based on their perceived usefulness and ease of use—to the integration of AI in English academic writing contexts may provide substantial insights in comprehending their behavioral intention towards using AI tools in educational settings, and develop appropriate ethical guidelines.

Literature Review

Artificial intelligence has increasingly been used in English writing instruction as a form of support in drafting, revising, summarizing, rephrasing, and language refinement, which usually result in enhancing writing performance while saving time, especially for lower-level writing skills. It also demonstrated a positive effect on analytical thinking and problem-solving that simultaneously reduces the mental effort (Abdallah, 2025; Deng et al., 2025). The findings of the study revealed that the respondents represented a balanced population of Senior High School students in terms of age, gender, and academic track, providing a reliable basis for examining students' perceptions and attitudes toward the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing. As observed in recent literature, AI has become increasingly integrated in educational settings, particularly in writing instruction, where students are continuously exposed to digital tools that support drafting, revising, and improving written outputs (Abdallah, 2025; Deng et al., 2025).

The results showed that students generally perceived AI as highly useful across multiple dimensions of English language writing, particularly in improving writing quality, increasing efficiency, organizing ideas, and supporting academic writing tasks. These findings reinforce studies suggesting that AI functions as an assistive writing technology capable of enhancing grammar, coherence, clarity, and structural organization while reducing cognitive load during the writing process (Khalifa, 2024; Aydin et al., 2025; Li et al., 2024). This suggests that students recognize AI as an effective tool that improves both technical and higher-order aspects of writing.



In relation to attitudes, students demonstrated generally positive perceptions toward the integration of AI in writing tasks. Respondents reported moderate comfort in using AI tools, strongly agreed that AI is appropriate in academic writing when used responsibly, and acknowledged habitually using AI as part of their writing practices. This supports studies showing that students increasingly accept AI because of its convenience, efficiency, and supportive role in academic writing, although ethical concerns regarding originality, overreliance, and academic integrity continue to influence how confidently students integrate these tools (Pensky & Usdan, 2025; Zhai, 2024; Deep, 2025).

Comparative analyses further revealed that students' perceptions of AI usefulness remained consistent across age, gender, and academic track, with no statistically significant differences observed among these variables. This suggests that accessibility to AI tools, exposure to similar academic writing demands, and shared educational environments play a stronger role in shaping students' perceptions than demographic differences alone. This finding is supported by previous studies which argue that exposure and educational context influence technology acceptance more significantly than age, gender, or disciplinary background (Kasneci et al., 2023; Brata et al., 2024; Younas et al., 2025).

Similarly, students' attitudes toward AI showed no significant differences based on age and gender, although a significant difference was observed in habitual use when grouped according to academic track. This indicates that while students generally share comparable acceptance and comfort toward AI, academic specialization may influence how frequently these tools are integrated into writing tasks depending on academic demands. Overall, the findings reinforce the growing role of AI as a valuable educational support tool in English writing, while emphasizing that its effectiveness depends on responsible use, ethical awareness, and maintaining students' independent thinking throughout the writing process (Chan & Hu, 2023; Ibrahim & Kirkpatrick, 2024; Floris & Renandya, 2025).

Theoretical Underpinning

The UTAUT2 (Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology 2) serves as the theoretical foundation of the study by explaining how students accept and continue using AI technologies in English writing. The study specifically focuses on two core constructs: Performance Expectancy, which relates to students' perceived usefulness of AI in improving writing quality, efficiency, organization of ideas, and academic writing support; and Effort Expectancy, which refers to perceived ease of use, including comfort, appropriateness in academic writing, and habitual use of AI tools. By narrowing the framework to these two constructs, the study directly examines how SHS students' attitudes toward AI in English writing are shaped by both the benefits they perceive from the technology and how easy they find it to use, ultimately providing a theory-based understanding of technology acceptance and future use behavior in educational contexts.



Objectives

This study aims to examine the perceived usefulness and attitudes of Senior High School students on Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing. Particularly, it aims to determine (1) the profile of the respondents in terms of: Age, Gender, and Academic Track; (2) the extent do the respondents perceive the usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing in terms of: Improvement of Writing Quality, Writing Efficiency, Organization of Ideas, and Support in Academic Writing; (3) the attitudes of the respondents toward the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Language writing in terms of: Comfort in using AI tools, Perceived Appropriateness in Academic Writing, and Habitual Use of AI in Writing; (4) whether there is a significant difference in the respondents' perceptions of the usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing when grouped according to their profile; and (5) whether there is a significant difference in the attitudes of the respondents towards the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing when grouped according to their profile.

Methodology

This section presents a discussion of the research methodology used, the study's subjects and respondents, the research instruments, the validity and reliability of the instruments, the data gathering procedure, and the statistical tools and procedures for data analysis.

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative descriptive nonexperimental research design to examine the perceived usefulness and attitudes of Senior High School students toward the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing. The descriptive approach was utilized to systematically describe students' perceptions regarding the benefits of AI-assisted writing and to analyze their attitudes toward integrating AI tools in academic writing tasks.

In addition, the study determined whether significant differences existed in students' perceptions and attitudes when grouped according to selected demographic variables such as age, gender, and academic track.

Locale of the Study

This study was conducted in a private school in Malate, Manila that offers Senior High School education and caters to students under different academic strands, namely Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS), Accountancy, Business and Management (ABM), and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). The institution was selected as the locale of the study because it provides an academic environment where students are regularly engaged in various writing tasks such as essays, research papers, reports, and other academic outputs that increasingly require the use of digital technologies.

Furthermore, the school serves as an appropriate setting for the study due to the growing accessibility of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools among students, particularly in assisting them with academic writing tasks. Since the research focuses on examining the perceived usefulness and attitudes



of Senior High School students toward AI in English language writing, the institution provides a relevant context in understanding how learners integrate emerging technologies into their educational experiences.

Respondents of this Study

The respondents of this study were Senior High School students in academic track which was selected through purposive sampling based on the following: (1) Students who are currently enrolled in Senior High School and are exposed to academic writing tasks in English-related Subjects; (2) Students who are currently enrolled in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) strand; Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS) strand; and Accountancy, Business, and Management (ABM) strands, as these academic strands require regular engagement in English writing tasks, allowing for an appropriate and valid comparison of perceptions among tracks; (3) Students who are currently enrolled in or have taken subjects that are related to English (such as English for Academic and Professional Purposes, Research in Daily Life, Reading and Writing Skills, Creative Writing, and Creative Non-Fiction); and (4) Students must have used at least one AI-assisted writing tool (e.g., ChatGPT, Grammarly, QuillBot, or similar) for English writing tasks (e.g., essays, research papers, reflections, reports, or school writing outputs) within the current academic year.

Data Gathering Instrument

The primary instrument used in this study is a researcher-developed survey questionnaire designed to measure the perceived usefulness and attitudes of Senior High School Students toward the use of AI in English language writing. The questionnaire consists of four major parts: (1) the demographic profile of the respondents; (2) screening question; (3) perceived usefulness of AI in English language writing; and (4) attitudes toward the use of AI in English writing. Furthermore, the perceived usefulness section consists of four dimensions: improvement of writing quality, writing efficiency, organization of ideas, and support in academic writing. The attitude section includes three dimensions: comfort in using AI tools, perceived appropriateness in academic writing, and attitudinal dependence on AI in writing.

The survey questionnaire was constructed utilizing a 4-point Likert scale whereas for each item, 4 is labeled as “strongly agree,” meaning that students positively accept AI in English writing tasks, and conversely 1 as “strongly disagree,” meaning that students negatively accept AI in English writing tasks. A 4-point Likert scale was utilized in this study to eliminate the neutral midpoint commonly present in a 5-point Likert scale. This approach encourages respondents to provide clearer directional responses answers regarding their perceptions of usefulness and their attitudes toward AI rather than selecting a neutral response.

Instrument Validity and Reliability

The research instruments were validated by a panel of three (3) experts in the fields of English education, educational research, and Information Technology and Research Ethical. The validators were all college and university professors who were selected based on their academic qualifications and relevant professional experience who were instrumental in developing a valid research instrument for this study. Each validator assessed the items in terms of clarity, alignment of items to each construct, relevance, and appropriateness of language. Based on their feedback, necessary revisions to



grammar and questionnaire items were made, including the elimination of redundant statements, and improvement of alignment with the objective of the study and theoretical framework which was then revised by the researcher (See Appendices D and E).

The researcher also examined item performance during pilot testing to further strengthen the instrument. Findings from the initial administration suggested that some items may not accurately represent intended constructs, leading to a review and refinement of those items to improve clarity and conceptual alignment. The revised instrument was thereafter prepared to ensure that all items appropriately capture each construct of the research study. Then, face and content validity were observed, as the items were deemed understandable for the target respondents.

To ensure the instrument's reliability, a pilot test was conducted to determine the consistency of the items in measuring the constructs of perceived usefulness and attitudes toward the use of AI in English language writing. Internal consistency reliability was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient by Angelli Kristie Balinas, a statistician who specialized in business statistics. An initial pilot test was conducted among fifteen (15) Senior High School students who were not part of the actual study.

Results from the first pilot testing revealed that some constructs obtained questionable to poor Cronbach's alpha values, indicating that certain items did not consistently measure their respective variables. Hence, this prompted the researcher to have the necessity of revising or removing the problematic items.

Following these revisions, a second pilot test was conducted among another fifteen (15) Senior High School students who had not taken part of the prior pilot testing. The results demonstrated a substantial improvement in internal consistency, with the overall Cronbach's alpha and the reliability coefficients of each construct reaching acceptable to excellent levels (see Appendix F). This indicates that the instrument has achieved strong internal consistency and is reliable for use in the actual data collection.

Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to data collection, the researcher secured permission from the administration of the selected private school in Manila to conduct the study entitled *Rewriting the Future: Perceived Usefulness and Attitudes of Senior High School Students on Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Language Writing* to ensure compliance with institutional and ethical standards. After approval was granted, respondents were selected through purposive sampling based on predetermined criteria such as current Senior High School enrollment, academic track, and use of AI-assisted writing tools for English academic tasks. Selected participants were then oriented regarding the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, confidentiality of responses, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. To protect privacy, no personally identifiable information was collected, and all responses were anonymized for academic purposes only. The validated survey questionnaire was then administered through Google Forms with clear instructions provided to respondents, allowing sufficient time for completion. After data collection, responses were checked for completeness, encoded, and analyzed using appropriate statistical tools, while all collected data were securely stored in compliance with Republic Act No. 10173 (Data Privacy Act of 2012) to ensure confidentiality and proper handling of information.



Ethical Considerations

The researcher ensured that the study adhered to ethical standards in conducting research within a private school in Manila, particularly in handling participants and managing collected data responsibly. First, voluntary participation was observed by ensuring that respondents freely participated in answering the survey questionnaire without any form of coercion or pressure. Second, the confidentiality of respondents' information was protected in accordance with Republic Act No. 10173 (Data Privacy Act of 2012), ensuring that all personal information and responses remained private throughout the study. Third, an informed consent process was observed by securing permission from the school administration before conducting the survey and informing participants about the purpose of the study. Fourth, the researcher ensured that the study posed minimal to no risk, as respondents were not exposed to any physical, psychological, or socio-economic harm during participation. Lastly, proper data collection procedures were followed by obtaining the necessary permissions and administering the survey questionnaire ethically, ensuring that all gathered data were used solely for academic research purposes.

Analytical and Statistical Schemes

After the data were collected, the responses were carefully reviewed to ensure accuracy and completeness, after which they were coded and systematically organized for analysis. The gathered data were analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical tools to address the research questions and test the hypotheses of the study. Frequency and Percentage were used to describe the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, gender, and academic track, directly addressing Research Question 1. Weighted Mean was utilized to determine the extent of respondents' perceived usefulness of Artificial Intelligence and their attitudes toward its use in English language writing, specifically addressing Research Questions 2 and 3. For perceived usefulness, responses were interpreted using the following scale: Highly Useful (3.25–4.00), Useful (2.50–3.24), Moderately Useful (1.75–2.49), and Slightly Useful (1.00–1.74). For attitudes toward AI use, responses were interpreted as Strongly Agree (3.25–4.00), Agree (2.50–3.24), Disagree (1.75–2.49), and Strongly Disagree (1.00–1.74). Standard Deviation was used together with the weighted mean in analyzing the consistency and variability of responses for Research Questions 2 and 3. To determine whether significant differences exist between groups, an Independent Samples T-Test was used when respondents were grouped according to gender, addressing Research Questions 4 and 5, while One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied when respondents were grouped according to academic track, also addressing Research Questions 4 and 5. These statistical treatments enabled the researcher to interpret the findings and draw conclusions aligned with the objectives of the study.

Results and Discussion

Profile of the Respondents in terms of Age, Sex, and Academic Track

Table 1

Profile of the Respondents

Variable		Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age	18-19		116	94



	20 and above	7	6
Sex	Male	50	41
	Female	73	59
Academic Track	Humanities and Social Sciences	44	36
	Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics	36	29
	Accountancy, Business and Management	43	35
	TOTAL	123	100

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the 123 respondents in terms of age, sex, and academic track. Findings show that the majority of respondents (94%) were aged 18–19 years old, indicating a relatively similar age group with shared academic experiences and exposure to Artificial Intelligence (AI). In terms of sex, 59% were female and 41% were male, reflecting a balanced representation of learners from both groups. For academic track, respondents were distributed across Humanities and Social Sciences (36%), Accountancy, Business, and Management (35%), and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (29%), showing a diverse representation of Senior High School learners. Overall, the demographic profile suggests that the respondents provide a balanced and representative population suitable for examining students' perceptions and attitudes toward AI in English language writing.

Extent of the Respondents' Perception of the Usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) In English Language Writing

Table 2

Extent of the Respondents' Perception of the Usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) In English Language Writing in Terms of Improvement of Writing Quality

Items	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
2.1.1. The use of AI tools has improved my English writing in terms of linguistic accuracy.	3.33	Highly Useful
2.1.2. AI-generated feedback allows me to revise my written work with greater clarity.	3.37	Highly Useful
2.1.3. AI tools improve the accuracy of my writing by providing options for sentence structures.	3.28	Highly Useful
2.1.4. The integration of AI into my writing processes has improved the overall quality of my writing.	3.27	Highly Useful
Mean	3.31	Highly Useful

Table 2 presents the respondents' perception of the usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing in terms of improvement of writing quality. The overall mean score of 3.31 (Highly Useful) indicates that students strongly perceive AI as beneficial in enhancing the quality of



their writing. Among the indicators, “*AI-generated feedback allows me to revise my written work with greater clarity*” obtained the highest mean ($M=3.37$), suggesting that students particularly value AI’s immediate feedback in refining their outputs, while “*The integration of AI into my writing processes has improved the overall quality of my writing*” received the lowest mean ($M=3.27$), indicating that some students may still be adjusting to fully integrating AI in writing tasks. The standard deviation ($SD=0.553$) shows relatively consistent responses among participants. These findings align with studies by Dong et al. (2025) and Li et al. (2024), which emphasize that AI-assisted writing improves clarity, grammar, organization, and overall writing quality through real-time feedback and revision support.

Extent of the Respondents’ Perception on the Usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) In English Language Writing

Table 3

Writing Efficiency

Items	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
2.2.1. The use of AI tools has allowed me to complete my writing tasks faster	3.28	Highly Useful
2.2.2. The use of AI makes it easier to accomplish English language writing tasks.	3.28	Highly Useful
2.2.3. AI tools help me complete writing tasks more efficiently when I encounter difficulties in expressing ideas.	3.35	Highly Useful
2.2.4. The use of AI makes revising my written outputs easier.	3.32	Highly Useful
Mean	3.31	Highly Useful

Table 3 presents the respondents’ perception of the usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing in terms of writing efficiency. The overall mean score of 3.31 (Highly Useful) indicates that students strongly perceive AI as an effective tool in improving writing efficiency. The highest-rated indicator, “AI tools help me complete writing tasks more efficiently when I encounter difficulties in expressing ideas” ($M=3.35$), suggests that students particularly value AI as support when facing difficulties during writing, while the lowest-rated indicators on completing tasks faster and easier ($M=3.28$) still reflect a highly positive perception. The standard deviation ($SD=0.551$) indicates relatively consistent responses among participants. These findings support studies by Dwivedi et al. (2023) and Rudolph et al. (2023), which emphasize that AI improves productivity, reduces writing effort, and provides real-time assistance that helps students write more efficiently and manage academic writing tasks with greater ease.



Extent of the Respondents' Perception of the Usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) In English Language Writing

Table 4

Organization of Ideas

Items	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
2.3.1. AI has provided me with ways to organize my ideas clearly in writing.	3.38	Highly Useful
2.3.2. AI supports a clearer flow of my thoughts throughout my entire written work.	3.34	Highly Useful
2.3.3. The use of AI improves the overall structural arrangements of paragraphs in my written work.	3.41	Highly Useful
2.3.4. AI tools support me in presenting a complex idea in a more logical and organized manner.	3.43	Highly Useful
Mean	3.39	Highly Useful

Table 4 presents the respondents' perception of the usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing in terms of organization of ideas. The overall mean score of 3.39 (Highly Useful) indicates that students strongly perceive AI as valuable in helping organize ideas and improve the structure of their written work. The highest-rated indicator, "*AI tools support me in presenting complex ideas in a more logical and organized manner*" (M=3.43), suggests that students particularly value AI in managing and structuring complex ideas, while the lowest-rated indicator on maintaining the flow of thoughts (M=3.34) still reflects a highly positive perception. The standard deviation (SD=0.590) indicates relatively consistent responses among participants. These findings align with studies by Kasneci et al. (2023), Dong et al. (2025), and Rudolph et al. (2023), which emphasize that AI improves coherence, organization, and logical flow, making it a valuable tool in supporting students throughout the writing process.

Extent of the Respondents' Perception of the Usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) In English Language Writing

Table 5

Support in Academic Writing

Items	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
2.4.1. AI tools provide substantial support in writing academic texts	3.27	Highly Useful
2.4.2. AI helps me monitor my tone in writing style (academic or formal) to meet the expected standard.	3.14	Useful
2.4.3. AI tools are helpful in paraphrasing academic sources accurately.	3.41	Highly Useful



2.4.4. The use of AI helps me complete my academic writing tasks with a clearer understanding of the output.	3.37	Highly Useful
Mean	3.30	Highly Useful

Table 5 presents the respondents' perception of the usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing in terms of support in academic writing. The overall mean score of 3.30 (Highly Useful) indicates that students strongly perceive AI as a valuable tool in supporting academic writing tasks. The highest-rated indicator, "*AI tools are helpful in paraphrasing academic sources accurately*" (M=3.41), suggests that students particularly value AI in handling academic content and improving comprehension, while the lowest-rated indicator on monitoring writing tone (M=3.14) was still interpreted as Useful, indicating that students find AI less dependable in maintaining academic tone and formality. The standard deviation (SD=0.557) shows relatively consistent responses among participants. These findings are supported by studies by Zhai (2023) and Cotton et al. (2024), which highlight that AI supports comprehension, paraphrasing, content development, and academic writing tasks, reinforcing its growing role as a valuable writing and learning support tool.

Summary Table for Perceived Usefulness

Table 6

Summary of the Extent of the Respondents' Perception on the Usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) In English Language Writing

Items	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
2.1 Improvement of Writing Quality	3.31	Highly Useful
2.2 Writing Efficiency	3.31	Highly Useful
2.3 Organization of Ideas	3.39	Highly Useful
2.4 Support in Academic Writing	3.30	Highly Useful
Mean	3.32	Highly Useful

Table 6 presents the summary of respondents' perception on the usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing across four constructs. The overall mean score of 3.32 (Highly Useful) indicates that students generally perceive AI as a valuable tool in supporting various aspects of writing, with a standard deviation of 0.563 showing relatively consistent responses. Among the constructs, Organization of Ideas obtained the highest mean (M=3.39), suggesting that students particularly value AI for helping structure and present ideas more clearly and logically. Meanwhile, Support in Academic Writing recorded the lowest mean (M=3.30), though all constructs remained within the Highly Useful range, indicating consistently positive perceptions across writing quality, efficiency, organization, and academic writing support. These findings align with studies by Ibrahim et al. (2024), Kasneci et al. (2023), and Imran et al. (2023), which emphasize that AI improves writing performance by supporting idea development, organization, feedback, and productivity, reinforcing its



role as a meaningful aid throughout the writing process.

The Attitudes of Respondents Toward the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Writing Tasks

Table 7

Comfort in Using AI Tools

Items	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
3.1.1. I feel confident in using AI tools in my English Language writing tasks.	2.94	Agree
3.1.2. I am comfortable using AI tools in different stages of writing.	2.96	Agree
3.1.3. I find AI tools easy to use in assisting with writing tasks.	3.32	Strongly Agree
3.1.4. I feel comfortable using AI tools for English Language writing tasks.	2.97	Agree
Mean	3.05	Agree

Table 7 presents the respondents' attitudes toward the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English writing in terms of comfort in using AI tools. The overall mean score of 3.05 (Agree) indicates that students generally feel comfortable using AI in writing tasks, although some hesitation may still exist in fully integrating these tools into academic work. The highest-rated indicator, "*I find AI tools easy to use in assisting with writing tasks*" (M=3.32), suggests that students strongly recognize AI as accessible and user-friendly, while the remaining indicators, all interpreted as Agree, indicate moderate confidence in consistently using AI across writing tasks. The standard deviation (SD=0.608) reflects relatively consistent responses among participants. These findings support studies by Zhai (2024), Rahmawati (2026), and Kasneci et al. (2023), which suggest that while students perceive AI tools as easy to use, ethical concerns, academic integrity, and concerns over originality may still influence their confidence and comfort in fully integrating AI into academic writing.

The Attitudes of Respondents Toward the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Writing Tasks

Table 8

Perceived Appropriateness in Academic Writing

Items	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
3.2.1. AI tools can be used responsibly in English Language writing tasks.	3.43	Strongly Agree
3.2.2. AI tools are appropriate to use when their responses are carefully analyzed before use.	3.47	Strongly Agree



3.2.3. The use of AI is appropriate as it serves as a guide for my own writing.	3.40	Strongly Agree
3.2.4. The use of AI tools is appropriate when it follows the ethical and institutional guidelines.	3.42	Strongly Agree
Mean	3.43	Strongly Agree

Table 8 presents the respondents' attitudes toward the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English writing in terms of perceived appropriateness in academic writing. The overall mean score of 3.43 (Strongly Agree) indicates that students strongly perceive AI as appropriate for academic writing when used responsibly and within proper academic boundaries. The highest-rated indicator, "*AI tools are appropriate to use when their responses are carefully analyzed before use*" (M=3.47), suggests that students recognize the importance of critically evaluating AI-generated outputs rather than relying on them without reflection. The consistently high ratings across all indicators show a shared understanding that AI can serve as a supplementary academic tool while maintaining accountability and ethical responsibility. These findings align with studies by Cotton et al. (2024) and Zhai (2024), which emphasize that students perceive AI as appropriate in academic contexts when its use follows academic integrity standards, ethical guidelines, and responsible application in the writing process.

The Attitudes of Respondents Toward the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Writing Tasks

Table 9

Habitual Use of AI in Writing

Items	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
3.3.1. In the current educational landscape, using AI is no longer a 'bonus' but a standard tool for SHS students to remain competitive in writing.	2.98	Agree
3.3.2. I would find it difficult to maintain my current level of writing quality if I did not have access to AI tools.	2.83	Agree
3.3.3. I believe AI tools are necessary when I am facing challenges with words or organization of thoughts in writing.	3.15	Agree
3.3.4. I consider AI tools to be an essential requirement, rather than an optional choice, for completing my English writing assignments.	2.96	Agree
Mean	2.98	Agree

Table 9 presents the respondents' attitudes toward the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English writing in terms of habitual use. The overall mean score of 2.98 (Agree) indicates that students generally incorporate AI into their writing practices, although not at a level of strong dependence. The highest-rated indicator, "I believe AI tools are necessary when I am facing challenges with words or



organization of thoughts in writing” ($M=3.15$), suggests that students primarily use AI as support when encountering difficulties during writing. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated indicator on maintaining writing quality without AI ($M=2.83$) indicates that students do not view AI as indispensable and still recognize their own writing abilities independent of these tools. These findings align with studies by Chan and Hu (2023) and Kasneci et al. (2023), which suggest that while AI is increasingly integrated into academic writing practices, students generally treat it as a supplementary aid rather than a necessity, reflecting a balanced use between technological support and independent writing skills.

Summary Table for Attitudes

Table 10

The Summary Table on the Attitudes of Respondents Towards the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Writing Tasks

Items	Mean	Verbal Interpretation
3.1 Comfort in Using AI Tools	3.05	Agree
3.2 Perceived Appropriateness in Academic Writing	3.43	Strongly Agree
3.3 Habitual Use of AI in Writing	2.98	Agree
Mean	3.15	Agree

Table 10 presents the summary of respondents’ attitudes toward the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English writing across the identified constructs. The overall mean score of 3.15 (Agree) indicates that students generally hold positive attitudes toward integrating AI in writing tasks, with a standard deviation of 0.596 showing relatively consistent responses. Among the constructs, Perceived Appropriateness in Academic Writing obtained the highest mean ($M=3.43$), suggesting that students strongly believe AI is acceptable when used responsibly and within ethical boundaries. Meanwhile, Habitual Use recorded the lowest mean ($M=2.98$), followed by Comfort in Using AI Tools ($M=3.05$), indicating that while students recognize the benefits of AI, they have not yet developed strong reliance on it in their writing routines. These findings align with studies by Chan and Hu (2023), Zhai (2024), and Kasneci et al. (2023), which suggest that students generally maintain positive attitudes toward AI while balancing its use with ethical considerations, academic integrity, and independent skill development.



Comparison of the Respondents' Perceptions of the Usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Language Writing when Grouped According to Their Profile

Table 11

When Grouped According to their Age

Comparison of the Respondents' Perceptions of the Usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Language Writing when Grouped According to Their Age	Age	Mean	S.D.	T-value	p-value	Sig	Decision on H ₀
Improvement of Writing Quality	18-19 years old	3.30	0.563	-1.17	P = 0.28 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₁
	20 years old and above	3.46	0.336				
Writing Efficiency	18-19 years old	3.28	0.550	-1.91	P = 0.09 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₁
	20 years old and above	3.64	0.476				
Organization of Ideas	18-19 years old	3.38	0.594	-0.94	P = 0.38 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₁
	20 years old and above	3.57	0.515				
Support in Academic Writing	18-19 years old	3.28	0.555	-1.34	P = 0.22 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₁
	20 years old and above	3.57	0.554				

Table 11 presents the comparative analysis of respondents' perceptions on the usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing when grouped according to age. Results show that all p-values across the four constructs—Improvement of Writing Quality (p=0.28), Writing Efficiency (p=0.09), Organization of Ideas (p=0.38), and Support in Academic Writing (p=0.22)—are greater than the 0.05 significance level, indicating no statistically significant difference between age groups and leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Although respondents aged 20 years old and above obtained slightly higher mean scores, these differences were not significant enough to indicate varying perceptions. This suggests that students, regardless of age, generally share similar views on the usefulness of AI in writing tasks. These findings align with studies by Kasneci et al. (2023) and Chan and Hu (2023), which suggest that perceptions of AI usefulness are more influenced by exposure and educational context rather than demographic factors such as age.



Comparison of the Respondents' Perceptions of the Usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Language Writing when Grouped According to Their Profile

Table 12

When Grouped According to their Sex

Comparison of the Respondents' Perceptions of the Usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Language Writing when Grouped According to Their Sex	Sex	Mean	S.D.	T-value	p-value	Sig	Decision on H ₀
Improvement of Writing Quality	Male	3.20	0.619	1.90	P = 0.06 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₁
	Female	3.94	0.491				
Writing Efficiency	Male	3.22	0.579	1.43	P = 0.15 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₁
	Female	3.37	0.526				
Organization of Ideas	Male	3.29	0.633	1.56	P = 0.12 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₁
	Female	3.46	0.552				
Support in Academic Writing	Male	3.27	0.604	0.46	P = 0.65 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₁
	Female	3.32	0.526				

Table 12 presents the comparison of respondents' perceptions on the usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing when grouped according to gender. Results show that all computed p-values across the four dimensions—Improvement of Writing Quality, Writing Efficiency, Organization of Ideas, and Support in Academic Writing—are greater than the 0.05 significance level, indicating no statistically significant difference between male and female respondents and leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Although female respondents obtained slightly higher mean scores across all variables, the differences were not significant enough to suggest varying perceptions between groups. This indicates that students generally share similar perceptions regarding AI usefulness regardless of gender. These findings are consistent with studies by Brata et al. (2024) and Zhou (2025), which suggest that perceptions of AI usefulness are shaped more by shared academic experiences, access to technology, and exposure to digital tools rather than gender differences.



Comparison of the Respondents' Perceptions of the Usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Language Writing when Grouped According to Their Profile

Table 13

When Grouped According to Academic Track

Comparison of the Respondents' Perceptions of the Usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Language Writing when Grouped According to Their Academic Track	Academic Track	Mean	S.D.	T-value	p-value	Sig	Decision on H ₀
Improvement of Writing Quality	ABM	3.40	0.510	1.33	P = 0.27 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₁
	STEM	3.19	0.500				
	HUMSS	3.30	0.630				
Writing Efficiency	ABM	3.44	0.530	2.12	P = 0.13 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₁
	STEM	3.26	0.540				
	HUMSS	3.21	0.570				
Organization of Ideas	ABM	3.52	0.460	1.63	P = 0.20 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₁
	STEM	3.36	0.740				
	HUMSS	3.30	0.510				
Support in Academic Writing	ABM	3.41	0.460	1.46	P = 0.24 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₁
	STEM	3.28	0.530				
	HUMSS	3.20	0.650				

Table 13 presents the comparison of respondents' perceptions on the usefulness of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing when grouped according to academic track. Results show



that all computed p-values (0.27, 0.13, 0.20, and 0.24) are greater than the 0.05 significance level, indicating no statistically significant difference among ABM, STEM, and HUMSS students across the four dimensions and leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Although ABM students obtained slightly higher mean scores, the differences were not significant enough to suggest varying perceptions across academic tracks. This indicates that students generally share similar views regarding AI usefulness regardless of specialization. These findings are supported by studies by Younas et al. (2025) and Crompton and Burke (2024), which suggest that AI tools provide similar benefits across disciplines, with accessibility, shared academic demands, and common exposure to technology playing a greater role than academic track in shaping perceptions of usefulness.

Comparison of the Respondents' Attitudes on the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Language Writing when Grouped According to Their Profile

Table 14

When Grouped According to their Age

Comparison of the Respondents' Attitudes on the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Language Writing when Grouped According to Their Age	Age	Mean	S.D.	T-value	p-value	Sig	Decision on H ₀
Comfort in Using AI Tools	18-19 years old	3.02	0.60	-1.79	P = 0.12 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₂
	20 years old and above	3.46	0.63				
			6				
Perceived Appropriateness in Academic Writing	18-19 years old	3.42	0.50	-0.89	P = 0.40 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₂
	20 years old and above	3.57	0.42				
			6				
Habitual Use of AI in Writing	18-19 years old	2.98	0.66	0.14	P = 0.89 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₂
	20 years old and above	2.93	1.00				
			7				

Table 14 presents the comparison of respondents' attitudes toward the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing when grouped according to age. Results show that all p-values across the three constructs—Comfort in Using AI Tools (p=0.12), Perceived Appropriateness in Academic Writing (p=0.40), and Habitual Use of AI in Writing (p=0.89)—are greater than the 0.05 significance level, indicating no statistically significant difference between age groups and leading to



the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Although respondents aged 20 years old and above obtained slightly higher mean scores in comfort and perceived appropriateness, these differences were not significant enough to indicate distinct attitudes. This suggests that students generally share similar attitudes toward AI regardless of age. These findings align with studies by Chan and Hu (2023) and Kasneci et al. (2023), which suggest that attitudes toward AI are influenced more by shared educational experiences, accessibility, and familiarity with technology than by age differences alone.

Comparison of the Respondents' Attitudes on the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Language Writing when Grouped According to Their Profile

Table 15

When Grouped According to their Gender

Comparison of the Respondents' Attitudes on the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Language Writing when Grouped According to Their Gender	Gender	Mean	S.D.	T-value	p-value	Sig	Decision on H ₀
Comfort in Using AI Tools	Male	3.02	0.64	0.40	P = 0.69 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₂
	Female	3.07	0.59				
Perceived Appropriateness in Academic Writing	Male	3.41	0.53	0.46	P = 0.64 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₂
	Female	3.45	0.49				
Habitual Use of AI in Writing	Male	2.9	0.72	1.05	P = 0.29 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₂
	Female	3.03	0.65				

Table 15 presents the comparison of respondents' attitudes toward the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing when grouped according to gender. Results show that all computed p-values across the three dimensions—comfort in using AI, perceived appropriateness, and habitual use—are greater than the 0.05 significance level, indicating no statistically significant difference between male and female respondents and leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Although female respondents obtained slightly higher mean scores across all dimensions, the differences were not significant enough to indicate varying attitudes between groups. This suggests that students generally share similar attitudes toward AI regardless of gender. These findings align with studies by Chan and Hu (2023) and Kasneci et al. (2023), which suggest that attitudes toward AI are influenced more by shared academic experiences, accessibility, and perceived usefulness rather



than demographic factors such as gender.

Comparison of the Respondents' Attitudes on the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Language Writing when Grouped According to Their Profile

Table 16

When Grouped According to their Academic Track

Comparison of the Respondents' Attitudes on the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English Language Writing when Grouped According to Their Academic Track	Academic Track	Mean	S.D.	T-value	p-value	Sig	Decision on H ₀
Comfort in Using AI Tools	ABM	3.21	0.592	2.95	P = 0.06 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₂
	STEM	2.90	0.546				
	HUMSS	3.01	0.646				
Writing Efficiency Perceived Appropriateness in Academic Writing	ABM	3.5	0.503	0.65	P = 0.52 > 0.05	NS	Failed to Reject H ₀₂
	STEM	3.41	0.525				
	HUMSS	3.38	0.490				
Habitual Use of AI in Writing	ABM	3.16	0.639	3.20	P = 0.04 < 0.05	S	Reject H ₀₂
	STEM	3.00	0.733				
	HUMSS	2.80	0.639				

Table 16 presents the comparison of respondents' attitudes toward the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing when grouped according to academic track. Results show that Comfort in Using AI Tools ($p=0.06$) and Perceived Appropriateness in Academic Writing ($p=0.52$) are greater than the 0.05 significance level, indicating no statistically significant difference across ABM, STEM, and HUMSS students in these two dimensions. However, Habitual Use of AI ($p=0.04$) is below the 0.05 significance level, indicating a significant difference and leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis for this dimension. Among the groups, ABM students obtained the



highest mean in habitual use ($M=3.16$), followed by STEM ($M=3.00$) and HUMSS ($M=2.80$), suggesting differences in how frequently students incorporate AI into writing tasks. These findings align with studies by Crompton and Burke (2024), Chan and Hu (2023), Younas et al. (2025), and Zhai (2023), which suggest that while students across disciplines generally share similar attitudes toward AI, differences in academic demands and task requirements may influence how frequently AI is used in practice.

Conclusions

According to the respondents' demographic profile, the sample reflected a balanced representation of Senior High School students in terms of age, gender, and academic track. This suggests that the participants came from relatively diverse yet comparable academic backgrounds, providing a reliable basis for examining students' perceptions and attitudes toward the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language writing.

The findings revealed that students generally perceived Artificial Intelligence as highly useful in improving writing quality. This implies that AI tools effectively support learners in enhancing clarity, grammar, sentence construction, and the overall quality of their written outputs through immediate feedback and revision assistance.

Similarly, the results showed that students perceived AI as highly useful in improving writing efficiency. This indicates that AI helps learners accomplish writing tasks more easily, particularly when they encounter difficulties in expressing ideas, reducing effort while improving productivity during the writing process.

Moreover, students strongly perceived AI as highly useful in organizing ideas during writing tasks. This suggests that AI tools effectively assist learners in structuring thoughts, improving coherence, and organizing complex ideas into clearer and more logical written outputs.

In addition, the findings demonstrated that AI was perceived as highly useful in supporting academic writing tasks. This implies that AI serves as a meaningful academic support tool by assisting students in paraphrasing, content development, and understanding academic writing requirements more effectively.

Taken together, the overall findings indicate that students generally perceive AI as highly useful across multiple dimensions of English language writing. This suggests that AI has become a valuable educational support tool, with its strongest contribution observed in helping students organize and develop their ideas more effectively.

In terms of attitudes, the results revealed that students generally feel comfortable using AI tools in writing tasks. This indicates that learners are familiar with these technologies, although ethical concerns and confidence in responsible use may still influence the extent of their comfort in fully integrating AI into academic work.

Furthermore, students strongly agreed that AI is appropriate for use in academic writing when applied responsibly. This suggests that learners recognize the importance of critically evaluating AI-generated outputs and maintaining ethical standards when integrating AI into academic tasks.

The findings also showed that students generally incorporate AI into their writing habits, although not at a level of strong dependence. This implies that students view AI primarily as a supplementary support tool while still maintaining independence in their writing abilities and decision-making processes.

Overall, students demonstrated generally positive attitudes toward the integration of AI in



English writing tasks. This indicates that while learners recognize AI as an acceptable and beneficial academic tool, they continue to maintain a balanced approach in using it responsibly and moderately.

When grouped according to age, the results showed no significant difference in students' perceptions of AI usefulness. This suggests that learners across age groups generally share similar views regarding the benefits of AI in improving different aspects of English language writing.

Likewise, no significant difference was observed in students' perceptions of AI usefulness when grouped according to gender. This indicates that male and female students similarly recognize the benefits and usefulness of AI tools in writing-related academic tasks.

Similarly, students from different academic tracks demonstrated no significant difference in their perceptions of AI usefulness. This suggests that AI provides relatively uniform benefits across disciplines regardless of students' academic specialization.

In relation to attitudes, the findings revealed no significant difference when students were grouped according to age. This implies that students generally share comparable levels of comfort, acceptance, and habitual engagement with AI regardless of age differences.

Likewise, no significant difference was found in students' attitudes toward AI when grouped according to gender. This suggests that attitudes toward AI integration are shaped more by shared academic experiences and access to technology rather than gender-related differences.

However, when grouped according to academic track, a significant difference was observed in students' habitual use of AI despite similar levels of comfort and perceived appropriateness. This indicates that academic specialization influences how frequently students integrate AI into their writing practices, reflecting differences in task demands and writing habits across disciplines.

Acknowledgment

I would like to express my utmost gratitude to my thesis adviser who has guided me along the process of conducting this study. Also, to my family, friends, colleagues, whose constant support has made this journey possible. Lastly, I am grateful to the Almighty God who has provided me with wisdom and the source of my strength in pursuing greater feats. I owe this to the One who own it all. Soli deo Gloria!

Authorship and Contribution Statement

Cruz: Concept and design, literature review, data collection, analysis, and interpretation.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare the absence of any conflict of interest that could have influenced the content or conclusions of this paper. They affirm that no financial, personal, or professional relationships with other individuals or organizations have compromised the objectivity, integrity, or impartiality of the research work. As a final point, no external parties influenced the study design, data collection, analysis, or interpretation.



References

- Abdallah, N. (2025). ChatGPT in higher education: A systematic review of opportunities, challenges, and implications. *Computers & Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 100220. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100220>
- Aydin, O., Karaarslan, E., Erenay, F. S., & Bacanin, N. (2025). Generative AI in academic writing: A comparison of DeepSeek, Qwen, ChatGPT, Gemini, Llama, Mistral, and Gemma. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.04765>
- Brata, W. W., Padang, R. Y., Suriani, C., Prasetya, E., & Pratiwi, N. (2022). Students' Digital Literacy Based on Students' Interest in Digital Technology, Internet Costs, Gender, and Learning Outcomes. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 17(3).
- Chan, C. K., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *Education and Information Technologies*.
- Deep, P. D. (2025). Impacts on writing skills, critical thinking, and integrity in AI-assisted education. *Societies*, 15(9), 247. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15090247>
- Deng, R., Jiang, M., Yu, X., Lu, Y., & Liu, S. (2025). Does ChatGPT enhance student learning? A systematic review and meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Computers & Education*. Retrieved February 03, 2026 from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360131524002380>
- Floris, F. D., & Renandya, W. A. (2025). Artificial intelligence tools for research writing: Practical tips for teachers. *TESL-EJ*, 29(1). <https://doi.org/10.55593/ej.29113int2>
- Ibrahim, K., & Kirkpatrick, R. (2024). Potentials and implications of ChatGPT for ESL writing instruction. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 25(1), 87–104. Retrieved February 4, 2026 from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1441344.pdf>
- Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., ... 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>
- Khalifa, M., & Albadawy, M. (2024). Using artificial intelligence in academic writing and research: An essential productivity tool. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine Update*, 5, 100145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmpbup.2024.100145>
- Li, X., Chu, S. K. W., & Ki, W. W. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence in English writing classrooms: Opportunities and challenges. *Education and Information Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12577-3>
- Pensky, T., & Usdan, S. (2025). Generative AI's impact on graduate student professional writing. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-025-00528-z>
- Younas, M., et al. (2025). AI tools in higher education: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Education*.
- Zhai, X. (2024). ChatGPT and AI in education: Ethical concerns, academic integrity, and implications for learning. *Educational Technology & Society*.

