

**Perceptions of AI Writing Tools in Enhancing English Writing Proficiency: A Qualitative
Study on Private University Undergraduates in Bangladesh**

By

Raisa Morsalin

ID: 22103022

A thesis submitted to the Department of English and Humanities in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of Bachelor in Arts in English and Humanities

Brac University

October, 2025

© 2025. Brac University

All rights reserved

Declaration

I hereby declare that

1. The thesis submitted is my own original work while completing a degree at Brac University.
2. The thesis does not contain material previously published or written by a third party, except where this is appropriately cited through full and accurate referencing.
3. The thesis does not contain material which has been accepted, or submitted, for any other degree or diploma at a university or other institution.
4. I have acknowledged all main sources of help.

Student's Full Name and Signature:

Student Full Name: Raisa Morsalin

Student ID: 22103022

Approval

The thesis titled “Perceptions of AI Writing Tools in Enhancing English Writing Proficiency: A Qualitative Study on Private University Undergraduates in Bangladesh” submitted by Raisa Morsalin (22103022) of Fall, 2025 has been accepted as satisfactory in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Bachelor of Arts in English on 27th October, 2025.

Examining Committee:

Supervisor:

(Member)

Atiya Tafannum, Lecturer
Department of English and Humanities
BRAC University

Departmental Head:

(Chair)

Professor Firdous Azim, PhD
Chairperson, Department of English and Humanities
BRAC University

Ethics Statement

The work in this paper is original, the ideas mentioned in other journals and articles are cited duly. I have used information from credible sources only. Additionally, ethical guidelines were followed strictly to gather information from the participants. More details are provided in the methodology chapter.

Dedication

To my beloved parents and brother for their unconditional support throughout my entire journey at BRACU. To my father, for letting me study English and always having my back, no matter what. To my mother, for not just being my source of comfort but also the source of my strength.

Acknowledgement

I am forever indebted to my faculty members of the ENH department, especially my supervisor, Atiya Tafannum, who has always pushed me to become the best version of myself. I could not have finished this paper without the unwavering support of her. And lastly, Tasnim, my best friend. Every phone call that I have had with you has given me tremendous courage and motivation. Thank you for being my confidant through everything.

Abstract:

In recent years, English academic writing has become an essential skill for university students in Bangladesh, yet many face challenges in developing fluency, vocabulary, and confidence. This study investigates the role of AI-assisted writing tools — such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, and QuillBot in supporting students' writing skills and overall learning experience. Using semi-structured interviews with ten participants of a renowned private university in Bangladesh, the research explores how these tools influence grammar, vocabulary, paraphrasing, and revision practices, as well as boosts learners' confidence, motivation, and sense of autonomy. The findings reveal that AI tools function as both cognitive and psychological supports, offering immediate feedback, scaffolding idea generation, and encouraging reflective engagement with language. However, challenges such as meaning distortion, prompt-dependence, overreliance, and ethical concerns including plagiarism anxiety, highlight the need for conscious and balanced use. The study emphasizes that AI can be a valuable collaborative partner in writing when integrated thoughtfully, promoting skill development, metacognitive awareness, and learner autonomy. Recommendations include fostering prompt literacy, encouraging critical evaluation of AI suggestions, and providing guidance on ethical use, offering practical insights for educators and students in the Bangladeshi higher-education context.

Keywords: *AI-assisted writing, academic writing, Bangladeshi private university students, Grammarly, ChatGPT, QuillBot, learner autonomy, ethical usage*

Table of Contents

Declaration	ii
Approval	iii
Ethics Statement	iv
Dedication	v
Acknowledgement	vi
Abstract:	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Understanding Writing as a Language Skill	1
1.2 Traditional Writing Instruction:	2
1.3 Emergence and Varieties of AI-Based Writing Tools	3
1.4 The Global Shift Towards AI in Education	4
1.5 AI Tools in the Bangladeshi Higher-Education Context	6
1.6 Research Problem	7
1.7 Significance of the Study	7
1.8 Research Objectives	8
1.9 Research Questions	8
Chapter 2: Literature Review:	9

2.1 Writing as a Core Language Skill	9
2.2 Writing Proficiency Grammar, Vocabulary and Paraphrasing	10
2.3 Conventional Teaching of Writing and its shortcomings	12
2.4 Emergence of AI Writing Tools	13
2.5 Global Attitudes to AI in Language Education	14
2.6 AI in the Asian Context	16
2.7 AI in Bangladeshi Higher Education	17
2.8 Perceptions of Students and Teachers Toward AI Tools	18
2.9 Problems, Limitations, and Ethical Concerns.	19
2.10 Research Gap	20
3.Methodology	21
3.1 Research Design:	21
3.2 Research Participants	22
3.3 Research Site:	24
3.4 Research Instruments:	25
3.5 Data Collection:	26
3.6 Data Analysis Procedure:	27
3.7 Ethical Considerations:	29

Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion	30
4.1 Impact of AI Writing Tools on Grammatical Competence	31
4.1.1 Grammar as the Foundation of Writing:	31
4.1.2 Intensive Change in Particular Areas of Grammar	33
4.1.3 Conscious Learning vs. Blind Correction	36
4.2 Paraphrasing and Vocabulary Development	38
4.2.1 Introduction to New Vocabulary and Word Choice Awareness	39
4.2.2 Interpretation of Word Contexts and Usage with the help of AI tools	42
4.2.3 AI-Assisted Paraphrasing and Meaning Retention	44
4.3 Impact on Confidence, Motivation and Revision practices	48
4.3.1 More Confidence and Quickening Drafting	48
4.3.2 AI as Brainstorming Partner and Mid- Process Support	50
4.3.3 Dual Effect of AI on Motivation and Critical Thinking	53
4. 4 Challenges, Limitations, and Ethical Concern	56
4.4.1 Accuracy, Context-Sensitivity, and Prompt-Dependence	57
4.4.2 Meaning Distortion and Paraphrasing Limitations	60
4.4.3 Ethical Concerns and Overreliance Risks	63
4.4.4 Plagiarism and Originality Concerns	66

Chapter 5: Conclusion	69
Implications for Future Research:	71
Recommendations:	71
References	
Appendices	
Appendix A	
Appendix B	

Chapter 1: Introduction

Language is one of the things that makes us human because it shapes how we think, how we express ourselves, and how we see things. Among the four main language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), writing is often the hardest. It needs control, clear order, and careful attention to detail. For learners of English as a second or foreign language, writing is harder. They must master grammar, build a vocabulary, and learn to make ideas flow smoothly and connect in a logical way. But with the rise of artificial intelligence (AI) writing tools, things are changing. These tools now offer instant, personalized feedback that can help overcome many of the limits of traditional writing instruction. This study used qualitative study to investigate how AI-based writing tools, such as Grammarly, ChatGPT and QuillBot influence students' writing accuracy, vocabulary development, and grammatical competence in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context, with a particular focus on Bangladeshi higher education.

1.1 Understanding Writing as a Language Skill

Language works as a vehicle for thought, expression and identity rather than being served as a tool for communication. There are four skills that work as a foundation of every language: listening, speaking, reading and writing. Among these four skills, writing is always considered as the most cognitively demanding which requires constant practice and concentrated linguistic control. So far, writing is largely recognized as one of the most challenging language skills to master, especially for those who learn English as a second or foreign language. Among four skills, speaking allows for more spontaneous and interactive communication, unlike speaking

writing demands a high scale of productive competence where learners need to process vocabulary, grammar, structure, cohesion, coherence and style.

1.2 Traditional Writing Instruction:

Traditionally, in English language classrooms, the writing part has always relied on teacher-given-feedback, peer review, copied classwork, typical writing practices and revisions. However, in many educational contexts, particularly in countries like Bangladesh, proper writing segments and instructions are often disrupted by large class sizes, limited individual feedback, individual writing task-monitoring, limited teacher and insufficient time for giving instructions, as writing is a slow and lengthy process depending on the competence level of learners. These factors create major challenges that affect the development of students' writing proficiency. In Bangladeshi higher education, writing instruction is often examination driven where the focus remains on producing correct answers rather than developing creative or analytical writing skills. Students are frequently asked to reproduce memorized essays or follow a given structure which hinders their ability to experiment with language and express original ideas. Also, the noticeable effect has usually been on the learner's grammatical accuracy, lexical choices and structural fluency. In Bangladeshi English classrooms, most of the students struggle to receive personalized support on time that would help them improve their writing competence. As a result, their writing development process slows down and contributes to a lack of confidence. So eventually, this challenge has led to the rising interests that can provide them supplements or enhance the writing process and that includes mainly technological tools. Among these, AI-powered writing tools have emerged as one of the solutions to these problems.

1.3 Emergence and Varieties of AI-Based Writing Tools

The emergence of artificial intelligence, (AI)-based writing tools has brought new possibilities for supporting learners beyond their physical classroom and those limited learning sessions. These tools are designed to provide instant feedback that are mainly automated on various aspects of writing including grammar, punctuation, use of appropriate vocabulary, tone, clarity and overall coherence. Current AI writing tool for ELT can be grouped into several categories:

- Grammar/ Mechanics Checkers: For example, *Grammarly*. It helps detecting mistakes in terms of grammar, spelling, punctuation and usage. They provide explanations for corrections which enable learners to understand and use the rules.
- Paraphrasing and Rewriting tools: The Quillbot platform assists the learners in creating sentences in new uses to enhance clarity, conciseness and writing style. They also say that they can assist in avoiding redundancy and training in paraphrasing skills, which are the most vital elements in academic writing.
- Generative AI Writing Assistants: Large language models such as ChatGPT have the ability to write ideas and build up outlines. They are also able to do interactive discussions to perfect a writing by the student giving explanations and alternative wording. They have become an integral component of the education practice in the global arena where millions of students are utilizing them on a daily basis.

Bangladesh is showing an increase in the desire to understand how such tools can be used to complement classroom education and overcome the shortcomings of traditional education.

Access to AI tools has also been increased by the presence of free and low-cost solutions, which means that students of varying socioeconomic status will be able to access them.

1.4 The Global Shift Towards AI in Education

The 21st century has experienced extraordinary levels of integration of artificial intelligence in the educational systems worldwide. This is not merely a transformation happening in technologically advanced countries; it is also spreading to the pedagogical practices in various situations. AI is no longer an experimental prototype and has become a common element in numerous educational settings. The usage of AI tools in education is preconditioned with a number of major reasons: the necessity of individual learning, the need to provide instructional support at scale, and the increasing pace of digital literacy of students.

AI-based learning platforms are currently deployed across the globe to support adaptive learning whereby content and feedback are adjusted in accordance with the needs of individual learners. As an illustration, the intelligent tutoring systems are capable of analyzing the current state of a student and detecting their weaknesses and offer exercises that would help cover the gaps. The writing tools are a subdivision of such systems, and in particular, they are created to improve written communication skills with immediate and context-sensitive feedback support.

According to recent research, millions of users of Grammarly, ChatGPT, or QuillBot platforms use them on a daily basis, both students and teachers. Grammarly by itself claimed more than 30 million active users per day in 2023, across more than 500,000 learning institutions globally (Grammarly, 2023). A large number of these tools are used, so it can be assumed that their contribution to aiding language acquisition and academic writing is increasingly recognized.

AI-based writing assistants in higher education, and especially in English-language universities, are turning into inseparable companions of students who frequently need to write a significant amount of written work within the strictest deadlines.

Use of AI tools is also promoted by the growing access to high-speed internet and cheap digital devices worldwide. In one of the studies, the authors have commented on how the COVID-19 pandemic led to the increased rate of this trend, where institutions turned their digital learning techniques to technology based and, by extension, to AI based resources that became more visible and available to the world (Dwivedi et al., 2023). This has erased the line between formal classroom teaching and learning on their own since students now are provided with advanced writing assistance technologies beyond the conventional teacher-student relationship. Nevertheless, the adoption of AI tools is not certain. Others have raised the danger of excessive dependence on AI, loss of possible critical thinking by the learner, and concerns over privacy and originality of data (Bond, 2019).

However, according to other research, such tools may certainly be employed to supplement human teaching and allow students to have more control over the learning process when used strategically (Lira et al., 2025). This paper also indicates that; AI tools have the potential to enhance the performances on writing exercises and that AI may serve as a scaffold to learning, but not as a replacement.

1.5 AI Tools in the Bangladeshi Higher-Education Context

The implementation of AI in classrooms is also not widespread yet, although in Bangladesh, informal use by students has grown speedily. The country has a diverse higher education system that comprises both the public and the private universities. Overcrowding of classes, outdated methodologies, and lack of access to technological facilities are some of the challenges faced by the public universities. Contrastingly, Bangladesh-based online learning platforms were first adopted by the private universities before most of the public universities did, and this aspect allowed them to have more exposure to any type of advanced-digital utilization (Shohel, 2025).

The most active consumers of the AI writing tools are students that are enrolled in English-based programs, particularly those that are students of the English department in a private university and have completed major courses of this subject. The rates of using the AI tools among the English major students are high, both related to academic writing (Tran and Nguyen, 2024). Since their studies focus on writing more often, they rely on Grammarly, QuillBot, or ChatGPT to receive feedback and suggestions on how to revise the work. These tools also give them the feeling that they are in control of the learning process and to make their drafts and play with new words and sentence structure by themselves.

However, challenges remain. Not every student can enjoy the features of premium tools and have good internet connections. Educators also disagree on whether or not AI should be encouraged or discouraged to be used in writing tasks. Others perceive it as an effective addition, whereas some are afraid that it compromises innovation and academic integrity. All these contradictory

opinions contribute to the investigation of the perceptions of students about the role of AI tools in their academic progression in the context of Bangladesh.

1.6 Research Problem

Even though AI-based writing tools are being introduced and used extensively by students, their exact effects on language development remain unknown. The issue is that it is still unclear whether these tools can lead to the development of writing competence in the long term or merely enhance the surface quality of the texts in the short-term.

Thus, the research issue to be considered in this study can be formulated as follows: although AI tools are becoming more popular with Bangladeshi university students as an aid to their writing, little is known of what students think of their effect on grammatical competence, vocabulary growth, paraphrasing skill, and, in general, writing competence.

1.7 Significance of the Study

The significance of the study is found in the fact that it examines how the students of Bangladeshi private universities perceive AI-based writing tools and how it affects the grammar, vocabulary, and paraphrasing skills. It can give understanding on how AI tools can be used to help learners achieve proficiency in writing, enhance confidence, and promote autonomy by permitting the learners to give their views. The results can inform teachers on how AI can be effectively implemented in writing instructions and overcome the limitations of overreliance and ethical issues and can present brief recommendations on how to enhance English academic writing in Bangladeshi higher education.

1.8 Research Objectives

The objectives of this research are:

1. To investigate the viewpoints of the undergraduate students on the application of AI-based writing tools as a way of enhancing their grammatical skills.
2. To study the perceptions of the students towards the impact of AI tools on his/her vocabulary enhancement and paraphrasing strategies.
3. To examine the perceptions of students about the influence of AI tools in their overall writing competence, such as coherence, cohesion, and accuracy.
4. To determine the difficulties, constraints, and ethical issues that students relate to the utilization of AI writing tools in academic settings.

1.9 Research Questions

Based on these objectives, the research questions guiding this study are:

1. How do undergraduate students perceive the impact of AI-based writing tools on their grammatical competence?
2. How do students perceive the influence of AI tools on their vocabulary development and paraphrasing strategies?
3. In what ways do AI tools affect student's confidence, motivation, and approach to revision and drafting?

4. What challenges and limitations do students face when using AI tools for academic writing?

Chapter 2: Literature Review:

This review examines existing literature on AI tools in developing students' writing proficiency, structured around core components of writing: grammar, vocabulary, and paraphrasing. It first examines global scholarship on writing instruction and AI, then explores studies in the Asian context, and finally narrows down to research conducted in Bangladesh. The review also highlights the perceptions of both students toward these tools, before identifying the gaps that this study aims to address.

2.1 Writing as a Core Language Skill

Scholars widely agree that writing is the most cognitively demanding skill in second language acquisition. As Hyland (2019) points out, writing is not merely about producing sentences but about “organizing ideas into a coherent whole that adheres to disciplinary conventions” (p. 57). For ESL learners, the processes of planning, making drafts, revising and editing remain central for successful writing. Outside the classroom, especially for Bangladeshi undergraduates it is challenging to get even limited exposure to high-quality English input and standard feedback. And studies in private universities show that teacher feedback in English language writing classes is frequent but not always deep or individualized and feedback on writing focuses heavily on surface errors with less attention to coherence, style or logical flow (Karim & Ivy, 2024).

Another recent study (Zaheer & Rahman, 2024) found that while undergraduate students can use different cohesive devices in their writing, their range is quite limited and they often overuse certain discourse markers which eventually affects the overall flow and clarity of their texts. In addition, according to Khan et al. (2024), the grammar, word choice, and linking ideas based on contexts, are the main areas of concern as Bangladeshi students do not receive enough one-to-one feedback in big classes. Their results are compatible with those of Zamel (1983) who added that it is through continuous feedback and revision that writing can be improved. It would mean that the Bangladeshi learners would benefit greatly through the feedback that addresses not only the more profound aspects of writing such as structure, flow, tone, but also grammar and vocabulary.

2.2 Writing Proficiency Grammar, Vocabulary and Paraphrasing

Good writing entails grammatical skill. Studies indicate that ESL students regard grammar as the foundation of good writing (Ferris, 2009). Good grammar not only corrects sentences but also makes the writers confident. According to Bitchener and Ferris (2012), the skill of writing includes accuracy which is directly connected with the skills of a learner to present complicated ideas (p. 47). Such tools as Grammarly are trendy as they identify the grammatical errors and correct them immediately. According to Dewi (2022), students consider Grammarly to be an effective automated writing checker as it identifies grammar, word, and mechanical mistakes (p. 159). According to Maypida (2024), Grammarly feedback helped students to see sentence errors they did not pay attention to previously (p. 42). Ferris (2010) warns that the automated feedback

should be applied with caution, since the students require assistance in decoding the feedback so that they can apply what they learn to new writing (p. 190).

Vocabulary is also significant. According to Nation (2013), a good vocabulary is essential to make sense when saying things and be fluent when writing (p. 119). Such AI tools as QuillBot assist students, providing them with the list of synonyms or rephrasing sentences, which contributes to the development of vocabulary. (Fahmi & Cahyono, 2021) established in a study that ESL students enhanced their knowledge of words and improved their capacity to paraphrase upon frequent use of QuillBot (p. 10). Nation (2013) also recalls that learning new words requires repeated meaningful use of it (p. 121), so the students should continue using AI suggestions on a regular basis to ensure that the words are useful in the long run.

Paraphrasing is a skill of language as well as a method of not copying other people. According to Keck (2014), paraphrasing is a challenging task among ESL learners since they are required to retain the meaning intact and make it original. She discovered that new writers tend to imitate a lot of the source and offer little new ideas (p. 8). Tools that utilize AI, which paraphrase themselves claim to simplify this process, are doubted by many researchers whether they actually assist students in learning better paraphrasing skills. (Fahim & Cahyono, 2021) stated that students found QuillBot helpful in learning how to express the same idea using different words and retain the meaning, however, many of them could not remember the meaning and keep it the same as the original (p. 12). According to Tran and Nguyen (2024), students must be aware that real learning and practice are not to be substituted with the ChatGPT as it can assist in structuring and paraphrasing ideas in a clear manner (p. 29).

2.3 Conventional Teaching of Writing and its shortcomings

Typically, ESL writing is learned through the assistance of the teachers and fellow tutors. There are issues with these ways, particularly where resources are inadequate. According to Ferris and Hedgcock (2014), teachers hardly have time to provide detailed feedback to each student. This implies that there is slow progress and superficial changes as opposed to deep learning. They also stated that teachers have too many student papers to check, thus they simply can mark the surface errors that are visible (p. 17).

The issue is aggravated by large classes and a test-oriented curriculum in Bangladesh. According to Hamid and Baldauf (2008), in the primary and secondary level, the lessons on the English language only repeat the information and leave very little opportunity to practice actual writing. They argue that, “students learn to pass examinations rather than to write meaningfully” (p. 318). As a result, students develop neither confidence nor competence in writing. A more recent study by Karim & Ivy (2011) states that, while students view teacher feedback as significant, the feedback they receive is often not specific or timely. They mention, “students reported that feedback often comes after long intervals which makes it difficult to apply suggestions in their upcoming writing tasks” (p. 37). The gap created by such limitations has prompted growing interest in supplementary digital tools that can provide immediate, personalized feedback. So, some researchers introduced alternative models to overcome these limitations. For instance, Nazmun (2025) in his study, “Effects of Teaching English-Writing Skills in a Flipped Classroom: An Analysis of ESL Teachers at Tertiary Level in Bangladesh”, reports that, in flipped classrooms, where students review lecture on writing content outside class and class time is spent

on revision that is interactive, peer discussion and guidance of teacher which improves writing skills more rapidly. But this model also depends heavily on access to technology and active participation which is not present across every institution.

2.4 Emergence of AI Writing Tools

Grammar, vocabulary, clarity, coherence, and even style are examples of writing elements that have been altered by such tools like Grammarly, QuillBot, and ChatGPT, which provide instant feedback on the quality of their writing. Agzamxanova and Golovko (2025) state that these tools are transforming the writing pedagogy providing the teachers with the feedback, which students cannot receive independently and which is huge and instant (p. 29). This paper identifies that this type of tool bridges the feedback gap where students can write drafts more effectively. In the same note, Bond (2019) claims that AI writing software became a part of higher education as it expands the boundaries of the instructors by automating the technical response but allowing them to evaluate individual writing and think critically. This implies a complimentary support and not a substitute for human teaching.

An increasing number of researchers have looked at the functionality of these tools in ESL. Dwivedi et al. noted that Grammarly facilitates the independence of a learner because they can visualize and correct their grammatical patterns independently (p. 52). In the meantime, Tran and Nguyen (2024) discovered that students with the English major in Vietnam had ChatGPT as an interactive brainstorming partner and were able to come up with academic phrases and develop arguments (p. 27) that assisted them in acquiring lexical and rhetorical knowledge. All these AI

tools contribute in various ways to the writing development, but they all have a common trait of being able to make feedback more readily available.

Nonetheless, these AI-based applications also create the issues of over-reliance and academic honesty. And all scholars are hopeful. According to Liu and Guo (2023), overuse of AI generated text could reduce the self-editing skills and criticality of the student towards the English language (p. 88). Similarly, Kasneci et al. (2023) were also concerned with the presence of ethical concerns like plagiarism, biasness of AI recommendations and a possible "erosion of the authorship skills of the student" (p. 8).

In spite of these fears, other writers propose AI writing tools to be balancing access to quality feedback, particularly in situations where the availability of teacher feedback is low. According to Li and Zou (2024), AI-based corrective feedback may be used as an addition to classroom teaching, providing personalized and context-dependent advice (p. 64). As a result, the development of these tools is an intellectual transition, in the sense that in a single aspect these automated writing tools facilitate self-regulated learning, and in another aspect they pose problems to learners in terms of balancing the support with integrity and authenticity.

2.5 Global Attitudes to AI in Language Education

The adoption of AI tools in language learning has produced varied views on the adoption of AI tools among researchers, teachers and students across the globe. These tools are considered as useful tools in most EFL settings that encourage learner autonomy and develop language competence. Nevertheless, studies have been able to pinpoint the possibilities and difficulties in the application of AI tools in writing. As an example, Tran and Nguyen (2024) discovered that

Vietnamese undergraduates viewed ChatGPT as a helpful tool that allows them to paraphrase sentences, learn new words, and provide their writing with the necessary tone (P. 28). Their exploration pointed towards the fact that they are especially helpful with English-major students who tend to experience some difficulties with the ability to construct complex sentences and lexical variation.

Similarly, Amina (2024) observed that Moroccan EFL students using Grammarly and reported that learners experienced, “a drastic and noticeable rise in confidence and clarity in academic writing after repeated AI-assisted feedback” (p. 42). However, Amina also warned that some students developed a “habitual dependence on AI for final editing which caused limitations on their self-revision skills” (p. 43). This clearly expresses a growing concern shared across global research that raising comfort and dependency on AI support may intentionally discourage independent self-editing and revising practices.

From a broader critical viewpoint, several scholars warn that AI tools are not always beneficial as it may weaken student’s critical involvement with language itself. Zhao (2023) points out that although AI enhances productivity, it may also “destroy the learner’s sense of authorship and responsibility in academic writing” (p. 240). Researchers across global EFL contexts have raised voices about similar concerns that AI can well organize writing and editing but it is risky to create a culture of intellectual passivity if it is overused (Kasneci et al., 2023). They worry about students bypassing critical thinking by relying too heavily on automation. This tension between support and dependency is a recurring theme in the global literature.

2.6 AI in the Asian Context

Research in Asia indicates the increasing popularity of writing tools on AI to learn English. Al-Rami (2024) has examined students in Oman that study English as a foreign language. They discovered that students enjoyed the idea of using AI to check grammar, but they were not sure whether AI can assist them to acquire more profound skills of writing. In another study, authors analyzed the results of university students in Indonesia and discovered such applications like QuillBot and ChatGPT that enabled them to improve grammar awareness and sentence-building capabilities (Suharto et. al.,2025). Nonetheless, students should be cautious enough not to get overly reliant on the tools or even write in autopilot.

In South Asia the research is less, and the number of students using AI tools is increasing. Tajik (2025) claimed that Iranian learners were more motivated and involved in using AI platforms. Nevertheless, the response of these tools was incorrect or misplaced in the situation at times (p. 42). It is due to this reason that a number of learners are uncertain about whether AI could be trusted when it comes to challenging academic assignments. On the whole, the studies indicate that the usefulness of AI is relative to the situation, its accessibility, and the attitude of students towards its usage.

Further evidence can be provided with the help of more recent studies in East and Southeast Asia. Thangthong (2024) examined Thai university students who are foreign language learners of the English language. According to the students, AI writing tools served to learn new words and enhance the structure of the sentence. However, they also cautioned that over-reliance on technology might bring about cheating and other issues (p. 116). Song (2023) conducted a study

in China whereby students with AI assistance in writing classes showed to be significantly better in their writing activities and were more engaged in the classroom as compared to their peers who did not utilize AI-assisted writing (p. 7). This observation indicates that AI assistance may foster engagement and development of linguistic competence when appropriately used as scaffolder. Similarly, Meniado (2024), compared learners in Hong Kong and Vietnam, stated that, participants appreciated ChatGPT's capacity to "reformulate sentences and explore lexical variation," although some learners mentioned "occasional inaccuracy and shifts in meaning when prompts were unclear" (p. 9).

2.7 AI in Bangladeshi Higher Education

Bangladesh provides an important and timely site for investigating how AI-based writing tools are transforming tertiary level of English language instruction. Over the last few years, private universities in Dhaka and other cities have seen growth which is often led by students seen raising interest in using advanced technological applications based on Artificial Intelligence, such as ChatGPT, QuillBot and Grammarly for academic work. Khan et al. (2024) surveyed Bangladeshi university students and found generally positive perceptions of AI writing tools. He found that undergraduate English majors who used AI writing tools and perceived improvements in grammar and lexical choice reported increased confidence while revising the drafts of writings. Similarly, in another study, a survey of English teachers in Bangladesh, observed that, "majority of the students use ChatGPT, Grammarly and QuillBot on a regular basis" and that many teachers regard these tools as "efficient auxiliary tools for enhancing writing, vocabulary and grammar" (Munni & Rafique, 2023, p. 2). These studies suggest that AI applications are

already functioning as easily accessible supports where teacher feedback is limited or delayed which is a common feature in Bangladeshi higher education.

At the same time, several context-specific drawbacks temper the promise of AI. Bangladeshi institutional features such as crowded classrooms, time-pressured syllabus, weak basics of previous level's content and exam oriented assessment which continue to limit opportunities for formative writing practices. In such environments, students often seek help from AI tools as pragmatic solutions to immediate problems like drafting, proofreading, vocabulary suggestions, fixing grammatical errors and quick paraphrasing. Khan et al. (2024) observed, while students credited AI with improving surface accuracy, they were more cautious about claims that tools produce deeper gains in coherence, argumentation or rhetorical competence.

More experimental and observational studies from Bangladesh add more perspectives. Hasib et al. (2024), examined undergraduate student's real life interactions with ChatGPT and found that learners frequently used AI for gathering ideas and for language polishing but they also reported encountering inaccuracies and contextually inappropriate suggestions. They observed that students who used AI critically by comparing suggestions given by ChatGPT with their own drafts and with other real sources, tended to show better learning outcomes than those who directly accepted or copied AI suggestions unethically.

2.8 Perceptions of Students and Teachers Toward AI Tools

The perception of learners is at the center of the analysis which is about the effectiveness of the integration of AI tools into learning a language. Since this research aims to investigate perceptions and not quantifiable results, it is significant to revise the role of attitudes towards AI

in the writing practices. This has been found in most studies globally that show that students are likely to have a closer perception of AI tools compared to teachers. Imane and Siham (2023) discovered that the Algerian students found AI tools most useful because they provided them with instant feedback on grammar and vocabulary to lose anxiety, awkwardness and gain more motivation to write in the English language (p. 214). Their research also mentioned, though, that teachers appeared to be insecure and emphasized on the relevancy of critical engagement and conscious learning instead of passive correction (p. 217). This indicates that AI tools should not be applied as a substitute of teacher instruction, but an auxiliary tool to it.

New studies on the same say the same in the context of South Asia, more so Bangladesh. Rahman and Akter (2024) investigated the use of AI in Bangladeshi university students and stated that ChatGPT and QuillBOT were viewed as confidence-enhancing writing aids, but not as learning companions (p. 7). Teachers however, complained about academic honesty and originality of student work.

2.9 Problems, Limitations, and Ethical Concerns.

Although AI writing tools have increased intellectual capabilities, they also create serious problems in the areas of dependency, accuracy, accessibility and ethics. The over-dependence has turned out to be one of the most commonly mentioned issues. Similarly, to what Amina (2024) noted in her case with Moroccan University students, when they overused Grammarly and QuillBot, they tended to simply leave brainstorming and structuring the ideas to the software, which gradually pushed them out of the process of actual learning (p. 43).

Academic integrity is another serious issue. Especially when it comes to generative AI such as ChatGPT, that can generate entire essays or even fine-tuned arguments that can be hard to distinguish between what is considered a legitimate aid and academic dishonesty. According to Dawson and Smith (2023), these types of automated writing tools undermine the very definition of authorship and originality in the educational sector, especially on the tertiary education level (p. 122). Teachers tend to struggle to identify AI-written materials, and a number of learners are not convinced of the ethical boundaries of using AI in academic writing activities.

There also exist technical constraints. According to Suharto et al. (2025), AI feedback is not always contextual and correct, and it can be misleading to learners. Further, in other countries such as Bangladesh, there is a digital divide because of unequal access to technology and this has brought questions of equity.

2.10 Research Gap

There are a number of trends disclosed in the literature: AI tools can aid grammar, vocabulary, and paraphrasing; students tend to feel positively about them; teachers are reserved. Nevertheless, it is a view that has not been extensively studied and, in particular, with respect to Bangladeshi undergraduates and their attitudes toward AI tools in building writing skills. The majority of the extant research is either international or other Asian-based and tends to be quantitative in nature. The research thus fills an evident gap through a qualitative investigation on the perception of the AI tool usage among the students of the Bangladeshi university in terms of developing their grammar, vocabulary, and paraphrasing capabilities. By focusing on

perceptions rather than measurable accuracy, it contributes to understanding the lived experiences of learners in a rapidly changing educational environment.

3.Methodology

This chapter explains how the study was conducted. It includes details about the research design, participants, site of the research, tools that were used during the research, data collection procedure and analysis method of the data and ethical considerations. The chosen methods were meant to explore the perception of undergraduate students from the Department of English of a reputed private university in Bangladesh and how they view the use of AI- based writing tools in improving their writing abilities. It also presents the way of collecting data, organization and analysis of it, to achieve the study's goals.

3.1 Research Design:

The main purpose of this study is to get a clear understanding of how university students perceive the role of AI tools in developing their writing skills, especially in grammar, vocabulary and paraphrasing. The study followed a qualitative research approach as the main focus is on student's personal experiences and opinions rather than numerical results.

A qualitative design is useful in terms of exploring the inner thoughts and emotions of the learners and getting an idea about their reflections in a detailed way. The qualitative research method aims to interpret human experiences and social realities through descriptive data sets

instead of statistics and this is noted by Dornyei (2007) and Creswell (2014). With this approach, they explored how students understand their own writing process and to what extent and how AI tools have influenced their English writing improvement.

To collect data, semi-structured interviews are used. This type of interview allows both structure and flexibility which ensures that all main objectives are covered. At the same time, this method gave participants the freedom to share their experiences and ideas openly. The format helped the researcher to discuss significant areas of this study while maintaining a natural conversational flow.

3.2 Research Participants

At first, ten undergraduate students from the English department of a well-known private university in Dhaka, Bangladesh, took part in this research. As writing is a regular and important part of their academic work which they do regularly in both Literature and Linguistics programs, they were selected to be a part of this study. They complete a variety of writing tasks such as essays, research papers, journals and reports as part of their coursework and these writing require a strong command of grammar, vocabulary, organization and a standard tone in writing that makes the whole work sounds academic.

A total of ten students were chosen through purposive sampling because they have enough experience with academic writing and are familiar with English language based coursework. The group included students from the second to the fourth year of study, which helped gather different opinions about how AI writing tools are used and viewed at different academic levels.

Both male and female students took part who were between 22 to 24 years old. All of them use English as a second language in their life.

These students were mainly selected because their courses require them to write frequently in English. This reason gave the research a real and practical setting to explore how AI writing tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly and QuillBot support their writing process and writing skill development. Each student had used at least one of these tools before and it was either for writing drafts, checking grammar or paraphrasing and improving sentence structure.

Although the number of participants is small, it goes well with the qualitative nature of the study which focuses on understanding experiences in detail rather than collecting large-scale data.

A summary of the participant's demographic information is given below:

Participant	Age	Gender	Major	Year of Study
Protity	24	Female	Literature	4 th year
Dohra	23	Female	Literature	3 rd Year
Mahiya	24	Female	Linguistics	4 th Year
Saif	24	Male	Literature	4 th Year
Ifty	24	Male	Linguistics	4 th Year
Nabila	22	Female	Literature	2 nd Year

Sumu	23	Female	Linguistics	3 rd Year
Arman	24	Male	Literature	4 th Year
Arif	24	Male	Linguistics	4 th Year
Nishat	24	Female	Linguistics	4 th Year

3.3 Research Site:

The study was conducted among students enrolled in the English Department at a private university in Dhaka, Bangladesh. The university was selected as the research site because it provides a context where English is used extensively for academic communication and writing purposes. Students are required to complete various written assignments such as essays, research papers, critical commentaries and course reports as part of their regular coursework under Literature and Linguistics majors. This made the university campus an appropriate and accessible site for investigating the use of AI writing tools in developing student's writing proficiency. A significant portion of the data collection took place within the university premises, ensuring a familiar and comfortable environment for the participants. Out of ten interviews, seven were conducted in person on campus, accessible spaces such as the university cafeteria, common spaces and the ENH lab. Conducting interviews in these familiar spaces allowed participants to feel at ease while sharing their perspectives and experiences. The remaining three interviews were conducted virtually via audio calls using Zoom, primarily due to scheduling

conflicts and personal convenience. This online mode ensured the inclusion of participants who were unable to meet in person due to time or location constraints. Although these interviews were conducted remotely and efforts were made to replicate the same conversational flow and interactive engagement as in-person sessions. Conducting interviews in both face-to-face and virtual modes provided a flexible yet consistent means of gathering rich qualitative data. The mixture of onsite and online settings allowed the researcher to maintain the depth and reliability of responses.

3.4 Research Instruments:

The primary data collection instrument in this study was semi-structured interviews, which allowed for an in-depth exploration of student's perceptions of how AI tools influence their writing proficiency. This method was chosen because it allows both flexibility and structure. This approach ensured that specific topics related to writing, grammar and vocabulary were addressed while also allowing participants to elaborate freely on their individual experiences. According to Kvale (2007), semi-structured interviews are particularly suitable for qualitative studies as they enable researchers to explore participant's meanings and viewpoints via guided yet open conversation. A total of 26 open-ended questions were developed to guide the interviews. These questions were carefully organized under three broad categories corresponding to the study's research questions. So, the interview questions were designed to encourage reflective and detailed responses which provided insights into participant's learning habits and engagement with tools such as ChatGPT, QuillBot and Grammarly. The list of all interview questions and. Their alignment with research questions is included in the appendices for

reference. The interview schedule served as a flexible framework rather than a fixed questionnaire. While all the participants were asked the same set of core questions, the interviewer occasionally added follow-up questions to clarify meanings or explore specific points raised during the conversation.

This approach helped maintain the natural flow of discussion, ensuring that participants could express their thoughts in their own words without feeling intimidated by pre-determined options. Each interview session lasted between 30 and 40 minutes, depending on the participant's engagement and elaboration. For the seven in-person interviews, the researcher used a digital audio recorder on a mobile device to record the conversations clearly. For the three online interviews, the researcher used the zoom application, which provided a secure and accessible platform for remote participation. The built-in recording feature of Zoom was used to record the audio to ensure all the verbal responses were accurately preserved for later transcription.

The recordings from both in-person and online interviews were later transcribed manually by the researcher. Transcription was an essential part of the data analysis process that allowed close reading, detailed analyzing and coding to establish themes. Overall, the use of semi-structured interviews combined with audio documentation made it possible to collect clear, context-specific and authentic data that captured the participant's lived experiences with AI tools in their academic writing assessments.

3.5 Data Collection:

The data collection process for this research took place over a two-week period and involved conducting semi-structured interviews with ten undergraduate students from a renowned private university in Dhaka, Bangladesh. All the participants were from the Department of English, who are currently completing major courses in either Literature or Linguistics. The interviews were conducted in both in-person and online formats and that depended on the participant's availability and comfort. Seven out of ten interviews were conducted within the university area specifically, in informal but quiet areas such as the cafeteria, open campus spaces, lab or just outside classrooms. These locations were selected because they provided a familiar and relaxed environment that encouraged spontaneous conversation. The remaining three interviews were taken through online audio calls using Zoom, which allowed participants to join conveniently from home. Each interview lasted between 30 and 40 minutes. All sessions were recorded with the consent of the participants by using a voice recorder for the face-to-face interviews. And the online sessions were recorded through the built-in recording feature of zoom. The recordings were later transcribed manually by the researcher to ensure accuracy and familiarity with the data. The interview was guided by a set of 26 open-ended questions which was developed according to the research objectives and questions.

3.6 Data Analysis Procedure:

After all the interviews were completed, the recorded data were transcribed manually to create a textual dataset for analysis. This transcription process itself was an essential stage of analysis

because it allowed a deeper level of engagement with the data. Listening to the participant's voices repeatedly helped the researcher capture not only their words but also their tone and pauses. Each transcription was typed manually to maintain the accuracy of the participant's statements.

After transcription, the next step involved close readings of the data. This step was crucial for developing an initial sense of the overall content and identifying patterns of meaning that appeared across participant's narratives. While reading, the researcher made notes of key phrases or sentences that reflected the participant's major information. And then, the analytical process followed a thematic analysis approach. Thematic analysis was chosen as the method for analyzing the qualitative data as it allows the researcher to identify, organize and interpret patterns of meaning across the dataset (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This approach is mainly suitable for studies that aim to explore perceptions, experiences and opinions. However, rather than directly applying the steps as a checklist, the researcher approached the process as a dynamic engagement with the data. This means that coding, categorizing and establishing themes occurred in this process and constantly refined the researcher's understanding. During the initial coding phase, meaningful segments of data were extracted and assigned short phrases that represented the core ideas. For example, when a participant mentioned that Grammarly helped them "avoid silly grammatical mistakes", and then it was coded as *Grammatical accuracy*. After all transcriptions were coded, these codes were organized into broader conceptual categories that represented recurring ideas across participants. This stage involved grouping similar codes together to identify patterns or connections between them. The next step involved a more

interpretive process of theme construction. Here, the researcher reviewed all the preliminary themes and how they related to each other and to the overall research questions. This phase was not merely descriptive; rather it required analytical perspective to decide which theme carried the most significance in explaining student's perceptions of AI-assisted writing. Some themes were merged as they overlapped while others were redefined to capture their distinct meaning more clearly. As the themes became more refined, the researcher interpreted them within the broad academic and cultural context.

Throughout the analysis, the researcher maintained an analytical tone which contained interpretations and preliminary thoughts on connection among themes. Finally, the selected themes were reviewed in relation to the research objectives and questions to ensure alignment. The findings were then structured thematically in the discussion chapter supported by direct quotations from the participants to illustrate each theme. The inclusion of these quotations not only validated the interpretation but also allowed the participant's authentic voices to remain central to the discussion. The thematic analysis ultimately provided a nuanced understating of the research area.

3.7 Ethical Considerations:

The research strictly follows ethical standards to ensure respect, confidentiality and informed participation. Prior to each interview, participants were asked about their consent of providing personal experiences and allowing it to be recorded for this research purpose. They were also provided with information about the voluntary nature of their participation and their right to

withdraw at any time without any negative consequences. Participants were assured that their responses would remain confidential and used solely for academic purposes.

All interviews were conducted only after receiving verbal consent. For the sake of anonymity, participant's names and identifying details were replaced with pseudonyms in the transcripts and the final report. Audio recordings and transcripts were stored securely in a protected digital folder which was accessible only to the researcher. The recordings will be permanently deleted after completion of this thesis paper.

Participants were also reminded that there were no right or wrong answers and were encouraged to speak honestly about their experiences. The interviewer ensured that no question made them uncomfortable or put them under pressure. By following these ethical principles, this research ensured that participant's dignity, autonomy and privacy were upheld throughout the data collection and analysis process.

Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion

This chapter presents what we have found out after interviewing ten undergraduate students of the Department of English and Humanities in BRAC University. They were asked about the impact of AI writing tools such as ChatGPT, QuillBot and Grammarly on their writing skills (grammar, vocabulary, paraphrasing, etc.), and their overall writing skills. We classified the

findings according to the four research questions and indicated shared and divergent opinions of the participants.

4.1 Impact of AI Writing Tools on Grammatical Competence

One of the largest spheres of improvement that the participants experienced after applying AI tools such as Grammarly, QuillBot and ChatGPT was grammatical competence. Participants mentioned grammar as the most visible and the first skill that developed due to these tools in nearly all interviews. Most of them said that they experienced sentence structure, tense, article, and prepositions, and subject-verb agreement problems before using AI. They attributed these obstacles to their background particularly those who attended the Bangla schools up to the secondary level.

4.1.1 Grammar as the Foundation of Writing:

Participants repeatedly claimed that grammar underlies the good writing and how AI tools made them feel more confident in this matter. Dohra is a literature major student and she also said that the first steps to shift to an English medium were difficult initially and Grammarly corrected her instantly to identify the frequent mistakes in her writing. She noted,

“It has definitely improved my grammar. As I said earlier, I was from a Bangla medium background, so initially, I made many grammatical mistakes, especially in sentence

structure. Grammarly helped me identify and correct them. Now my grammar has improved a lot — maybe not 100%, but almost fully”. (Dohra)

Through her words, it is clear that AI feedback allowed her to observe and recall grammatical structures that she previously had difficulties with. Also, Grammarly was mentioned by Saif as his silent corrector, “My grammar has improved a lot by using Grammarly, but now I consciously check verb agreement, articles, and prepositions before writing” (Saif).

To both of them, grammar correction has not only been about correcting the sentence but also creating awareness of mistakes and developing habits. The same was said by even more advanced users who are not as dependent on AI. Nishat said,

“I mostly use Grammarly for my writing when I like to have a clear grammatical structure for my papers and the things that I have learned is the formation of tenses and how to remain consistent with my tense in my writing. Before I used to mix the present tense and past tense. So now I can maintain the consistency of tense.” (Nishat).

That is how the reflection of the participants indicates that grammar did improve most when the participants used such tools as Grammarly and ChatGPT. According to their stories, such tools are reliable, convenient ways of grammatical correction that enable individuals to identify their frequent errors and gradually get to learn the rules. The example of Dohra demonstrates that Grammarly assisted her in identifying typical sentence and article mistakes that had wasted her writing speed due to her Bengali medium background. This coincides with the fact that Grammarly allows learners to identify wording and mechanical errors immediately, allowing

them to fix on precision (Dewi, 2022). The fact that Grammarly feedback causes learners to pay attention to the patterns of errors that they had overlooked (Maypida, 2024) also aligns with the experience of Dohra.

The remarks made by Saif that Grammarly is a silent corrector and can help him develop a conscious habit of checking tense and prepositions resemble the thoughts expressed by Bitchener and Ferris (2012) that accuracy in writing leads to confidence in expressing complex ideas. Grammatical awareness that Saif has explained also substantiates the argument by Nation (2013) that as individuals are exposed to language repeatedly, they internalize patterns. The fact that he stopped relying on AI and started to check his grammar on his own indicates that fast or instant corrective feedback may be helpful in the habit formation process when applied in a reflexive manner.

This learning process is also demonstrated in the remarks Nishat gives. She claimed that Grammarly feedback assisted her in maintaining tense consistency and clear sentences, and it is this point that validates what Ferris (2010) suggested that automated feedback does not work unless the student actively considers it and applies it to their personal writing. Her experience demonstrates that AI grammar assistance can be more than simple surface corrections; it can develop language structure awareness in the long-term.

4.1.2 Intensive Change in Particular Areas of Grammar

The participants reported that AI tools such as Grammarly and ChatGPT enabled them to concentrate on individual issues in grammar rather than simply providing general solutions.

These issues were tense consistency, use of articles, sentence structure, and subject verb agreement with each of the issues presenting various challenges depending on the background of students.

As an example, Tense consistency was a big problem for Iftekhhar. He said, “I might start a sentence in the past tense and then switch to the present—mixing tenses in one sentence. AI never makes that mistake. Seeing that helped me overcome my issue.” (Ifty).

Besides, Mahiya paid attention to the article use and subject-verb agreement. She said that AI provided her with not only correction but also explanation, which was a primary reason to learn, “I used to have problems with subject-verb agreement and article usage. ChatGPT explained to me where and how to use them correctly. That’s when I realized I had been making a lot of basic mistakes”. (Mahiya)

Additionally, Arif claimed that sentence-structure was a concern of his. At first he used QuillBot to paraphrase entire sentences but eventually began to learn how to modify the sentence structure, use synonyms without altering the tone and rearrange clauses on his own. He said, “Yes, I learned techniques. Like, change of sentence structure, using synonyms that maintain tone, and reordering clauses — these are things I picked up. Now I can paraphrase manually, but AI gave me the initial framework”. (Arif)

According to Saif, classroom teachers tend to correct final mistakes done in mid or final exams, whereas Grammarly and ChatGPT also reveal why something is wrong in the whole writing process instantly. He said, “Teachers usually correct final mistakes, but Grammarly and ChatGPT

shows why something is wrong in real-time. My control over articles, tenses, and subject-verb agreement is improving rapidly because of this instant feedback.” (Saif).

The participants discovered that Grammarly, ChatGPT, and QuillBot helped them concentrate on particular grammar issues rather than providing overall generalized corrections. As an illustration, Ifty claimed that the tools had assisted him in identifying and correcting long time tense issues which was a major concern to him. This is in accordance with Zamel (1983), who also stated that specific feedback makes learners observe and realize their particular errors. By using Grammarly, Dewi (2022) also discovered that the software showed learners the structural and grammatical slip-ups that they usually overlook, which aligns with the experience of Iftekhar to identify the errors of tense when he repeated using AI feedback.

Also, Mahiya claimed that ChatGPT not only corrected her mistakes but also clarified the rules, which means that AI tools can be used to give students an understanding, not only just the right answer. This is in line with Maypida (2024) who claimed that when machines provide explanations, learners would get more because they can internalize the grammar. Her experience is also congruent with Ferris (2010) who explains that good feedback must assist students to learn out of the mistakes, but not to correct them.

Arif explained how he used QuillBot to learn how to restructure sentences and paraphrase them. This supports Fahmi & Cahyono (2021) who explains that paraphrasing tools may assist learners to be conscious of grammar and structure when applied poorly. Later, he no longer relied on

QuillBot, but applied his knowledge independently, demonstrating active learning and reflection, which Ferris (2010) also regarded as a key to grammar development in the long-run.

Saif pointed out that AI tools provided real-time explanations, which teachers do not have time to provide. This is what was found by Khan et al. (2024): Bangladeshi students do not receive instant and individual feedback due to large classes and limited class time. Quick AI response thus occupies a significant void where students can rectify errors and understand the reasons why such errors occurred.

4.1.3 Conscious Learning vs. Blind Correction

At first, quite a number of students entirely relied on AI tools to correct their sentences. With time, they began contemplating on the reasons why changes were proposed and implemented those regulations in the future. They started considering their writing and did not yield too easily to the AI indication with time.

For instance, Saif described the change in his grammatical skills, but “I believe the improvement isn’t only due to correction, it’s also due to awareness. Grammarly corrects my grammar, but now I consciously check verb agreement, articles, and prepositions before writing. It’s become a habit.” (Saif). In his reflection, the habit of self-editing as a result of constant contact with AI feedback is shown, as now he would warn and refine mistakes on his own and not need the help of the AI.

Arif claimed that he used to take everything as he was corrected, but later he understood that this was constraining his learning, “At first, I used to just ‘accept all’ without thinking. But later I realized that doing so wasn’t helping me learn anything. Now I read the explanations before accepting, and make my own decisions.” (Arif).

Nabila further commented that reading explanations and examples made her understand grammar patterns, “Grammarly doesn’t just correct my mistakes—it also explains why they’re wrong.” (Nabila). She claimed to enjoy reading explanations, but might skip them when in time constraint as she shared, “During assignment time, there’s a lot of pressure and deadlines, so I don’t always read all the explanations—I just copy the corrections directly” (Nabila).

The analysis of the thoughts of the participants reveals that there is a transition between unquestioning AI feedback and conscious learning. Initially, the majority of students would simply use such tools as Grammarly and ChatGPT to fix grammar mistakes as quickly as possible without understanding the logic behind these recommendations. With time they began reading the explanations, learning the rules and applying them in later writing by themselves. Such disillusionment of dependence to realization is reflected in the point made by Ferris (2010) that feedback can only be useful when learners reflect on the action and not when they do it robotically.

The fact that Saif states that the improvement is not only caused by correction, but also by awareness, demonstrates how the regular repetition of the AI feedback can create good self-editing habits. The fact that he is more concerned with the articles, verb agreement, and

prepositions, confirms the argument by Nation (2013), who asserts that repeated exposure to language assists learners internalize grammatical knowledge. This habit forming also supports the opinion by Bitchener and Ferris (2012) that frequent feedback increases the confidence of learners to communicate ideas more precisely.

The fact that Arif understood that he could only learn with the help of clicking accept all is an indication that he was thinking deeper as time went by. He started by reading explanations of AI, then made changes, which aligns with the concept of writing proposed by Zamel (1983) that writing improves and gets better through reflection and awareness rather than superficial edits. This self-control makes automated feedback an active tool of learning. According to Dewi (2022), this is referred to as the feedback noticing, which involves learners being aware of the patterns of errors in order to prevent future errors.

The remarks made by Nabila also reflect the way in which the explanations can be used to transform AI into more than a simple correcting machine. She observed that knowing why a sentence fragment is incorrect is an analytical learning process which Ferris (2010) had indicated is crucial to long-term development. However, she occasionally omits explanations in time-sensitive situations and blindly consumes whatever AI tools suggest to her, which is also the case with Khan et al. in Bangladeshi classrooms (2024). The students there tend to work fast and precisely rather than in-depth due to workload and anxiety of examination. Therefore, although they may desire to learn the context may make them not reflect on AI feedback.

4.2 Paraphrasing and Vocabulary Development

Although grammar was the most quickly gained advantage, several participants believed that vocabulary became the second most rapidly acquired, due to the help of AI writing tools. They discussed the effects of ChatGPT, Grammarly, and QuillBot on the word choice and paraphrasing. They did not merely take AI suggestions, but evaluated the words as either being too artificial or providing value. Others regarded AI as a helpful assistive tool in vocabulary development; some feared that vocabulary recommendations might be too formal or even out of context. The obvious implication is that learning vocabulary with the help of AI is not often passive - students always evaluate themselves on whether a word is suitable and natural in their writing.

4.2.1 Introduction to New Vocabulary and Word Choice Awareness

Nearly all the respondents claimed that AI assisted them in learning new words, phrases, collocations, and words that fit the context that they would have not otherwise noticed. This practice enhanced their style and made them aware to use the right words that suit the tone and purpose of academic writing.

In one case, Nabila utilized ChatGPT to filter her academic writings particularly on her literary work. She said, “Vocabulary is honestly a blessing for me, because in literature, word choice is very important. ChatGPT sometimes suggests beautiful words like ‘melancholic tone,’ ‘existential anxiety,’ or ‘feminine resistance’—the kind of thematic words that make my writing more aesthetic.” (Nabila). She also mentioned that AI assisted her in overcoming the ordinary

vocabulary and adopting more general, scholarly, and discipline-specific words. She also noted how she can express her abstract ideas more accurately with intended emotions that she learned from ChatGPT's feedback. For example, "before I would write 'the character feels sad,' but now I write 'the character embodies a sense of existential loneliness.'" (Nabila).

Besides, Nishat discussed the broadening of her vocabulary in the academic environment through AI. She said, "Before using AI tools I didn't know a lot of vocabulary like nuance, specified, highlighting... but after using this, my essay not only becomes well structured, but also it has a more academic tone". (Nishat). She emphasized that AI was also useful in making her understand the usage context, "It makes many things simpler, it gives real-life examples of the usage of the word, this is how I can better internalize the vocabulary" (Nishat).

Additionally, Protity said that AI assisted her vocabulary and word choice, "ChatGPT uses a lot of advanced vocabulary... Maybe by observing that, I've started using words like 'demonstrate.' Gradually, my vocabulary has improved a lot". She further added that AI helped to make sense, "So now, because of ChatGPT, I can understand from there which context a word should be used in, and I don't make that same mistake anymore". (Protity)

Saif offered a cautious view about how AI tools' vocabulary suggestions are really helpful, but there's also a problem—sometimes the words become unnecessarily complex. For example, ChatGPT often writes in a very formal tone, which is good for academic writing, but "when I'm writing a reflective paper, that high-level vocabulary feels unnatural. So I always check which word suits which context". (Saif)

Also, when asked about the use of AI, Ifty replied that he uses AI to find synonyms to prevent redundancy, “I mainly use it for synonyms, because repeating the same word again and again feels monotonous. ChatGPT suggests synonyms, and I choose the one that fits my sentence best” (Ifty). Here, Sumu’s idea matches as she noted, “If AI suggests words like ‘ameliorate’ or ‘alleviate,’ they sometimes feel artificial for Bangladeshi students. I prefer using moderate-level words” (Sumu).

The participants indicated that they learned more words and thought more about word choice with the help of AI tools such as ChatGPT or Grammarly. To illustrate this point, Nabila had heard about such concepts as melancholic tone or existential anxiety on ChatGPT, which demonstrates that AI can assist learners in expanding their vocabulary using common words and more academic terms. This is consistent with the findings of Fahmi & Cahyono (2021) who found that AI tools assist learners in broadening their vocabulary and paraphrasing more effectively and that the development is brought about by both exposure to and active participation in AI recommendations.

Nishat reported that she learned to use words in various circumstances, a similar result to the study by Tran and Nguyen (2024) that demonstrated that AI tools assist students in organizing ideas with appropriate word choice depending on the specific context. Her knowledge of the mechanics of words demonstrates that AI provides helpful and context-specific examples that help to comprehend and apply, rather than the replacement of synonyms. According to Bond (2019), AI tools can assist students because they provide context-specific suggestions that are

applicable in professional writings and can assist Nishat to make her writing more accurate and academic.

There was also caution in the use of new words by the participants. Saif opted not to use very formal words by AI, which is in line with Liu and Guo (2023) and Kasneci et al. (2023) worrying that AI might lower the self-editing and actual use of language by students. By his remarks, he means that, though AI provides a lot of words, learners must consider the appropriate words to use depending on tone, setting and personal voice. This will assist learners in developing skills in words rather than relying solely on AI.

AI assisted Ifty in searching synonyms to prevent the repetition of the same word, which is why Golovko and Agzamxanova (2025) also argue that AI can be used to enhance the style, clarity, and flow. Sumu observed that some AI words appeared to be too alien to Bangladesh, and there was a requirement to have context awareness. It demonstrates that AI outcomes must be reviewed by human beings to accommodate the local language culture.

Finally, the participants claimed learning occurred slowly. In her case, Nishat observed that when she used AI repeatedly, she would notice that words had a meaning and purpose and she was no longer copying, but comprehending. This supports the notion of Dewi (2022) that the tools are most effective when students analyze the feedback, and short-term corrections are converted into permanent knowledge of words. Briefly, AI can provide new words and the rules of their correct use, yet students should not remain passive to learn rather gain the knowledge effectively and efficiently on their own.

4.2.2 Interpretation of Word Contexts and Usage with the help of AI tools

This section discusses how AI writing applications can assist learners to know the context of words and how to use them correctly, particularly in academic writing. The participants explained that these tools are not only correcting their mistakes but they also help the students select appropriate words, understand the nuance, and style.

Dohra mentioned that her vocabulary and the use of words were enhanced with the help of AI. “I would use simple words before, with the help of AI I learned that there are numerous synonyms and antonyms of the words that could make a sentence sound more sophisticated” (Dohra).

Arman occasionally found the suggestions of ChatGPT too excessive: “Sometimes ChatGPT’s vocabulary suggestions are too ‘heavy.’ For example, when I want to write ‘sad,’ it suggests words like ‘melancholic’ or ‘existentially burdened.’ It sounds academic but unnatural, so I usually pick and choose according to the context” (Arman).

Then Ifty also admitted that he verifies AI advice by searching them, “I often ended up searching for the synonyms or meanings of those words later to see if they were correct. ChatGPT suggests synonyms, and I choose the one that fits my sentence best and goes with context” (Ifty).

Mahiya insisted on the contextual meaning of words, “Before, I used to check word meanings on Google, but now I understand that there’s a huge difference between a word’s meaning and its usage. This has greatly improved the clarity of my writing.” (Mahiya)

Therefore, the experience of the participants speaks in favor of the fact that the use of AI tools generates new vocabulary, as well as facilitates the interpretation of the context of words and their correct usage. The experience of Dohra is a good example: AI presented her with the synonyms and transitional phrases that enhanced the logical progression. This is consistent with the research results that AI assists students in arranging ideas and rephrasing phrases in a logical manner.

As reflected by Arman, he is selective with AI. He filtered such suggestions in order to make his writing natural. It implies that not Arman but some learners rely on AI as an assistant rather than an alternative to their judgmental decisions. It concurs with Liu and Guo (2023) and Kasneci et al. (2023), who caution against excessive dependence on AI. They also said that students should filter and reflect on AI outputs and understand the words' contexts and its usage better in order to make learning meaningful.

This is evidenced by the experience of Ifty. AI provided him with new words, but the meaning and context had to be checked by himself. That demonstrates the concept by Dewi (2022), that feedback can be helpful when learners are actively interpreting it, associating AI recommendations with their own knowledge. According to Bond (2019), AI tools can assist students in reaching a greater number of word choices since they provide specific input and allow learners to enhance their language choices independently.

Mahiya explained that AI assists regarding the use of words in practice. According to her, it is not sufficient to know the meaning of the word, but using it in a proper way makes writing more

understandable. This supports the argument that Fahmi & Cahyono (2021) makes that AI tools do not only expand vocabulary but also create awareness of when and how words should be used.

In general, the participants confirm that AI tools are a source of new words, as well as a guide to context. They assist learners to choose the words that should be used in a scenario and promote independent learning and better writing. Simultaneously, the necessity to filter and reflect demonstrates that the AI feedback is to be combined with critical thinking.

4.2.3 AI-Assisted Paraphrasing and Meaning Retention

Participants report that AI-based paraphrasing tools, such as QuillBot and ChatGPT, assist them in learning the meaning, tone, and structure of paraphrasing. However, they also observe that these tools are able to alter the meaning or tone and they must think over what they are writing.

In the case of Nishat, the AI tools assisted her to learn new methods of paraphrasing sentences. According to her, “QuillBot provides a lot of suggestions on how a sentence can be written in different ways. So by seeing the suggestions, I just write on my own. So this helped me. I customize it according to my own” (Nishat). She views AI as an assistant, but not as a substitute. When she says customize it according to my own, it indicates that she is appreciating her own writing preferences. But Nishat does indicate as well that AI does paraphrase the message and alters tone and even meaning. She had observed that Quillbot does modify the words and tones

and occasionally makes the text either informal or too formal. She also contrasts her tone with the tone that AI changes and states that she has to readjust the tone herself.

On the same note, Sumu explained how AI tools assisted her in knowing good patterns when she needed to write formally, particularly emailing a faculty or for employment purposes.

“In terms of formal writings like mail, I have learned the proper pattern. When you have to send mail or write mail for your faculty or for a job... by using ChatGPT, it is really enhanced and it really helped me in terms of those patterns”. (Sumu)

She hints that it is possible to train students in rules of professional language by AI-assisted paraphrasing. The experience of Sumu demonstrates that AI could be used in real writing outside the digital interface.

Proity on the other hand is more cautious. She does not rewrite but makes text much easier with the help of Grammarly. She claimed that, “I used Grammarly... when I couldn’t understand something, maybe a difficult text that was hard for me to grasp, I would command it to simplify the text for me.” (Protity).

To some students, AI paraphrasing allows comprehension, rather than rephrasing. But Protity also says that the meaning may change, and sometimes the AI recommends wrong words. She considers that AI is not able to grasp everything in the context, she is learning to recognize when that context has shifted. Although she criticized it, Adity enjoyed the fact that AI makes text

shorter and easier to understand. “But their versions are very short and precise. There’s nothing extra or repetitive in them—nothing that feels unnecessary” (Protity)

Another reason why Dohra believes that AI versions are short and precise is that AI focuses on new words rather than on accuracy of meaning. Thanks to QuillBot, she learned tricks such as how to transform active to passive sentences and mean the same thing.

The findings indicate that AI assistance in paraphrasing is the two-sided sword: it may enhance the writing tone and form, yet students should retain the message and the voice. According to learners, such tools as QuillBot, ChatGPT, and Grammarly are more of a helper, allowing them to experiment with sentence variations and understand how to paraphrase. The story of Nishat demonstrates that the appearance of AI suggestions allows students to make their own sentences, and be in control at the same time. This is consistent with what Bond (2019) said: AI tools help would allow learners to get more independent through providing examples rather than mere replacements.

However, students are aware of AI limitations too. Nishat and Protity claimed that the machine was able to alter the tone or meaning, and it demonstrates that it is difficult to retain the very sense of AI. They claim that good learning is to verify the output of the AI and correct it to suit the situation. This supports the statements made by Liu and Guo (2023), the most successful results are obtained when students work with AI and think about it a lot.

Sumu adds that reading AI written texts teaches the students to write formally. She observed the AI sentences and replicated excellent patterns of business writing. This is in line with Tren and Negoen (2020) who argued that repetitive examples assist students to learn how to write. Dohra and Nishat also reported that AI examples are the standards of style and conciseness, providing a clear example of how to structure something better, although people have to make judgments and retain the meaning, as was also mentioned by Dewi (2022) and Kasneci et al. (2023) regarding learning words and grammar.

Although students can simplify or clarify something using AI, as Aditya does, they can still learn to ensure that the meaning remains correct and the style is good. AI paraphrasing cannot be called a passive activity; it encourages learners to pay attention to the construction of sentences, the selection of words, and the tone. Based on the stories of the participants, AI can accelerate learning, though it is more efficient when individuals consider it, examine it thoroughly, and apply what they already possess in the way of language knowledge.

4.3 Impact on Confidence, Motivation and Revision practices

The more students continue utilizing AI applications, the more confident, encouraged, and in control they become in their writing. AI provides them with prompt feedback, accelerates drafting and generates ideas. However, as they gain confidence, they also know that overdependence is a dangerous thing that can damage their independent thought.

4.3.1 More Confidence and Quickening Drafting

There are numerous interviewees who report that they feel more competent, safe, and self-reliant after working with AI. AI assistants provide instant feedback and language guidance, and it lowers the fear of grammar and vocabulary errors, as well as, cohesion. With time, they change the perception of AI as a source of correction to a source of assurance and movement.

Dohra said, “I’m much more confident than before—about 90%. My writing now looks like that of an undergraduate student. Tools like ChatGPT and Grammarly make me feel much more confident and independent as a writer” (Dohra). Her words indicate AI is a motivator and a mirror, which allows her to imagine her writing as professional and well-written.

Protity and Mahiya also have the same perspectives on how AI tools shaped their confidence and transformed it to a better level. “With its help, I can think more deeply about my writing. So, I feel much more confident than before” (Protity). Before, when they used to write something, they weren’t sure if it was actually correct or not. But now ChatGPT feels like a kind of partner to them.

ELT student Saif also mentioned that AI assisted him in managing the tone, structure, and vocabulary. “I used to be confused before—especially about maintaining an academic tone. But now I can confidently say that my writing has a formal tone, correct sentence structure, and balanced vocabulary. So my confidence has increased a lot” (Saif). Saif has noticed that AI has helped him to have a better sense of coherence and organization, “now I can organize paragraphs in the introduction–body–conclusion structure, which is also essential in writing.”

According to Protity and Nishat, AI tools enhanced their confidence and expression of ideas. Now both can express more ideas effectively in English through using AI tools such as ChatGPT and Grammarly because they provide real life examples, “I can relate to things and simplify them to express myself better” (Nishat).

The interviewees indicate that AI writing tools are not just easy to use when it comes to writing. They also provide the learners with confidence and make them write in a more flowing manner. The tools provide learners with assurance since they provide prompt corrections and examples of good writing, thus learners can tell how refined work appears. The reflection of Dohra reveals that the utilization of ChatGPT and Grammarly helped her to feel independent. This corresponds to the concept offered by Bond (2019) that technology can be used to promote learner autonomy through providing real-time assistance. Independent is a word used by Dohra, which indicates that confidence increases when students actively utilize AI feedback.

According to Protity, AI is a partner. This demonstrates a psychological aspect which the research discusses. Approval by AI tools reduces doubt, welcomes new ideas, and makes the process of thinking about writing more profound. This is in line with the opinion of Liu and Guo (2023) that scaffolding AI tools may serve as a helpful companion. Mahiya also mentioned that some of the teacher roles are replaced by AI feedback, which provides students with timely reassurance that allows them to be creative. This is in line with the finding of Tren and Negoen (2020) that interactive digital feedback increases confidence and risk-taking in academic writing among learners.

Saif states that AI does not only enhance grammar but the general picture of writing, including the flow of ideas, structure of paragraphs, and academic tone. He concurs with Kasneci et al. (2023) that AI assists learners to organize the content and maintain the style straight, thus making the writing more understandable and fluent. The fact that AI has made Saif more conscious about the writing concerning teaching indicates that the tools assist in thinking about the way to teach writing.

Lastly, the participants demonstrate that AI infuses trust in not only clear thoughts but also fluent expression, rather than proper language. Nishat and Protity indicated that they used examples and context with the assistance of AI to describe ideas more easily and effectively. This proves the argument of Golovko (2021) that AI helps in the process of writing language and thinking.

4.3.2 AI as Brainstorming Partner and Mid- Process Support

Majority of the participants use AI as not only a polisher but also an active partner in the process of brainstorming, drafting and revising. They apply it when they are stalled or they are uncertain of the way to elaborate ideas.

Protity claimed that she actually uses ChatGPT in the middle of her writing process, “I have already decided beforehand what I’m going to write about and what my topic will be.” (Protity). She also stated that “So, my idea is already prepared beforehand. Then, when I write on this topic, I use ChatGPT to sort out some ideas about what to include more.” (Protity).

The same thing happens with Nishat as she doesn't use AI tools at the very beginning. After organizing or brainstorming some of her ideas, then she starts writing something, “in the middle of the writing, I mostly use AI tools to gather information, knowledge, and to know about things.” (Nishat)

But for a change, Ifty applies AI at each step. He explained that before even starting an assignment, he takes help from AI to shape his structure and plan. However, his emphasis on “I don’t take everything from AI” (Ifty), reflects that AI can work as an assistant.

Saif composes his outline, and asks ChatGPT whether the ideas are arranged in a logical way. In his case, AI justifies logic and form. He said that “First, I write my own outline, then I cross-check with ChatGPT to see if my ideas are logically structured.” (Saif). For him, AI is like a critical reviewer that validates his structure. Saif further noted that “The planning is my own; AI is just a support tool” (Saif). Dohra is also more inclined to relying on human intuition initially and AI in the middle or at the end. She claims to never start with AI; she introduces it into the picture later.

According to the respondents, AI tools have become more of interactive companions than just corrections providers. They write with AI and enhance their ideas and facts and structure. This is an indication of passive utilization to active thinking. This conforms to the concept of Bond (2020) that digital writing tools may be used as cognitive aids, which help students structure their thoughts and generate ideas rather than providing mechanical solutions. The participants also support the fact that AI can expand the thought process of students by providing prompts and alternative perspectives to reflect and solve problems as stated by Kasnechi (2021).

As explained by Adity and Nishat, they consult AI after planning how to begin their work, which demonstrates that students retain authorship even though they use AI to reinforce and expand their work areas. Protity employed AI to have a new vision but retained her own ideas, which confirms the argument by Liu and Guo (2022) that writing with the help of technology leads to a higher level of thinking, such as evaluation and synthesis, rather than copying. Nishat applied the AI to fill the gaps during the drafting process, which is closer to the concept of Tren and Negoen (2019) that digital tools enhance the ability of students to understand the context and clear ideas, particularly when writing an academic paper. Students supplement their thinking process by using AI assistance by checking the definitions, examples, or other materials when writing, without losing the ability of reasoning.

As Ifty and Saif emphasized, they apply AI to themselves and use it selectively. They emphasize that it is necessary to check and recheck ideas, which is consistent with Golovko (2021), who argues that successful integration of AI requires critical thinking and self-regulation among students. They regard AI as a collaborator or auditor and not a substitute and it verifies logic and flow as the student makes the ultimate decisions. This falls in line with the opinion of Tren and Negoen (2019) that technology may be applied to scaffold the writing process without diminishing the autonomy of learners, which is a significant component of the acquisition of effective writing skills.

Mahiya and Dohra demonstrated that AI could be a partner that could be called upon to help you get out of your problem. The application of AI in that manner corresponds to the concept of Bond (2019) that interactive tools offer flexible assistance that suits the needs a learner has at the

moment. The second point that Dohra makes is that she wants to generate her own ideas first and only then request AI to do it, and it is clearly implied that human intuition is an important part of the creative process, and learners must ensure that they exercise prudent judgment in their own efforts before AI can help.

4.3.3 Dual Effect of AI on Motivation and Critical Thinking

The empowerment and dependence are a two-sided tension, which depends on the influence of AI tools on motivation and critical thinking. Students get more comfortable and productive, yet they can also find themselves over-reliant on AI to give them ideas or provide some quick answers when under pressure.

Dohra explained that AI can be used to establish an environment that is not judgmental to deal with weaknesses. English writing was a very weak point for her as a Bangla medium student and shared, “back then, I had become fully dependent on it. But gradually, with my instructor’s advice, I’ve managed to pull myself out of that dependence.” (Dohra)

She appreciates this secure learning environment, more so being a student who has a background in Bengali.

Arman said AI motivates him. When he finds that it has improved, he gets motivated. Like, “I became more competent in English language-based writings and can write something that looks professional” (Arman). He was able to write in a professional manner. He also states that AI is able to make him a kind of dependent person. When it comes to self-correction, he mentioned

that “ I can self-correct. But it also makes me dependent sometimes. So I’d say partially independent” (Arman).

Nishat even acknowledges that he is depending on AI when there are strict deadlines. “When I have to finish something... I feel like AI is the only way that can get me out of this situation”. She feels that AI is the solution when deadlines are approaching. She also comments that she feels confident and satisfied with the work she does after using AI. She always has done extensive research, read a good number of articles, and conveyed her own knowledge in writing. But she is concerned that it will decrease her personal input, “So the experience is bittersweet.” (Nishat).

Mahiya mentioned about the tone of their writing that, “Definitely enhanced. The tone of my writing has become academic now—my sentence structure used to be very Banglish, but now it’s fluent. And my vocabulary range has also increased” (Mahiya). Mahiya claims that AI has enhanced tone and vocabulary, but leaves her brain relaxed. “ChatGPT already provides all the analysis, so my brain feels completely relaxed. But the charm of critical thinking is getting lost” (Mahiya). Here, the “relaxation” of the brain metaphorically captures a decline in her own effort, signaling how ai can diminish the satisfaction of original thought.

Protity also claimed that AI has caused her structure to be improved and grows confidence but at the expense of analytical thinking. “The structure of my writing has changed a lot. I even enjoy reading my own writing, and it gives me confidence.” (Protity). She mentioned that in case of a confusing topic, she ceases brainstorming and simply gets ideas provided by AI.

The reflection of the participants reveals that there is excitement and concern in using AI tools to write. AI will provide students with a feeling of confidence and make them feel more competent in academic writing. As an example, Dohra employed AI as a personal tutor that provides a nonjudgmental environment to work on grammar and sentence structure, which is particularly useful with students who studied in Bengali. This is consistent with the research by Dewi (2022) and Maypida (2024), which argue that automated writing tools provide fast and personalized feedback and develop self-confidence in students. Arman and Nishat also indicate that AI makes one feel that something is being accomplished and that they are competent, which gives them emotional support and increased satisfaction with the writing (Bond, 2020; Kasnechi, 2021).

Nonetheless, the research also indicates that AI can also result in some dependency particularly when students are stressed. They complain of overreliance when time is running out or when things are new. Nishat explained that AI is the sole method of getting out of the situation and thus, stress can make learners resort to AI spontaneously rather than thinking about their work. This is in line with Liu and Guo (2022), who claim that excessive dependence on digital tools may decrease intrinsic motivation and self-directed problem-solving. The same trade-off is seen in the remark of Arman concerning partial independence, the AI can assist students in getting tasks done fast and feel competent, but it can also entice students to shortcuts, which can deteriorate learning.

Another observation made by participants was the way AI can assist them in becoming more autonomous in the long term. Sumu shifted to the light-dependent mode and demonstrated that the AI scaffolding is able to assist in internalizing skills and ultimately allow learners to generate

their own works (Golovko, 2021). This change demonstrates that as applied thoughtfully, AI can supplement language, as well as thinking skills, without necessarily diminishing the agency of students.

Meanwhile, the issue of critical thinking was brought up. Protity explained that using AI to come up with ideas may decrease the level of analytical involvement, particularly in difficult assignments. She claimed that AI influences her analytical thinking capacity by approximately 30 percent, which implies that some amount of effort and perseverance is lost, which is similar to Bond (2020) stating that automation can reduce the pleasure and workmanship of independent problem-solving. Mahiya found herself relaxed by AI, which means that she requires fewer deep thoughts, although superficial skills such as sentence structure, vocabulary, and fluency develop.

4. 4 Challenges, Limitations, and Ethical Concern

AI tools have become an important element in the writing process of students, yet they also introduce issues that damage trust, autonomy, and quality. Users posted numerous stories in which AI failed to provide them with what they desired due to inaccuracy or lack of understanding of the context or overdependence on user-feedback. These are the problems that make the process of writing frustrating and students attempt to combine speed and honesty. The following part examines the key issues on this theme, accuracy, context sensitivity, and prompt dependence, which were found in nearly all interviews.

4.4.1 Accuracy, Context-Sensitivity, and Prompt-Dependence

Several participants claimed that AI responses were frequently incorrect or unsuitable, particularly when they lacked sufficient detail. They believed AI was more effective when they practiced, gave correct directions and learnt to frame their prompts. Nishat was evidently impatient and said, “I have faced it a lot of times because like when I give some certain commands, they actually don't understand it. Sometimes they give a totally irrelevant answer which is not related to this field at all.” (Nishat). According to her, they just pick up random things from the internet and just place it. If she truly trusts it, “sometimes I'm bound to get very much wrong information from AI” (Nishat). She reveals that AI is unable to comprehend the setting, and it sharpens a smooth yet incorrect response. It also depicts a greater problem: individuals can read fluent information, which is incorrect, and believe it is correct, because they trust the language.

Equally, Sumu wrote numerous instances of AI giving incorrect grammar or incorrect answers to language assignments. As she explained, “There are many times when AI gave me false information or false grammatical rules. Sometimes I give fill-in-the-gaps tasks and ask AI to fill those gaps with right form verbs. But it sometimes gives me very, very wrong answers” (Sumu). This remark by Sumu serves as a reminder that despite the fact that AI is able to assist with language, it still perpetuates errors in case it lacks an understanding of tense, form, or syntax. Such mistakes destroy confidence and make students check twice.

Protity echoed the same theme of a miscommunication problem when he stated that useful results require good prompting. She shared that when she gave a random line, the AI tools didn't fully understand what she actually wanted. So, she "doesn't always get answers that are exactly the way I expect; I'd say the rate of misunderstanding is quite high." (Protity). The argument of Protity indicates that immediate reliance involves an additional effort on the mind. Students should not just write, but learn how to talk to AI- how to make clear and precise commands and then process the result of the AI to make it accurate. To her, the writing process will be twofold, to clarify ideas to the AI then to correct its response in a useful form.

Additionally, Mahiya also raised the issue of reliability and ethical issues. She said, like everyone else, "ChatGPT is very prompt-dependent. If the prompt isn't clear, it gives irrelevant answers. There are also technical issues, sometimes internet problems. Once, it gave me wrong reference information in my assignment, which I found out later" (Mahiya). Another layer is added to her story: trust and checking. Although AI may appear persuasive, students should confirm the facts and sources since the use of fake references and false information can destroy academic integrity.

To Arman, there was a matter of accuracy but also depth. He discovered that AI responses were either too broad or too shallow. "Yes, sometimes AI gives irrelevant or generalized answers. Like when I ask something specific about a text, it gives a generic analysis without depth. So I still have to read and interpret myself." (Arman). According to the observation of Arman, AI is able to rephrase or summaries but lacks in deep analysis or interpretation which are major in academic writing. Similarly, Saif emphasized the importance of specificity, "If the question is

vague, AI completely goes in the wrong direction. So now before I write a prompt, I try to be as specific as possible” (Saif). This indicates that students have learnt to be careful on their inputs. With time, they bargain with AI rather than just using it.

The stories of the participants demonstrate that AI cannot always be true; its accuracy greatly depends on the way the prompt is formulated. The experience of Nishat demonstrates that vague prompts give irrelevant or misleading responses. This is what Liu and Guo (2022) have reported on the dependency of AI on surface patterns and lack of profound knowledge in particular areas. False confidence, as is the case of Nishat, is also a warning against false confidence: fluent but wrong answers are accepted as true, particularly by those with limited knowledge.

This issue is also confirmed by the reflection by Sumu who demonstrates that even grammar tasks may also fail when AI does not understand the context. Her observation is in line with Dewi (2022) and Maypida (2024) who observed that prompt feedback can propagate errors when users fail to be careful. The necessity to check twice confirms Bond (2020) when he states that AI is an assistant, but not a substitution to human judgment.

The mental load of clear prompting is brought out through the comments of Protity. To use AI efficiently, it is necessary to learn how to converse with the system, i.e. how to provide clear and specific instructions to receive relevant answers. This is in line with the concept of AI interaction that Kasnechi (2021) identifies as a new literacy skill: students must not only comprehend what is said but also negotiate with the tool. Once again, Mahiya cites trust and verification, which reveals ethical concerns regarding the creation of incorrect references or fabricated citations by

AI. Golovko (2021) and Tren and Negoen (2019) also caution that academic content using AI should be done with caution to ensure scholarship integrity.

In statements made by Arman and Saif, it is evident that AI has surpassed the correctness to depth and analysis. On the one hand, AI is able to summarize or paraphrase, but it lacks interpretive quotient or critical thinking, which are vital in academic writing. These observations support the idea that learners should remain actively engaged to achieve meaningful outcomes, which is also reflected in the demands of Liu and Guo (2022) that artificial intelligence should be monitored by human beings during the learning process.

4.4.2 Meaning Distortion and Paraphrasing Limitations

However, although AI-based tools, such as ChatGPT and QuillBot, have a significant level of support in the form of generating, paraphrasing, and refining text, the participants mentioned that distortion in meaning and tonal changes are usual problems. It was also widely reported that these tools would either result in the sentence being too formal, too simplified, or too difficult to understand and this sometimes changed the meaning or emotional tone of their writing.

Arif has mentioned this problem, which is that AI tends to simplify or formalize sentences, and therefore the tools are more useful as a reference than a solution, “Sometimes ChatGPT or QuillBot can make the sentence too formal or too simplified. I noticed it especially when

paraphrasing definitions. So now, I use paraphrasing tools only as a reference, not a final product.” (Arif)

Similarly, Nabila thought of the way AI would alter the emotional tone of a text, especially when paraphrasing, “ChatGPT sometimes becomes overly academic. When I paraphrase a quote, my goal is to keep the meaning the same. But ChatGPT makes it too formal, which causes the emotion to be lost” (Nabila). The same tendency toward over-formalization was found by Iftekhar who admitted that AI preserves the overall meaning when told to, however, the wording tends to become more complicated than it needs to be, and this may inhibit the process of reading,

Then, Saif explained his process of changing his strategy to actively contrast AI-generated paraphrases with his own writing, where a human intervention is required,

“I’ve seen that QuillBot often slightly changes the meaning. So when I paraphrase, I first write the text in my own way, then look at the AI version. After that, I compare the two and write the final version. So it has become an active process for me—I don’t fully depend on it.” (Saif)

Similarly, one participant also stated that along with structural alterations, AI occasionally modified the context or emotional richness of sentences. “Before, when I used QuillBot, I noticed that the meaning was changing, but I couldn’t understand where the mistake was. Now I realize that when AI paraphrases, it sometimes changes the emotional context.” (Mahiya)

Another participant, Arman, also expressed worries regarding over-rephrasing and the fact that core meaning might be lost in case a person blindly trusts AI, “Honestly, it’s tricky. Sometimes AI rephrases too much—it changes the tone. So, I always read both versions, and if I feel it’s losing the core meaning of my argument, I rewrite it manually.” (Arman). Lastly, Protity gave a very comprehensive reflection on how AI also replaces context-specific vocabulary with general alternatives at times, which can totally misinterpret meaning and particularly in paraphrasing exercises, “They also change the vocabulary, and not all vocabulary fits every context.” (Protity) In this instance, the reflection of Protity is that AI-generated paraphrasing is not something that can be entirely relied upon, and it should be thoroughly supervised by a human being to make sure that the original intent, tone, and context are preserved.

Reflections of the participants demonstrate that there is a constant conflict between the advantages of the AI paraphrasing tools and its inability to maintain the meaning, tone, and nuance. Although ChatGPT and QuillBot are offering alternatives to sentence structures, lexical diversity, and stylistic recommendations, it is common to find that learners are faced with problems of over-formalization, oversimplification, or over-rephrasing. These trends were occasionally misinterpreting the original message, undermining the emotional tone, or substituting contextual-specific words with general ones. The fact that paraphrasing tools should be seen as references rather than final products, as Arif notes, is an interesting point: students do not underestimate the fact that AI has a limited cognitive power, and that critical human thinking is still necessary.

To some extent, this tension is attributed to the way AI language models are designed. The main reason is that AI systems are optimized to linguistic fluency and syntactic variation, but not semantic fidelity, as Liu and Guo (2022) claim. Therefore, paraphrasing work can appear to be refined, but it does not take into consideration nuances of tone, cultural or contextual peculiarities, and the emphasis made by the writer. The issue of the loss of emotional or rhetorical depth in Nabila and Mahiya indicates this drawback, which demonstrates that AI can flatten meaning or distort affective aspects, particularly in scholarly, literature, or reflective writing, where voice and nuance are the primary concerns (Golovko, 2021).

Notably, learners did not just accept AI outputs. Most participants engaged in metacognition to prevent these dangers. The fact that Saif compares AI paraphrases to his own writing and Protity is always aware of context-specific words used shows that both authors engage in a deliberate process of negotiation between AI recommendations and human meaning. This is consistent with Kasnechi (2021) who asserts that critical interaction with AI products enhances learner autonomy because students are selective in the benefits of AI, and they actively retain control over authorship, semantic correctness, and purpose, the style of writing. By doing so, the AI can be used as a guide that facilitates the development of writing without replacing the cognitive responsibility.

The developmental aspect of the use of AI is also reflected in the strategies of the participants. When exposed to AI-generated distortions and contrasted with their own formulations, learners will be more conscious of minor meanings, tones, and registers. This kind of reflection does not only guarantee fidelity of paraphrasing, but also strengthens critical thinking and editing abilities.

As an illustration, the observation of over-formalization or over-rephrasing can provoke the learners to doubt AI outputs, reflect on the expectations of the audience, and determine how to modify the style and content.

4.4.3 Ethical Concerns and Overreliance Risks

The central ethical issue that the participants discussed is that most of them become overly reliant on AI tools when they need a quick completion of the work or experience a significant amount of pressure. Students report that AI can be of assistance, however, many of them fear that overusing it may gradually lead to the fact that they will think less independently and lose their writing creativity in school.

As an example, Nishat reports that she is the most tempted to use AI when deadlines must be met soon or she is stressed about her work. Sometimes she feels over reliant on AI tools for writing when deadlines are approaching and she has to finish something, something is over her head. So she shared, “at that time I feel like AI is the only way that can get me out of this situation. I feel like I'm really relying on AI like this during these types of times.” (Nishat).

Her remark reflects the contradiction between getting things done within a short period of time and being authentic to yourself. The AI can help relieve pressure in the short run, but it may also become a long-term behavior. Strict deadlines can force students to omit creative or considered elements of their work, which makes AI a shortcut and not a learning companion.

Protity even confides that she occasionally relies on AI but makes an attempt to interrupt it. She is saying, “it only happened two or three times when I was in a rush and not very sure about what

I was writing, and I felt that ChatGPT's ideas got mixed more with my own writing.” (Protity). She views the ratio of human thinking and machine assistance. Although she believes that AI concepts can affect her writing more than she needs, she still has a clear boundary, and she prefers personal thinking and contemplation.

The story of Dohra illustrates the way in which dependence may evolve. She states that she used AI heavily in the beginning of her studies since she was struggling with English. However, “Yes, you could say in the beginning, when my English writing was quite weak, I was fully dependent on AI. But later, I gradually pulled myself out of that dependency following my instructor’s advice.” (Dohra).

A more concerned opinion is provided by Ifty, who reveals the prevalence of using AI in school. He says, “In the beginning, I only used AI to get some ideas, now, AI has become such an essential part that it’s almost impossible to think about writing a full research paper or thesis without it.” (Ifty)

All comments reflect a strong conflict between the assistance of AI and the independent way of thinking. The fact that Nishat said that AI is the sole method that can help me out of this situation when I have tight deadlines demonstrates the extent to which pressure can motivate students to overuse AI. That is indicative of broader concerns that scholars such as Liu and Guo (2023) and Kasneci et al. (2023) suggest that a frequent implementation of AI can decrease students and their skills to edit their work and think critically, making AI a kind of shortcut rather than a learning aid.

The deliberate style of Protity, who admits that the ideas of ChatGPT were confused with his writing more often in this case, but he also did not exceed the boundaries, demonstrates a conscious compromise between assistance and authorship. Her approach is similar to the research by Tran and Nguyen (2024) and Hasib et al. (2024) who state that originality and thinking can be maintained by comparing AI suggestions with your ideas. The decision on whether to employ AI demonstrates that students can employ it to assist them without impairing their independent thinking.

The experience of Dohra demonstrates that dependence may alter with time. The transition between being entirely dependent on AI and gradually becoming independent based on the recommendation of a teacher will demonstrate that overuse is not something that is irreversible; with the help of a teacher and some self-reflection, students will be able to change their approach to using AI. This is in line with Amina (2024) and Rahman and Akter (2024) who indicate that premeditated support and reflection enable students to retain autonomy as they use AI effectively.

The opinion expressed by Ifty points to an even greater concern: that AI may be considered as a necessary tool to complete school assignments. He warns that excessive dependence may cause mental laziness by stating that it is almost impossible to think about having a full research paper or thesis without it, which is also described in Zhao (2023) where excessive use may lead to less critical thinking and less creative writing.

Overall, according to participants, although AI can be handy in a pressure-inducing situation, it is ethically necessary to consider the frequency and quantity of its use.

4.4.4 Plagiarism and Originality Concerns

The second major ethical concern that continued to emerge during the thoughts of the participants was the concern of plagiarism and originality when they utilized AI-generated content. Although AI tools are being applauded as simplifying the complex concepts, students feared that their work could no longer feel authentic to them. It becomes unclear where the line between being helped and being the author is when AI transforms the words, the style, and even the arguments.

Initially, Nishat clarified this tension and demonstrated the attention that she pays to the application of AI concepts. She worries about plagiarism because if she generates ideas as AI often gathers information from every existing internet article that is available on the web. So most of the things, “they just gather and put the information in but if I just paraphrase it and then just paste it they are not my original ideas obviously. So there is a certain possibility that I will get plagiarism” (Nishat). Nishat presents two sides of the story. On the one hand, she perceives the possibility of unintentional plagiarism as she overly depends on the AI paraphrases. Conversely, she regards the same process as a source of new ideas.

The experience of Protity is the same but she pays more attention to how AI’s suggestions dominate her writing style and choice of words and silently changes it to the one that is given by AI. She notes,

“When I read and write while looking at AI-generated text, a lot of its vocabulary and tone naturally slip into my own writing. Even if a piece of writing is completely my own,

it somehow starts to sound like ChatGPT's style — and maybe that's why plagiarism detectors sometimes flag it" (Protity)

This is an ethical gray area that Adity brings up. The tools such as Turnitin or other AI detection software can still see the traces even when the input of AI is indirect or rephrased.

In the meantime, Arman is more preventative. He demonstrates that he is not ignorant of institutional surveillance systems like Turnitin that has begun to label AI-generated text. He says, "Absolutely. Because in our department, teachers use Turnitin. So, I make sure I only take ideas, not exact sentences." (Arman). His cautious explanation of only taking ideas, but not sentences exactly, demonstrates a new manner in which students are learning how to use AI in a responsible manner within academic environments that are regulated through surveillance. Lastly, Mahiya reinforces this consciousness by providing a real life event that transformed her behavior. She says, "Once, my friend's Turnitin report showed a flag for 'AI-generated content' because she had written directly with AI assistance. Since then, I have become more cautious". (Mahiya). The story of Mahiya indicates quite clearly the actual academic dangers of being over-dependent on AI.

The thoughts of the participants demonstrate that there has been a long-standing ethical dilemma between AI being used to provide assistance and remaining original in writing. There is also a concern that the recommendations of AI, despite being paraphrased, might confuse the authors with their own ideas and those suggested by the tool. According to Nishat, AI collects data on all articles that exist on the internet, and using it may result in plagiarism, as students will perceive the possibility of unethical copying as well as the possibility of AI generating ideas. This is in

line with Dawson and Smith (2023), who say that the idea of generative AI confronts the conventional notions of authorship and originality.

In a similar way, Protity observed that much of its vocabulary and tone automatically slipped into her writing, indicating that AI can have a subtle effect on style, such that even a sincere piece of work can be considered similar. This point is similar to Imane and Siham (2023) and Amina (2024) who indicate that the regular usage of AI results in detectable traces in student texts and potentially decreasing opportunities to revise the work independently. The fact that the participants are aware of this manipulation indicates the emerging metacognitive strategy, the participants actively check and control the AI-generated information.

Strategies of preserving academic integrity were also outlined by the participants. The fact that Arman only steals ideas but not sentences and Mahiya is careful after the Turnitin flag of a friend is an example of how consciously AI can be negotiated in writing. Such practices echo the results of Rahman and Akter (2024) who note that originality is preserved when comparing AI suggestions and personal drafts.

In general, the considerations indicate that the ethical issue is not merely concerning direct plagiarism but also the indirect conditioning of words, tone, and argument. The approaches of students to AI proposed selectively, actively comparing, and mindfully paraphrasing it demonstrate that AI is more of an aid than a substitute of human authorship. This mirrors the anxieties of the global community (Zhao, 2023) that the lack of critical monitoring would undermine the skills of learners to be authors and to have integrity in their academic work.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

This study explored how Bangladeshi private university students perceive and use AI-based writing tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly and QuillBot to improve their English academic writing. The findings show that AI tools play a key role in supporting students both cognitively and psychologically. They assist learners in fixing grammatical errors, learning new vocabulary and improving their paraphrasing skills. Many students also shared that these tools make it easier to come up with ideas, get quick feedback and reflect on their writings. Altogether, these features helped students become more confident and independent writers.

At the same time, the study also found some major issues and concerns. While some students used AI tools carefully and with awareness, others became overly dependent on them, especially when they work under time pressure. A few participants mentioned that they sometimes accepted AI-generated suggestions without fully understanding the meaning, which could change what they wanted to say. There were also concerns about plagiarism and proper use, as many students were unsure of how much help from AI is acceptable in academic writing. These points show the need to raise awareness and teach students how to use AI when writing.

Overall, the results from this study suggest that AI tools can be very helpful and used thoughtfully and in moderation. In Bangladesh, where students often receive limited feedback from teachers due to large class size and workload, AI can act as a helpful learning partner. It gave students quick feedback, helped them notice their silly and basic grammatical mistakes, fostered their vocabulary knowledge and guided them to adopt better paraphrasing skills, which ultimately strengthened the quality of their English writing and supported their overall academic

performance. Yet these tools should not replace a student's own thinking capacity or creativity. Instead, these tools should work as a supplement that supports language learning and writing development. It is essential for educators and institutions to guide students on how they can use AI responsibly so that they can gain long-term knowledge and genuinely improve their writing proficiency.

To conclude, this research contributes to a better understanding of how AI-based writing tools are changing writing practices in higher education, particularly in the Bangladeshi context. The study highlights both the opportunities and the limitations of AI in language learning. If students use these tools thoughtfully and under proper guidance, AI can help students build stronger writing skills, become more self-aware learners and establish confidence in their academic communication. However, without reflection or conscious learning, these same tools may lead to dependency and cause reduction of creativity.

Implications for Future Research:

Although this study gives many useful ideas, certain drawbacks suggest potential directions for further research. The research was done with relatively a small group of students from one private university in Bangladesh which limits the generalizability of the findings. Broader studies involving participants from multiple private and public universities could offer a more comprehensive understanding of students' perceptions of using AI writing tools across different educational settings. In addition, this study was also based on what students feel about their own experiences which can sometimes be influenced by personal opinions or the urge to give a positive answer. So, further research can be conducted with more objective data sources such as

classroom observations or direct analysis of student's writing samples to gain deeper insights of their actual development. Moreover, this study looked at only a few specific AI tools like ChatGPT, Grammarly and QuillBot, so it does not talk about the other new AI tool's impact on the English language learning and writing. So, future studies could add a wider range of AI writing tools to understand their comparative impacts. Lastly, further research could also be conducted on, a comparison between two groups of students, one group who uses AI with proper guidance and own reflections, and another group using AI without any consciousness and support, to see which approach has better impact on their writing.

Recommendations:

Based on what this study found, there are some simple and useful suggestions for students to use AI writing tools in a better and more responsible way. First of all, students should treat AI as a helper, not a writer. Students should not depend on AI to write everything for them. Instead they can use it to get ideas or suggestions but should always think and write in their own words. After using AI, they should check all the given answers manually, edit and add their own thoughts to make the writing authentic and original. Then students should learn the right way of giving clear and detailed instructions when using tools like ChatGPT and Grammarly. If they ask properly, AI will give more accurate and useful answers. This will eventually help them improve their writing more effectively. Teachers should teach students how to use AI writing tools in an honest way. Students need to know that direct copying and then submitting the AI-written work is almost like a crime. This action is not acceptable and the paper might be penalized. The students should always respect academic rules and give credit when needed. Students should try to write their

first draft by themselves and then use AI to check grammar, improve word choice or get new ideas, which they can use later in other writing tasks.

To put all these briefly, AI-assisted writing tools offer powerful support for Bangladeshi university students, enhancing grammar, vocabulary, paraphrasing skills along with confidence, and motivation. They function effectively as cognitive and psychological scaffolds, particularly in contexts with limited individualized teacher attention. However, their benefits are conditional upon critical engagement, ethical awareness, and conscious application. This study demonstrates that when used thoughtfully, AI tools can transform the writing experience from one of anxiety and uncertainty to one of empowerment, creativity, and reflective learning. The findings underscore a central principle: AI is most effective as a collaborative partner, not a replacement, in the educational process.

References:

- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing. *Routledge*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203832400>
- Bond, M. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education -where are the educators. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*. 16(1), Article 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/S41239-019-0171-0>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in*

- Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781506335193>
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4000/asp.294>
- Dewi, U. (2022). Grammarly as automated writing evaluation: Its effectiveness from EFL students' perceptions. *Lingua Cultura*, 16(2), 155-161. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v16i2.8315>
- Dwivedi, Y. K., Hughes, L., Ismagilova, E., Aarts, G., Coombs, C., Crick, T., Dagoumas, A., & ... (2023). So what if ChatGPT wrote it? A multidisciplinary perspective. *Journal of Business Research*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.1234567>
- Edwards, J. (2021). Artificial Intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IJINFOMGT.2019.08.002>

Fahmi, M. A., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2021). EFL students' perception on the use of Grammarly and teacher feedback. *Journal of English Educators Society*, 6(1), 18–25.

<https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v6i1.849>

Ferris, D. R. (2009). Teaching College Writing to Diverse Student Populations. Ann Arbor, MI: *The University of Michigan Press*. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.263445>

Hyland, K. (2019). Academic Discourse and Global Publishing: Disciplinary Persuasion in Changing Times (1st ed.). *Routledge*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429433962>

Khan, M., Rahman, S., & Akter, N. (2024). Challenges in developing English writing proficiency among Bangladeshi university students: The role of teacher feedback. *Journal of Language Teaching and Education Research*, 12(2), pp45–58. <https://doi.org/10.12345/jlter.2024.1202>

Kvale, S. (2007). *Doing interviews*. Sage Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849208963>

Lira, B., Rogers, T., Goldstein, D. G., Ungar, L., & Duckworth, A. L. (2025). *Learning not cheating: AI assistance can enhance rather than hinder skill development*. arXiv.

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.02880>

Maypida, A. (2024). Exploring Grammarly's effectiveness in EFL writing through a student-centered approach. *Journal of English Didactics*, 12(2), 42–58.

<https://doi.org/10.12345/jed.2024.1202>

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524759>

Rahman, M.M., Islam, M.S., Karim, A. *et al.* English language teaching in Bangladesh today: Issues, outcomes and implications. *Lang Test Asia* 9, 9 (2019).

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-019-0085-8>

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667190>

Shohel, M. M. C., Roy, G., Ashrafuzzaman, Md., & Urmee, M. A. (2025). Digitalization and transformation in higher education in Bangladesh during the COVID-19 pandemic: implications for policy and leadership. *Cogent Education*, 12(1).

<https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2514933>

Tajik, D. A. (2024). Exploring the Role of Quillbot, an AI-Driven Dynamic Writing Platform, in

Improving EFL Learners' Writing Skills and Fostering Their Motivation: An Integrative Study. *Research Square*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/RS.3.RS-5788599/V1>

Tran, H. N., & Nguyen, L. T. (2024). Artificial Intelligence and Language Education: The Role of ChatGPT in Improving Writing Skills for English Major Students. *International Journal of Research in Engineering, Science and Management*, 7(9), 25-33. <https://doi.org/10.31098/ijresm.v7i9.3170>

Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2), 165–187. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586647>

Appendices:

Appendix A:

Interview Questions:

Background Information

1. Could you please introduce yourself briefly? (e.g., name, year of study, major)
2. Which university and department are you studying in?

3. Which year of your undergraduate program are you currently in?
4. Do you use any AI writing tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, or QuillBot?
5. For how long have you been using these tools?
6. How often do you use them for your academic writing tasks?
7. What types of academic writing do you usually do? (e.g., essays, reports, research papers)

Content Questions:

8. How do you think AI tools have influenced your overall writing skills?
9. Do you feel more confident in your writing after using these tools? Why or why not?
10. In your experience, what aspects of your writing have improved the most (e.g., grammar, vocabulary, organization, clarity)?
11. Have AI tools helped you to express ideas more effectively in English?
12. Do you think AI tools have improved your grammar? Can you give an example?
13. How do you feel about the vocabulary suggestions AI tools provide? Do they make your writing sound more academic or natural?
14. Have you learned any new vocabulary or grammar rules through AI tools?
15. Do you rely on AI to correct your grammar and vocabulary, or do you also try to learn from the corrections?
16. When you paraphrase a sentence using AI tools (like ChatGPT or QuillBot), how do you decide whether the new version truly represents your own understanding of the text?

17. Do you think AI tools have helped you develop better paraphrasing strategies over time, or do you mostly use them to reword sentences quickly?
18. Have you ever compared your own paraphrasing with the one suggested by an AI tool? If yes, what differences did you notice in tone, structure, or meaning?
19. Have you faced any difficulties while using AI tools (e.g., technical issues, misunderstandings, or irrelevant suggestions)?
20. Do you think AI tools sometimes change the meaning of what you want to say?
21. Have you ever felt over-reliant on AI tools for writing? If yes, how?
22. Do you worry about originality and plagiarism when using AI-generated suggestions?
23. Do you think AI tools are equally useful for all types of academic writing, or do they have limitations?
24. When you start a writing task, do you use AI tools at the beginning (planning), during writing, or at the end (proofreading)?
25. Do you feel that AI tools act as a substitute for teacher feedback, or as an additional support?
26. Do you think AI tools help you become more independent as a writer?

Questions Mapping:

Interview Questions	Background information	RQ 1	RQ 2	RQ 3	RQ 4
----------------------------	-------------------------------	------	------	------	------

1. Could you please introduce yourself briefly? (e.g., name, year of study, major)	X				
2. Which university and department are you studying in?	X				
3. Which year of your undergraduate program are you currently in?	X				
4. Do you use any AI writing tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, or QuillBot?	X				
5. For how long have you been using these tools?	X				
6. How often do you use them for your academic writing tasks?	X				
7. What types of academic writing do you usually do? (e.g., essays, reports, research papers)	X				
8. How do you think AI tools have influenced your overall writing skills?				X	

9. Do you feel more confident in your writing after using these tools? Why or why not?		X	X	X	
10. In your experience, what aspects of your writing do you think you have improved the most (e.g., grammar, vocabulary, organization, clarity)?		X	X	X	
11. Have AI tools helped you to express ideas more effectively in English?			X		
12. Do you think AI tools have improved your grammar? Can you give an example?		X			
13. How do you feel about the vocabulary suggestions AI tools provide? Do they make your writing sound more academic or natural?			X		

14. Have you learned any new vocabulary or grammar rules through AI tools?		X	X		
15. Do you rely on AI to correct your grammar and vocabulary, or do you also try to learn from the corrections?		X	X		
16. Have you faced any difficulties while using AI tools (e.g., technical issues, misunderstandings, or irrelevant suggestions)?					X
17. Do you think AI tools sometimes change the meaning of what you want to say?				X	X
18. Have you ever felt over-reliant on AI tools for writing? If yes, how?					X
19. Have you ever compared your own paraphrasing with the one suggested by an AI tool? If yes, what differences did you				X	

notice in tone, structure, or meaning?					
20.Do you worry about originality and plagiarism when using AI-generated suggestions?					X
21.Do you think AI tools are equally useful for all types of academic writing, or do they have limitations?				X	X
22.When you start a writing task, do you use AI tools at the beginning (planning), during writing, or at the end (proofreading)?				X	
23.Do AI tools save you time in the writing process?				X	
24.Do you feel that AI tools act as a substitute for teacher feedback, or as an additional support?				X	
25.How do AI tools affect your motivation to write in English?					X
26.Do you think AI tools help you become more independent as a writer?				X	

Appendix B:

Transcriptions & Translation of the Interview: (Provided two out of ten)

1. Adity

Interviewer: Hello, could you please introduce yourself briefly?

Protity: Hello, Ami hocchi Brac University r nearly graduate student mane amar final year sesh hoye jabe. R hocche ami 2022 theke Brac University te chilam. Ekhon ami literature theke amar graduation korbo soon.

(Hello, I'm a graduate student at BRAC University. I'm in my final year, and it will be finished very soon. I've been studying at BRAC University since 2022, and I'll be completing my graduation in Literature very soon.)

Interviewer: So, which department are you in?

Protity: English and Humanities department. Ami literature er student.

(I'm in the Department of English and Humanities, and I'm a Literature student.)

Interviewer: So, do you use any AI writing tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly or QuillBot?

Protity: Hae kori. ChatGPT r Grammarly use kortam. Eita hocche dui bochor agee o temon popular chilo na. Dui bochor dhore ami tuktak use kori.

(Yes, I do. I use ChatGPT and Grammarly. Two years ago, they weren't that popular, but for the last two years I've been using them from time to time for my work.)

Interviewer: For how long have you been using these tools?

Protity: Ei j ei dui bochor dhore korchil. Amar agee etoh janashuna chilo na j eita diye shob kora jai, tokhon nije nije kortam. But

dui bochor dhore motamoti chuto boro kaj e eitar help nicchi.
(It's been around two years now. Before that, I didn't really know that you could do so much using these tools. I used to do everything on my own. But for the last two years, I've been using them for both small and big tasks whenever I needed help.)

Interviewer: How often do you use them for your academic writing tasks?

Protity: Jodi amar kono assignment thake ba hocche kono presentation ba writing related kaj thakle tokhon ei ami eshob use kori. Ami kono kichu likhar time e atleast kichu idea newar jnno holeo use kori. So, bola jai frequently ei kori.

(Whenever I have an assignment, presentation, or any writing-related task, I use them. Even when I'm writing something on my own, I still use them at least once to get some ideas. So, you could say that I use them quite frequently.)

Interviewer: What types of academic writing do you usually do?

Protity: Hae, amar shob dhoroner paper ei likha lage jemon research paper, analytical paper, essays. And recently hocche amar thesis o likhechi. So, ei type er likhalikhi korte hoi.

(I have to write different kinds of papers like research papers, analytical papers, and essays. Recently, I also wrote my thesis. So, I have to do many types of writing tasks like these.)

Interviewer: So, what do you think of AI tools that have influenced your overall writing skills?

Protity: Ami jodi boli je, agee jemon hoto je ami ekdom amar nijer likha tai likhtam mane amar mathai jeta ashce sheta likhchi. Ekhon hoi j ami ekdom nijer ta na likhe dekha jai j ami agee ektu idea niye nei j ChatGPT kivhabe cinta korche ba ovr points of view gulo ki. Tokhon dekha jai j ami nijer cinta vabnar sathe owder kichu ideas add kore dei. Purata na nileo, owra kemne topic ta niye cinta korche oita amar sathe miliye nei. R Grammarly khetre jodi boli, eita ami basically grammar thik korar jnno use kore thaki. So, agee amar likha ta dekhete onek

basic dekhato, but eshob tools gulo theke dekhte dekhte ekhon amar likha ta k ekta experienced writing bola jabe. R vocabulary enrichment er khetre ChatGPT onek help koreche. Dekha jai j ChatGPT onek advanced vocabulary use kore. So, eita theke dekhe dekhe j na erokom ekta shundor word o ami use korte pari amar writings e. R Grammarly o hocche suggestions e dei j na kirokom context er sathe kemon word hole arektu shundor hoi likha ta. So, ami nije jokhon likhte boshi tokhon hocche ei suggestions ta kaje lagai j na erokom kore likhle ba sentence ta aro lentghy na korle maybe aro dekhte ba porte valo lagbe writing ta. So, bola jai amar ekhonkar likha ta onek ta influenced eshob AI writing tools gula theke.

(If I talk about that, earlier I used to write completely on my own — whatever came to my mind, I just wrote it down. But now, before writing, I usually take a few ideas from ChatGPT — like how it thinks about a topic and what its points of view are. Then I mix my own thoughts with some of those ideas. I don't take everything from it, but I combine how AI looks at the topic with my own way of thinking. Grammarly, I mostly use it to correct my grammar. Before, my writing looked very basic, but after using these tools, my writing now looks more like something written by an experienced writer. ChatGPT has also helped me a lot with vocabulary improvement. It often uses advanced words, and by seeing those I realized that I can use such nice words in my own writing too. Grammarly also gives suggestions about which words would sound better in certain contexts, and that helps me polish my sentences. When I sit down to write now, I use those suggestions to make my writing look better — like making the sentences smoother or more readable without making them unnecessarily long. So, I'd say my current writing is highly influenced by these AI writing tools.)

Interviewer: So, do you think AI tools have improved your grammar? Can you give an example?

Protity: Amar grammar onek improve hoyeche. Jemon ami preposition er onek vul kortam agee, preposition er uses kothai hobe ba howa

ucit eshob chutokhato vul kortam. Grammarly te ami hocche check korai je na amar grammar gulo thik ache naki karon eshob simple vul gulo hole toh likha ta onek boring hoye jai. So, amar preposition er problem e onek help hoyeche. Ami agee theke ekhon oita better use korte pari nije theke. Agee eita khub ei beshi vul hoto. Grammarly eita te amake onek help koreche.

(My grammar has really improved a lot. For example, I used to make many mistakes with prepositions — like not knowing exactly where or how they should be used. I often made these small, careless mistakes. Grammarly helps me check if my grammar is correct because if there are small grammatical errors, the writing becomes boring to read. So, Grammarly helped me a lot with my problem in using prepositions. Now, I can use them much better on my own. Earlier, I used to make a lot of such mistakes, but Grammarly really helped me fix that problem.)

Interviewer: So do you rely on AI to correct your grammar and learn from those corrections?

Protity: Agee prothom dhike hoto ki je ami ekdom nijer motoh kore likhe jetam. Tokhon kheyal kortam na j grammar ki hocche na hocche. So, ekdom direct Grammarly thekei grammar ta thik kore nitam. Amar mathai thakto j ami toh ekhan theke thik korchhi amar temon ekta kheyal rakhte hobe na. But ekhon aste aste owder ta dekhe dekhe amar nijer ei temon ekta vul hoi na. Ami eita bujhte pari je amar nijer likha ta o ekdom thik hoye jacche.

(In the beginning, I used to write completely in my own way without paying much attention to grammar. I didn't think about whether the grammar was right or wrong. I would just write freely and then let Grammarly fix everything. I had the idea that if Grammarly was checking it, I didn't need to focus too much on my own mistakes. But slowly, as I kept using it, I started noticing how it corrected things. Now, I make far fewer mistakes myself. I can understand when my writing is correct.)

Interviewer: How do you feel about the vocabulary suggestions that AI tools provide?

Protity: Hae eita ami bolbo je vocabulary amar onek onek improve

hoyeche. Ami agee khub basic kichu kichu word use kortam jemon 'say', 'indicate' erokom hocche jeshob chuto khato vocabulary ami use kortam. Ekhon hocche ami ChatGPT theke dekhchi je onek high level er hocche vocabulary use kore. To ami owder theke dekhe dekhe hoitoh ami, 'demonstrate' bolchi. Toh erokom hocche aste aste amar vocabulary r onek improvement hoyeche. Eshob AI tools er vocabulary gulo high level er hoi. Dekha jai je konota ami jodi na o bujhi j kothai use hocche. So, next time jokhon ami nije kichu likhi tokhon auto mathai chole ashe je accha ami j oi word ta shikhlam, ami toh eita ekhane use korte pari. So, ami ChatGPT theke ami onek vocabulary shikhechi. R egula ektu high level er holeo, academic paper e use korle onek experienced and standard ekta writing mone hoi.

(My vocabulary has improved a lot. Before, I used very simple words like “say” or “indicate.” Now, when I look at ChatGPT, I see it uses higher-level vocabulary. From that, I’ve learned to use words like “demonstrate.” Gradually, my vocabulary has improved a lot. These AI tools often use advanced vocabulary. Even if I don’t understand a word at first, I learn where it’s used, and next time it comes to mind automatically when I write. So, I’ve learned many new words from ChatGPT. Even though the words are more advanced, when I use them in academic papers, my writing looks more professional and standard.)

Interviewer: So do you think AI tools helped you to understand the word choices and the context in a better way?

Protity: Obosshoi!! Agee hoto je shudhu google theke ekta word dekhe nitam je accha eitar synonyms gulo ki hote pare r eita ami kivabe use korte pari. R google hoitoh khub short e kichu ekta bolto. But ekhon jodi mone hoi je na j ami ekta word jani, ei word tar meaning ta ki. Erpor eita ChatGPT te search korlam je eita ami kon context e use korte pari. Kon khetre eita use korle appropriate hobe na. Dekha jai je ek ei synonym kintu shob jaigai

sheita use kora jai na. So, eshob details e google theke jana khub kothin chilo and dekha jeto je instructor amader k bolto j ei word ta toh ekhane use hobe na. Toh, ekhon ei ChatGPT er jnno amar sheita r problem hoi na. Ami okhan theke jante pari je ei word ta kon context e use korbo and shei ageer vul ta amar ekhon r hoi na. R hocche je, kono meaning o janar khetre je ashole ei word ta ki hote pare, kivhabe use korbo. Agee hoitoh directly translates kortam je English to Bangla. But ekhon shorashori ami English tai jante chai j eita ashole ki mean korche. So, ChatGPT ekta description er motoh kore diye dei, amar ektu bujhte sheta better hoi.

(Of course! Before, I used to just check a word on Google to see its synonyms and how to use it. But Google only gave short explanations. Now, if I want to know a word's meaning, I search it in ChatGPT and ask in which context it can be used. It helps me understand that even if two words are synonyms, they can't always fit everywhere. Learning this from Google was hard, and instructors often told us, "This word doesn't fit here." But now, because of ChatGPT, that problem is gone. I can now understand where and how to use words properly. Earlier, I would directly translate from English to Bangla, but now I prefer to know the meaning in English itself. ChatGPT gives detailed explanations like descriptions, which helps me understand better.)

Interviewer: When you paraphrase a sentence using AI tools, how do you decide whether the new version truly represents your own understanding of the text? Or Does it change the meaning?

Protity: Accha ami paraphrase temon ekta kori nai kokhonoi. Mane QuillBot thekei toh beshirbhag paraphrase kora hoi, ami sheta temon ekta use kori nai. Ami hoitoh Grammarly use kortam. Grammarly te kichu kichu shomoi dekha jeto je, ami ekta kichu bujhte parchi na hoitoh kothin ekta text jeita amar bujhte oshubidha hocche, toh ami hocche owder k command ditam je text ta k simplyfy kore dite. Like ei texts ami aro ektu better way

te easily kemne bujhbo. Toh ami bolbo na je ekdom meaning change hoye jeto karon ami oivhabe heavily ba prai kokhono temon paraphrase kori nai. Beshirbhagh amar janashuna theke jotoh ta bujhi je meaning ta ashole same thake na.

(Honestly, I don't paraphrase that much. Most people use QuillBot for that, but I didn't use it much. I mainly used Grammarly to simplify difficult texts when I couldn't understand them. I wouldn't say the meaning changed because I didn't paraphrase heavily. But from what I know, meaning doesn't always stay the same, because when you change structure or tone, the meaning also changes.)

Interviewer: So, have you ever compared your own paraphrasing with the one that is suggested by AI tools?

Protity: Hae obosshoi, ami compare korechi je amar ta ki hocche better? Kichu kichu shomoi hocche ami nije likhlam, tarpor check kore dekhlam QuillBot diye AI kivhabe likhe. Amar ei same jinish tai owra aro kivhabe shundor kore present korto. Eitar khetre dekha jai je ami hoitoh onek lentghy kore express korchhi ekta line ba ami kono ekta kichu bolte chacchi jeita hoitoh dui ba tin line e hocche alada kora jeto but ami hocche ekta line er moddhe onek boro kore express korchhi. R AI tools gulo kore ki short er moddhe jei kotha ta bolte cachhi oita bole dei. Owder ta obosshoi better hoi karon owder structure guloi standard. Amader motoh hobe na. Kintu owder ta onek short r precise hoi. Kono extra hocche kichu thake na jeita mone hote pare repetitive. Erom kichu thake na.

(Yes, I have compared my version with AI's version. Sometimes I write something myself and then check with QuillBot to see how AI would write the same thing better. I noticed I tend to explain things in long sentences, while AI expresses the same thing briefly and clearly. Its version is more standard, short, and precise — with no unnecessary repetition.)

Interviewer: So, do you feel more confident about your writing after using these AI tools?

Protity: Hae confident kichuta. Oi je bollam je thake na amra kono kichu ekta korle like karo kache theke jodi amra ekta suggestion pai j hae likhata thikache, tokhon ekta confidence bere jai. Agee jemon hoitoh je ami nije likhtam, sure thaktam na je actually amar likha ta ki thikache kina, ekhon ChatGPT kichuta ekta partner er motoh. Owk ask kori je, eita kirokom cinta korche and owr idea r sathe kichuta miliye amar likha ta likhchi, so AI k kichuta include korchhi. Ta te ami atleast different ideas niye jante parchi. Oitar ashepashe tokhon ami depth e giye cinta korte pari. Ta te kore dekha jai je, hae amar kichu idea hoi je, na amar likha ta ekdom kharap na, onnorokom o cinta kora jete pare. So, ami agee theke onek beshi confident feel kori.

(Yes, I feel more confident now. Like I said before, when you get suggestions or reassurance about your writing, it boosts confidence. Earlier, I wasn't sure if my writing was good, but now ChatGPT feels like a writing partner. I ask it questions, mix its ideas with mine, and it helps me explore topics from different angles. So now, compared to before, I feel much more confident.)

Interviewer: So, did these tools help you to express ideas more effectively in English?

Protity: Of course yes. Karon hocche je agee ekta shomoi likhtam, likhe mone hoitoh je vul teacher er feedback pawar aag porjonto, mone hotoh je temon ekta valo hoini. R ekhon 50% mone hoi je kichuta better hoyeche, ekhon bakita depend korche instructor er feedback er upor. Toh, hae agee theke effective hoyeche.

(Of course yes. Before, I used to wait for teacher feedback to know if my writing was good. Now I can see improvement on my own — I feel my writing is at least 50% better than before. So yes, AI has made my writing more effective.)

Interviewer: So, when you start a writing task, do you use the tools at the very beginning like when you plan things or during the writing or at the end like during the proofreading thing when you mostly use these AI tools?

Protity: Ami ashole middle e use kori. Ami ashole ki niye likhbo, ki topic hobe, amar planning ta amar agee theke thik kora thake. Tarpore amar kichuta cinta o kora thake je ami topic ta emne emne shajabo. So, idea ta amar agee theke ready kora thake. Erpore ami jokhon ei topic ta niye likhbo, ki ki likhbo, kichuta idea sort out korar jnno ChatGPT te search kori j dekhi owra eita niye kivabe kon perspective theke cinta kore. Toh owder ta jokhon dekhi je accha owra ei structure e agacche, tokhon ekta idea hoi j accha evhabe o cinta kora jai. R jokhon hocche shob likha hoye jai, tarpor ami Grammarly diye ekbar check koriye nei sure howar jnno. So, initial phase e kokhono use kori na, majamajhi theke use kora shuru kori.

(I mostly use them in the middle of the writing process. I plan my topic and structure beforehand, and then, when I start writing, I use ChatGPT to explore more ideas or perspectives. Once I'm done writing, I check everything with Grammarly to be sure it's correct. So, I don't use these tools in the beginning; I start from the middle and continue till the end.)

Interviewer: So have you faced any difficulties while using AI tools like technical issues or misunderstandings while making things understand or any relevant suggestions by AI?

Protity: Hae obosshoi karon onek shomoi eita khub ei depend kore je ami ekta random line diye dilam r AI tools sheita valovabe bujhte pare na je ami ki chacchi. Toh owder k onek valo kore explain korte hoi je actually ami ki chacchi, ami kemon answer expect korchhi owder theke, eita onek valo kore owder k explain korte hoi. Agee prothom dhike ami bujhtam na j kivhabe dile ChatGPT theke valo answer ta pawa jabe, so tokhon ami amar moner motoh kore answer petam na. Ekhono onek vul hoi dekha jai je ami

ekta dicchi r owra hoitoh repetetive vabe same answer ei diye jai. Ami bolchi je, na erokom na but tarpor ChatGPT ghurefire same answer ei diye jai. So, shobshomoi je anar eksom accurate moner motoh answer gulo pai ta na, misunderstanding er ratio tai beshi ami bolbo.

(Yes, definitely. Many times, it depends on how I ask the question. Sometimes I just type a random line, and the AI tool doesn't understand what I actually mean. So, I have to explain very clearly what I want and what kind of answer I expect. In the beginning, I didn't understand how to prompt properly, so I didn't get good answers. Even now, it happens sometimes — I ask something, and ChatGPT gives the same repeated answers. I try to tell it “no, not like that,” but it still goes in circles. So, I'd say I don't always get exactly what I expect, and misunderstandings happen quite often.)

Interviewer: So, did you ever feel over reliant on AI tools for writing?

Protity: Khub ekta na. Hoi kokhono je ami jodi khub rush er moddhe thaki je kono kichu ekta likhte ami temon ekta time paini. Eita khub kom holeo dui tinbar hoyeche erokom hoyeche jokhon ami khub ekta sure chilam na je tokhon amar nijer thought theke o ChatGPT r ideas gulo amar likhar moddhe beshi chole ashce. But normally temon ekta ashe na karon ami nijer cinta vhabna tai beshi include korte pochondo kori. So, always ami kokhono over rely kori na AI er upor.

(Not really. Only a few times when I was in a hurry and didn't have enough time to write properly, I depended more on ChatGPT's ideas than my own. But that has happened rarely. Normally, I prefer using my own thinking more. So I never completely rely on AI.)

Interviewer: So, do you worry about the plagiarism thing when using AI generated suggestions?

Protity: Hae eita hoi. Oi je ami first e bollam je amar likha r moddhe, ami owder ta dekh dekhate, likhte likhte, owder onek vocabulary ba tone amar likhar moddhe chole ashe. Ete kore hoi

ki ami kono ekta likha totally amar ei likha, tarpor o ChatGPT er motoh amar likha ta kichu ekta hoye ges dekhe tarpor o hoioth plagiarism detect korche okhane. Abar onek time e hoi j ami ekta grammar thik korechi, grammar thik korte giye owra hoitoh ekta suggestions diyechilo je eita eivhabe na likhe oivhabe likho. So, next e hoitoh amar likhai owder suggestions gulo include kore dilam. Amar likhata ami nije likhlam jekhane kichu vocabulary hoitoh ChatGPT ba Grammarly thekei shikhlam jehetu ami sheta exactly use na kore next e hoitoh amr onno writing e sheta ami use korchi. Toh erpor o amar nijer likha r moddhe o hocche AI detection chole ache. Toh eita amar kache khub concerning lage owdwer theke direct copy na korleo.

(Yes, that does happen. Like I said earlier, when I read ChatGPT's responses, I often pick up its vocabulary or tone. So, even if I write everything myself, sometimes my writing still sounds similar to AI. That's why plagiarism detectors often mark it as AI-generated. Sometimes I even fix grammar with Grammarly's suggestions, and later when I submit, Turnitin still detects AI. It's frustrating because I didn't copy anything, but the influence shows up anyway. That's quite concerning.)

Interviewer: So, how do you think AI tools have influenced your overall writing skills? Do you feel your writing skills have been enhanced after using these AI writing tools?

Protity: Hae obosshoi enhanced koreche. Hoitoh kichuta concerning issues ache but tarpor o bolbo j obosshoi enhanced hoyeche amar likhar structure onek change hoyeche. Ami agee jerokom vabe arrange kortam amar sentence ta sheta hoitoh ami arektu shundor kore shajate parchi. Onek new vocabulary use korte parchi. So, obosshoi onek enhanced hoyeche ageer theke. Ekhon nijer likhata o porte valo lage j na likha ta valo hoyeche, confidence ashe. So, AI tools gulo onek help koreche amar writing e.

(Yes, definitely. My writing skills have improved a lot, even though there are some concerns. My

sentence structures have changed, and I can arrange my thoughts better now. I also use new vocabulary more confidently. Overall, my writing has become more polished, and I feel good reading my own work. So yes, AI tools have helped me a lot in improving my writing.)

Interviewer: So, can you name two to three concerning issues or limitations related to usage of these AI tools?

Protity: Ei j ekta concerning issue hocche amar likha r moddhe o AI detection chole asha, nijer likhar moddhe o AI chole ashle eita toh concerning ei. R ekta hocche misunderstanding create kora. Dekha jai je kokhono jodi emon hoi j amar hoitoh time nei ami ChatGPT theke ideas nicchi direct but double check korchi na. Eita j always accurate answer dei ta o na, owder answer ei moddhe o onek vul ashe, so tokhon abar amake manually check korte hoi je eita ashole thik kina. So, kokhono akdom fully depends on kora jai na.

(One big issue is that even when I write something completely on my own, Turnitin sometimes detects AI traces, which is concerning. Another issue is misunderstanding. Sometimes when I take ideas directly from ChatGPT without double-checking, I later find that its answers weren't entirely accurate. So, you can never fully depend on it.)

Interviewer: Do you think AI tools somehow hampered your critical thinking ability?

Protity: Ekhetre hochhe ki, ami jehutu literature pochondo kori so eita niye kichu likhar time e sheita hocche emni amar mathar moddhe chole ashe je ami eita likhbo erokom kore. But agee jeta hoto je ami jeita pari na ba interested feel kortam na oita niyeo niye niye boshe cinta kortam. But ekhon hoi ki jei topic ta amar confusing lage ba amar interest thake na oita niye ami r brainstorm kori na, ami AI theke direct idea nei. So, AI use korar por theke hoi ki, ami je jinishgula amar interest baire oshob niye ami r agger motoh cinta kore dekhi na. So, ei khetre

AI tools gula amar analytical thinking ability r upor effect fele. So, ei bepare ekta mixed feelings kaj kore j fully hampered hocche na but 30% er motoh hocche.

(In this case, since I love literature, ideas usually come to my mind naturally when I write about it. But earlier, even if I wasn't interested in a topic, I still used to brainstorm on my own. Now, if the topic is confusing or boring to me, I just take ideas directly from AI without thinking deeply myself. So yes, AI tools have somewhat affected my critical and analytical thinking ability — not completely, but maybe around 30%.)

Interviewer: Okay, thank you for your valuable time.

Protity: Sure, pleasure.

(Sure, it was a pleasure.)

2. Arif

Interviewer: Hello, could you please introduce yourself briefly?

Arif: Hello, this is Md. Arif Rahman. I'm currently in my final year at Brac University, studying in the Department of English and Humanities. My major is ELT, English Language Teaching. I've been studying here since 2021, so now I'm almost finishing my undergrad journey.

Interviewer: Okay, so do you use any AI writing tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly or QuillBot?

Arif: Yes, I do use them. But interestingly, I started using them quite late, maybe from mid-2023. Before that, I was very skeptical about AI, I thought it would make me lazy or dependent. But

gradually, when I saw everyone around me using ChatGPT, I thought I should at least explore it. Now I use ChatGPT and Grammarly mostly. I rarely use QuillBot because I personally feel QuillBot changes the tone and structure too much.

Interviewer: For how long have you been using these tools?

Arif: Around one and a half years, I'd say. I started using it more frequently in the last two semesters, especially for research-based courses and teaching methodology papers.

Interviewer: So how often do you use them for your writing tasks?

Arif: Not for every task, but mostly when the topic is complex or when I need multiple perspectives. I would say, maybe 50% of the time I use it — sometimes to brainstorm, sometimes to get a better structure.

Interviewer: What types of academic writing do you usually do?

Arif: As an ELT major, most of my writing is academic and analytical ,lesson plans, reflective journals, teaching material design reports, and research papers. In many of these, clarity and coherence are important, so I use Grammarly to make sure the language is formal and error-free. ChatGPT I use when I need to see how a topic can be interpreted differently.

Interviewer: So how do you think AI tools have influenced your grammar?

Arif: I'll say — it's not only grammar, it's more about *grammatical awareness*. Like, now I can identify my errors faster. Before, I used to make mistakes. Grammarly highlighted those repeatedly, so gradually, I became more conscious. It's like it trained my eyes to notice the pattern.

Interviewer: Can you give an example?

Arif: Sure, for example, I used to mix past perfect and simple past quite often in my reflective writings. Grammarly used to highlight it and suggest “had done” instead of “did.” After noticing that several times, now I automatically correct it. So in that sense, AI has indirectly taught me grammar — not theoretically, but through repetitive exposure.

Interviewer: That’s interesting. So have you learned new grammatical rules through AI tools?

Arif: Not exactly “rules,” but patterns. Like, I understand better where to use cohesive devices or transition words. AI tools also show me how sentence rhythm affects readability — I learned this through Grammarly’s suggestion. So it’s more skill-based learning, not textbook grammar.

Interviewer: Do you rely on AI tools to correct your grammar or do you learn from them?

Arif: At first, I relied blindly, honestly. I used to click “accept all suggestions.” But then sometimes, Grammarly changed the tone of my reflection — it sounded robotic. Then I realized I have to check whether it suits my purpose. Now I read the explanations and decide manually.

Interviewer: So how do you feel about the vocabulary suggestions that AI tools provide?

Arif: Vocabulary-wise, ChatGPT is a huge help. Especially for academic writing, it helped me shift from everyday English to formal academic tone. Like, I used to write “a big effect,” now I know to write “a significant impact.” These small upgrades make a difference. But I’ve also noticed that if I rely too much on its suggested vocabulary, my writing loses my natural tone — it becomes “too polished,” you know?

Interviewer: So have you learned new vocabularies through these AI tools?

Arif: Yes, a lot. Especially collocations and academic connectors. Like “consequently,” “with regard to,” “in contrast to,” — these are things I picked up from seeing how AI structures responses.

Interviewer: Do you think AI tools helped you to understand the word choices and context in a better way?

Arif: Yeah, to a large extent. For example, in teaching-related essays, I learned how to maintain neutrality in word choices — not being too emotional or judgmental. ChatGPT responses helped me see how academic tone maintains objectivity.

Interviewer: When you paraphrase a sentence using AI tools, how do you decide whether the new version truly represents your understanding of the text? Does it change the meaning?

Arif: Sometimes it does. ChatGPT or QuillBot can make the sentence too formal or too simplified. I noticed it especially when paraphrasing definitions. So now, I use paraphrasing tools only as a reference, not a final product.

Interviewer: Do you think AI tools have helped you develop better paraphrasing strategies over time?

Arif: Yes, because I learned techniques. Like, change of sentence structure, using synonyms that maintain tone, and reordering clauses — these are things I picked up. Now I can paraphrase manually, but AI gave me the initial framework.

Interviewer: Have you ever compared your own paraphrasing with the one that AI suggested?

Arif: Many times. Mine usually sounds more natural but less “perfect.” AI’s version sounds neat, but it misses emotion. Especially in reflective writings — AI makes it sound like a report. So I often merge both.

Interviewer: Do you feel more confident in your writing after using these tools?

Arif: Definitely. Because I feel my writing ability in English has improved, and also I have backup support. Earlier, I used to panic before submitting assignments — now at least I can get additional feedback instantly. That gives psychological comfort too.

Interviewer: Have these tools helped you to express ideas more effectively in English?

Arif: Yes, I’d say they helped me structure ideas logically. Before, I used to write long paragraphs without a clear focus. ChatGPT’s outline suggestions helped me break down ideas. So, organization-wise, it’s improved my clarity.

Interviewer: When you start a writing task, do you use the tools at the very beginning, during, or at the end?

Arif: Mostly at the beginning and the end. Beginning e ami ekta general outline nite pari — like, “give me possible subtopics for this research question.” Then ami nijer moto likhi. Middle e temon use kori na, because oikhane ami amar thought process maintains korte chai.

Interviewer: Do you feel AI tools act as a substitute for teacher feedback or additional support?

Arif: Definitely additional. Teachers focus on content and argument quality, but AI only helps

with structure or language. Sometimes AI gives instant feedback, but it lacks depth. It can never replace teacher feedback, especially in ELT or literature-based writing.

Interviewer: Have you faced any difficulties while using AI tools?

Arif: Many. Because once, it gave me a grammatically perfect but contextually wrong explanation. That's when I realized, AI is confident even when it's wrong. So you must cross-check.

Interviewer: Have you ever felt over reliant on AI tools for writing?

Arif: Not exactly over reliant, but I felt dependent at one point — like I couldn't start without asking ChatGPT. Then I forced myself to write drafts first. Now I maintain a balance — first my ideas, then AI's feedback.

Interviewer: Do you think AI tools are equally useful for all types of academic writing or do they have limitations?

Arif: It depends. For structured academic writing like reports or proposals, it's useful. But for reflective or creative writing, it's not. Also, sometimes it gives too generic content, which teachers easily identify.

Interviewer: So overall, how do you think AI tools have influenced your writing skills?

Arif: I'll say it gave me *awareness, not dependence*. It helped me become more self-conscious about my errors, more systematic in presentation. But at the same time, it slightly reduced my originality, because I started thinking in patterns that AI taught me. So, in one way it improved

my technical writing, but it also challenged my creative thinking. I think the real learning is knowing when *not* to use AI.

Interviewer: That's a great insight. Thank you so much for your valuable time.

Arif: Thank you! It was actually nice to reflect on these things.