

**THE USE OF CHATGPT ON STUDENTS' THESIS WRITING OF ENGLISH
EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM AT UIN SJECH M. DJAMIL DJAMBEK
BUKITTINGGI**

Renaldi¹, Veni Roza²

Reflinda¹, Melyann Melani²

Universitas Islam Negeri Sjech M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi

[¹renaldi170902@gmail.com](mailto:renaldi170902@gmail.com), [²veniroza@uinbukittinggi.ac.id](mailto:veniroza@uinbukittinggi.ac.id),

[³reflinda@uinbukittinggi.ac.id](mailto:reflinda@uinbukittinggi.ac.id), [⁴melyannmelani@uinbukittinggi.ac.id](mailto:melyannmelani@uinbukittinggi.ac.id)

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to identify AI-generated content in student thesis writing and to investigate the phenomenon of dependence on ChatGPT among students of the English Education Study Program at UIN Sjech M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi. The problem arises due to the rapid increase in the use of AI applications such as ChatGPT, while the campus does not yet have official guidelines regarding the use of AI in scientific work and there is a lack of student awareness in using AI responsibly. This situation raises ethical issues, including plagiarism, lack of honesty in acknowledging AI assistance, excessive dependence, and a decline in critical thinking skills. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the problems faced by students when using AI to complete writing assignments. This study used a quantitative descriptive research design, with data collected through document analysis of student theses involving the use of ChatGPT. Seventy-eight thesis documents were selected using purposive sampling techniques, and GPTZero was used as an AI detection tool to identify the level of AI involvement in student writing. The findings show that 75 out of 78 student documents indicate a high level of dependence on ChatGPT, while 3 documents show an acceptable level of AI usage. These results suggest that ChatGPT is often used not only for language refinement but also to generate substantial portions of academic texts, which may hinder students' independent writing skills, originality, and critical thinking, as well as raise concerns about plagiarism and academic integrity.

Keywords: ChatGPT, Over-reliance, AI detection, Thesis Writing, Academic Integrity

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini dilakukan untuk mengidentifikasi konten yang dihasilkan oleh AI dalam penulisan skripsi mahasiswa serta untuk menyelidiki fenomena ketergantungan terhadap ChatGPT di kalangan mahasiswa Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris di UIN Sjech M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi. Masalah ini muncul akibat

meningkatnya penggunaan aplikasi AI seperti ChatGPT, sementara kampus belum memiliki pedoman resmi mengenai penggunaan AI dalam karya ilmiah dan terdapat kurangnya kesadaran mahasiswa dalam menggunakan AI secara bertanggung jawab. Situasi ini menimbulkan masalah etika, termasuk plagiarisme, kurangnya kejujuran dalam mengakui bantuan AI, ketergantungan yang berlebihan, dan penurunan kemampuan berpikir kritis. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis masalah yang dihadapi mahasiswa saat menggunakan AI untuk menyelesaikan tugas penulisan. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain penelitian deskriptif kuantitatif, dengan data dikumpulkan melalui analisis dokumen tesis mahasiswa yang melibatkan penggunaan ChatGPT. Tujuh puluh delapan dokumen tesis dipilih menggunakan teknik sampling purposif, dan GPTZero digunakan sebagai alat deteksi AI untuk mengidentifikasi tingkat keterlibatan AI dalam penulisan mahasiswa. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa 75 dari 78 dokumen mahasiswa menunjukkan tingkat ketergantungan yang tinggi pada ChatGPT, sementara 3 dokumen menunjukkan tingkat penggunaan AI yang dapat diterima. Hasil ini menunjukkan bahwa ChatGPT sering digunakan tidak hanya untuk penyempurnaan bahasa tetapi juga untuk menghasilkan bagian substansial dari teks akademik, yang dapat menghambat keterampilan menulis mandiri, orisinalitas, dan pemikiran kritis mahasiswa, serta menimbulkan kekhawatiran terkait plagiarisme dan integritas akademik.

Kata Kunci: ChatGPT, Ketergantungan Berlebihan, Deteksi AI, Penulisan Skripsi, Integritas Akademik

A. INTRODUCTION

Technological developments in today's digital age have changed the way students learn, interact, and complete assignments. Artificial Intelligence (AI), which provides tools to aid the learning process through automation, instant feedback, and individual tailored assistance, is one of the most significant developments in education. Artificial Intelligence has been widely used to improve students' academic performance and digital literacy, especially in writing

assignments. (Cardona et al., 2023; Crompton & Burke, 2023).

Among the latest developments in artificial intelligence (AI), generative AI has attracted a lot of attention in educational circles. This technology is trained using large datasets and generates new text, images, audio, and computer code using machine learning models. (Galaczi & Luckin, 2023). In higher education, generative AI is increasingly used as a learning support tool, especially for academic writing. One of the most popular

applications is ChatGPT, developed by OpenAI, which is commonly used by students to help generate ideas, improve grammar, and organize academic texts (Kasneci et al., 2023).

ChatGPT is a language model built on Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT) technology, designed to understand commands and generate text that looks like it was written by a human. ChatGPT can answer questions, provide writing assistance, and even help with programming using deep learning techniques and training from large data sets. To evaluate and improve this model, human intervention is still necessary because the model is not perfect and can still produce biased or incorrect results (Dwivedi et al., 2023a).

Writing, particularly academic writing, is a core skill in higher education. It plays a crucial role in expressing ideas, presenting arguments, and demonstrating critical thinking. Thesis writing is considered one of the most demanding forms of academic writing because it requires students to combine research skills, language accuracy, coherence, originality, and independent thinking.

According to Yi (2009) writing involves transforming abstract ideas into clear and meaningful text, influenced by cognitive, linguistic, and contextual factors. For EFL students, this process becomes even more complex due to limited language proficiency, vocabulary, and metacognitive control (Wei et al., 2012).

AI-based tools such as ChatGPT can help students overcome some of these challenges. Research shows that ChatGPT can identify grammatical errors, suggest vocabulary, and improve sentence structure (Algaraady & Mahyoob, 2023). However, this support is especially helpful for students who struggle with English as a foreign language. However, scholars also emphasize that users must actively revise and evaluate AI-generated text, rather than accepting it without reflection (Waked & Ashraf, 2024).

Despite these benefits, growing concerns have emerged regarding students' over-reliance on AI tools. Students' attitudes, experiences, and perceptions strongly influence how they use AI in academic tasks. When students view ChatGPT as an easy and trustworthy solution, they may

depend on it excessively instead of developing their own writing skills (Slimi et al., 2025). Over time, this dependency may weaken students' ability to think critically, generate original ideas, and revise their own work. It also raises ethical issues related to plagiarism, authenticity, and academic integrity (Toar et al., 2022). Malik et al. (2024) warn that excessive reliance on AI feedback may reduce students' ownership of their writing and blur the boundary between assistance and substitution.

Preliminary research was conducted from May 23, 2025, to January 26, 2026, by using a questionnaire, which involved students answering questions related to their use of ChatGPT. After the questionnaire was distributed to students in the English Language Study Program, 28 of the 86 students responded to this initial survey, which aimed to identify their main concerns when using ChatGPT to complete their writing assignments.

First, many students admitted that they did use AI for academic writing assignments and relied too much on AI-generated writing without including enough of their own original work,

making it unclear how much of the work was their own.

Second, there is growing concern that reliance on ChatGPT may interfere with their ability to become independent writers. Some even openly admit that they use AI to help with their assignments, especially thesis writing, raising questions about the risk of plagiarism and academic integrity. These results highlight the real challenges students face when integrating AI-based tools into their academic work and emphasize the importance of ethical awareness and responsible use.

These findings indicate that, although ChatGPT is considered a useful learning tool, misuse and overuse can have a negative impact on students' writing development. Without proper guidance, students may become dependent on technology rather than strengthening their critical thinking, originality, and independent editing skills. Therefore, it is important to explore how students view and use ChatGPT in their academic writing, especially in thesis writing. In addition, this study also analyzes the role of ChatGPT in helping students compose academic

writing through the assessment of AI usage detected using an artificial intelligence detection tool called GptZero.

B. METHOD

In this study, used descriptive quantitative research design. Quantitative research focuses on the collection and analysis of numerical data to describe a phenomenon objectively. According to Creswell (2019), quantitative research involves the collection of numerical data that can be analyzed to explain a particular problem or phenomenon. Sugiyono (2018) explains that descriptive research aims to describe the characteristics of a phenomenon systematically based on the data obtained.

In this study, the researcher described the use of ChatGPT in writing student theses in the English Education Study Program at UIN Sjech M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi. The data were obtained from student thesis documents and were analyzed using GPTZero, an AI detection tool used to identify the percentage of AI-generated text in academic writing. The results of the analysis were presented in percentage form to show

the level of AI use in student thesis writing.

Instrument of the research

The instrument used in this study was document analysis, which aimed to analyze thesis writing assignments produced by students in the Thesis Writing course. As explained by Bowen (2009), document analysis is a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating printed and electronic materials to extract meaning, gain understanding, and develop empirical knowledge. These documents were selected because they represent evidence of students' academic writing practices and ChatGPT's involvement in written text composition. To support the analysis process, the documents were further analyzed using GPTZero, an AI detection tool designed to detect text generated by AI. The output generated by GPTZero is presented in the form of a score from 20 to 100 percent, which indicates the probability of AI-generated content in each document. These percentage results are then used to classify the level of AI involvement in student thesis writing.

C. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Description of Data

The data used in this study consisted of seventy-eight student thesis documents obtained from the English Education Study Program. These documents were selected using a purposive sampling method, in which the researcher selected thesis documents that met certain criteria. This approach allowed the researcher to access academic papers produced by students who had completed the thesis writing process.

Each selected document represents an original academic paper submitted by students as part of the academic requirements of the English Education Study Program. These documents are considered primary data because they reflect students' writing performance in an academic context. To analyze the extent to which artificial intelligence (AI) was involved in the writing process, all documents were carefully analyzed using ZeroGPT as an AI detection tool. ZeroGPT was used to assess the likelihood of AI-generated content by analyzing text patterns often associated with AI-assisted writing. This analysis aims to identify the

proportion of content potentially generated by AI in each document, allowing researchers to classify the level of AI involvement in student writing. Through this process, this study aims to provide an objective description of how AI tools, particularly ChatGPT, interfere with student writing practices. The results of this analysis are then used as a basis for interpreting patterns of AI use and discussing their implications for student academic development.

Data Analysis

The results of the AI detection process using ZeroGPT show varying levels of ChatGPT usage across the analyzed documents. The detection results are presented in Table 4.1. AI Detection Results Using ZeroGPT.

Tabel 1 AI Detection Results Using ZeroGPT

N O	Dokume nt Code	GPTZero Result		
		AI	Hum an	Mixe d
1	Docume nt AA	43% AI	57% Huma n	0% Mixe d
2	Docume nt AM	81% AI	19% Huma n	0% Mixe d
3	Docume nt CA	75% AI	25% Huma n	0% Mixe d

N O	Dokume nt Code	GPTZero Result		
		AI	Hum an	Mixe d
4	Docume nt DS	72% AI	0% Huma n	28% Mixe d
5	Docume nt DV	54% AI	25% Huma n	21% Mixe d
6	Docume nt EN	55% AI	18% Huma n	27% Mixe d
7	Docume nt FF	99% AI	0% Huma n	1% Mixe d
8	Docume nt GAA	76% AI	0% Huma n	24% Mixe d
9	Docume nt IRDP	80% AI	0% Huma n	20% Mixe d
10	Docume nt JM	82% AI	0% Huma n	18% Mixe d
11	Docume nt JW	96% AI	0% Huma n	4% Mixe d
12	Docume nt KF	99% AI	0% Huma n	1% Mixe d
13	Docume nt LNUD	97% AI	0% Huma n	3% Mixe d
14	Docume nt MZH	93% AI	0% Huma n	7% Mixe d
15	Docume nt MZ	22% AI	78% Huma n	0% Mixe d
16	Docume nt MAP	91% AI	0% Huma n	9% Mixe d
17	Docume nt MY	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
18	Docume nt NSNI	46% AI	33% Huma n	21% Mixe d

N O	Dokume nt Code	GPTZero Result		
		AI	Hum an	Mixe d
19	Docume nt NPS	47% AI	0% Huma n	53% Mixe d
20	Docume nt SPAS	30% AI	7% Huma n	63% Mixe d
21	Docume nt PSNN	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
22	Docume nt PM	46% AI	53% Huma n	1% Mixe d
23	Docume nt SKN	26% AI	74% Huma n	0% Mixe d
24	Docume nt TH	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
25	Docume nt TMP	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
26	Docume nt YA	90% AI	10% Huma n	0% Mixe d
27	Docume nt DR	96% AI	0% Huma n	4% Mixe d
28	Docume nt FYN	96% AI	0% Huma n	4% Mixe d
29	Docume nt IS	96% AI	0% Huma n	4% Mixe d
30	Docume nt NY	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
31	Docume nt WHQ	95% AI	5% Huma n	0% Mixe d
32	Docume nt AP	99% AI	0% Huma n	1% Mixe d
33	Docume nt MRH	97% AI	0% Huma n	3% Mixe d

N O	Dokume nt Code	GPTZero Result		
		AI	Hum an	Mixe d
34	Docume nt APH	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
35	Docume nt AF	24% AI	0% Huma n	76% Mixe d
36	Docume nt A	94% AI	0% Huma n	6% Mixe d
37	Docume nt AU	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
38	Docume nt DSW	76% AI	22% Huma n	2% Mixe d
39	Docume nt I	95% AI	5% Huma n	0% Mixe d
40	Docume nt E	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
41	Docume nt FU	92% AI	8% Huma n	0% Mixe d
42	Docume nt FZ	89% AI	11% Huma n	0% Mixe d
43	Docume nt NK	95% AI	5% Huma n	0% Mixe d
44	Docume nt GS	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
45	Docume nt HM	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
46	Docume nt JA	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
47	Docume nt K	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
48	Docume nt LL	27% AI	23% Huma n	50% Mixe d

N O	Dokume nt Code	GPTZero Result		
		AI	Hum an	Mixe d
49	Docume nt EAF	95% AI	5% Huma n	0% Mixe d
50	Docume nt MH	68% AI	0% Huma n	32% Mixe d
51	Docume nt N	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
52	Docume nt NF	81% AI	19% Huma n	0% Mixe d
53	Docume nt R	94% AI	6% Huma n	0% Mixe d
54	Docume nt QN	95% AI	5% Huma n	0% Mixe d
55	Docume nt RAS	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
56	Docume nt RYa	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
57	Docume nt SA	97% AI	0% Huma n	3% Mixe d
58	Docume nt ZK	40% AI	17% Huma n	43% Mixe d
59	Docume nt RS	67% AI	26% Huma n	7% Mixe d
60	Docume nt NA	62% AI	36% Huma n	2% Mixe d
61	Docume nt ANA	81% AI	19% Huma n	0% Mixe d
62	Docume nt ADR	62% AI	0% Huma n	38% Mixe d
63	Docume nt AV	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d

N O	Dokume nt Code	GPTZero Result		
		AI	Hum an	Mixe d
64	Docume nt DF	99% AI	0% Huma n	1% Mixe d
65	Docume nt ILP	20% AI	0% Huma n	80% Mixe d
66	Docume nt CAT	62% AI	0% Huma n	38% Mixe d
67	Docume nt DRP	62% AI	0% Huma n	38% Mixe d
68	Docume nt DDA	62% AI	0% Huma n	38% Mixe d
69	Docume nt IS	62% AI	0% Huma n	38% Mixe d
70	Docume nt JFz	97% AI	0% Huma n	3% Mixe d
71	Docume nt JF	62% AI	0% Huma n	38% Mixe d
72	Docume nt KR	97% AI	0% Huma n	3% Mixe d
73	Docume nt LS	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
74	Docume nt M.IE	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
75	Docume nt MT	97% AI	0% Huma n	3% Mixe d
76	Docume nt PG	97% AI	0% Huma n	3% Mixe d
77	Docume nt RP	100 % AI	0% Huma n	0% Mixe d
78	Docume nt RY	97% AI	0% Huma n	3% Mixe d

Based on the results listed in Table 1, the proportion of content identified as artificial intelligence (AI) in student thesis documents shows significant variation, ranging from 20% to 100%. This range indicates significant differences in how students integrate AI tools into their academic writing processes. When compared to the theoretical limit proposed by Guistillo et al. (2024), which states that AI usage in the range of 10–15% is still acceptable, while above 25% indicates dependence, the findings in this study show that most documents have exceeded the recommended AI usage threshold.

However, some documents, such as **AF**, **MZ**, and **ILP**, still have a somewhat acceptable level of AI involvement, around **20%–24%**. Although this percentage is slightly higher than the ideal limit suggested by Guistillo (2024) and the Kementrian Agama Republik Indosesia (2025), which set a maximum AI limit of 15%, these findings still indicate that these students rely more on their own writing abilities than other students who achieve much higher percentages. In this context, AI appears to function as

a supporting tool, for example, to improve language structure or clarify ideas, rather than as the primary source of written content.

The relatively acceptable percentage of AI in these documents also reflects the active involvement of students in the writing process and shows that academic responsibility is still maintained. These findings reinforce the concept that when AI usage is still at a limited level, its function tends to be supportive. Conversely, when the percentage of AI exceeds the recommended limit, its use can be understood as a form of dependence on AI (ChatGPT) that has the potential to weaken students' originality, independent thinking, and academic integrity.

On the other hand, many documents show unacceptable of AI involvement. Documents such as **AA, AM, CA, DS, DV, EN, FF, GAA, IRDP, JM, JW, KF, LNUD, MZH, MAP, MY, NSNI, NPS, SPAS, SPNN, PM, SKN, TH, TMP, YA, DR, FYN, IS, NY, WHQ, AP, MRH, APH, A,AU, DWS, I, E, FU, FZ, NK, GS, HM, JA, K, LL, EAF, MH, N, NF, R, QN, RAS, RYa, SA, ZK, RS, NA, ANA, ADR, AV, DF, CAT, DRP, DAA, IS, JFz, JF, KR, LS, M.IE, MT,**

PG, RP, and RY, record unacceptable detection results, with GPTZero results ranging from **26% to 100%.**

The consistently high percentage in these documents indicates a strong reliance on AI-supported writing tools during the thesis writing process. Specifically, documents such as **MY, PSNN, TH, TMP, NY, APH, AU, E, GS, HM, JA, K, N, RAS, RYa, AV, LS, MIE,** and **RP** show a perfect AI detection rate with a **100%** AI probability, indicating that AI-generated content may have played a significant role in the production of these texts.

Overall, these findings indicate that the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in student thesis writing varies significantly. Some students appear to use AI tools cautiously and sparingly, employing them primarily as a supporting resource during the writing process. On the other hand, other students rely more heavily on AI assistance, allowing it to play a significant role in shaping their written work. These differences indicate that students demonstrate varying levels of awareness, judgment, and responsibility when using AI tools for academic purposes.

Classification of AI Usage Levels

Tabel 2 Classification of AI Usage Levels

Classification	Percentage
Acceptable	10-15%
Somewhat Acceptable	16-25%
Unacceptable	26-50% and beyond

Based on Table 2, to facilitate the interpretation of research results, AI detection results are classified into three levels of AI usage: Unacceptable, Somewhat Acceptable, and Unacceptable. This classification helps describe the extent of students' dependence on AI tools, particularly ChatGPT, in the thesis writing process. When these categories are compared with the theoretical reference proposed by Gustilo et al. (2024), which suggests that AI usage of **10–15%** is still acceptable, while usage above **25%** indicates excessive dependence, and with institutional guidelines limiting AI usage to 15%, the findings reveal a pattern of excessive dependence on ChatGPT among students.

Unacceptable levels, ranging

from **26-50% and beyond**, were found in a large number of documents, including **AA, AM, CA, DS, DV, EN, FF, GAA, IRDP, JM, JW, KF, LNUD, MZH, MAP, MY, NSNI, NPS, SPAS, SPNN, PM, SKN, TH, TMP, YA, DR, FYN, IS, NY, WHQ, AP, MRH, APH, A, AU, DWS, I, E, FU, FZ, NK, GS, HM, JA, K, LL, EAF, MH, N, NF, R, QN, RAS, RYa, SA, ZK, RS, NA, ANA, ADR, AV, DF, CAT, DRP, DAA, IS, JFz, JF, KR, LS, M.IE, MT, PG, RP, and RY.**

The high percentage in these documents indicates a strong reliance on the assistance generated by artificial intelligence (AI) in the writing process. In many cases, these tools appear to function not only as supplementary aids, but as significant contributors to the development of language use, text organization, and overall academic presentation. This pattern indicates that, for these students, AI tools play an important role in supporting and shaping the final form of their thesis writing.

The level is **somewhat acceptable**, ranging from **16% to 25%**, found in several documents, including **MZ, AF, and ILP**. These documents show low AI involvement in the thesis writing process, indicating

that AI does not dominate the content or writing structure. The percentage of AI detection (GPTZero) in these documents is low, indicating that students only use ChatGPT to provide minimal assistance in their final assignments for thesis writing courses. However, even though the probability is low, this does not mean that they do not use AI in this task. Instead, they use this tool carefully to avoid easy detection by AI detection tools.

These findings show that the use of ChatGPT appears to be limited and cautious, mixing their language with AI-generated language, for example, to help clarify language or improve certain technical aspects, without diminishing the primary role of students as writers. Thus, the resulting writing better reflects the students' independent efforts and active involvement in the academic writing process.

Discussion

Based on the results of data analysis, this section discusses the findings in relation to the research question: *"How many percent of AI is used in students' thesis writing?"* The

results clearly show that most of the analyzed documents reflect a high level of dependence on artificial intelligence, especially ChatGPT. From a total of 78 documents, 75 were categorized as exceeding the recommended threshold of AI usage, which indicates that AI is not only used as a supporting tool but has become a dominant element in students' writing process.

At the same time, the data also reveal that the level of AI involvement is not uniform. Some students use AI moderately, while others rely on it heavily. This variation reflects how differently students integrate technology into their academic writing. A similar pattern was also found in a study conducted by researchers from UIN Sjech M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi, where AI tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, and QuillBot were widely used in the stages of brainstorming, drafting, and revising academic texts. The study reported that although AI helps improve grammar and organization, some students still depend too much on AI-generated content without proper paraphrasing (Ramanda et al., 2026).

The findings of this study indicate varying levels of AI

involvement in student thesis writing, ranging from low to very high usage. This variation reflects different patterns of technology integration in academic writing. According to the *Pedoman Penggunaan Kecerdasan Buatan Generatif dalam Pembelajaran*, AI is intended to function as a learning support tool rather than as a dominant source of academic content (Kementerian Pendidikan, 2024). The results show that documents with moderate AI detection levels demonstrate a more balanced use of technology, where students remain actively engaged in developing their arguments while using AI to refine language and structure. This is in line with findings by Rianto & Syafitri (2024) who emphasize that AI tools are most effective when used to support, not replace, students' writing processes.

This discussion is based on the results of document analysis using ZeroGPT as an AI detection tool to identify the proportion of text that was likely generated with the help of AI. The results were then interpreted with reference to acceptable limits of AI use in scientific works and reinforced by findings from previous studies within the local academic context.

Research conducted by Bagus Purnomo et al. (2024) shows that students' writing quality is closely linked to their critical thinking ability, which may decline when students rely excessively on automated tools.

This study found that the level of artificial intelligence (AI) detection in student thesis documents varied significantly, ranging from acceptable, somewhat acceptable, to unacceptable. This variation indicates that students use AI tools in different ways and to varying degrees during the writing process. The findings of this study show that most students seem to rely heavily on AI-generated text, while others use AI only as a tool or do not rely on it excessively. Similar findings were reported by Ningsih et al. (2023), who found that students' writing improvement is more effective when they remain actively involved in the writing process rather than depending entirely on external tools.

Several documents in this study were identified as having mixed AI detection results, indicating the presence of both human writing and AI assistance in the same text. This finding shows that students do not fully depend on AI but tend to combine their own writing with AI-generated content.

However, this pattern also suggests a gradual shift in how students rely on technology during the writing process. According to Rianto & Syafitri (2024), the use of AI-based feedback in writing can significantly influence how students develop their texts, as AI not only assists in correcting language but also provides suggestions that shape the overall structure of writing. In addition, Bagus Purnomo et al. (2024) highlight that excessive reliance on external tools may affect students' critical thinking ability, particularly in organizing ideas and constructing arguments. This indicates that although AI can support the writing process, overdependence may gradually reduce students' engagement in independent thinking and writing development.

This finding is further supported by Roza et al. (2026), who found that AI-generated feedback significantly improves grammar, organization, and writing clarity. However, their study also emphasizes that AI feedback works most effectively when combined with teacher and peer feedback, since human guidance remains important for developing critical thinking, deeper reasoning, and contextual understanding in writing.

Overall, the discussion shows that AI detection tools such as ZeroGPT identify AI-generated writing by analyzing language usage patterns, rather than by determining the authenticity of the author with certainty. These findings suggest that AI detection tools should be used as evaluation and support tools, rather than as definitive indicators of academic misconduct.

These results emphasize the importance of providing clear academic guidelines on the ethical and responsible use of AI tools in higher education. Educators are encouraged to guide students in using AI as a learning aid while maintaining authenticity, critical thinking, and academic integrity.

D. CONCLUSIONS

This study was conducted to examine the use of ChatGPT in writing undergraduate theses in the English Education Study Program through written document analysis using AI detection tools. Based on the findings presented in the previous chapter, it can be concluded that the level of AI involvement in student thesis writing varies significantly. Analysis of 78 thesis documents shows a wide range

in AI detection levels, from low to very high, indicating that students integrate AI tools into their writing processes in different ways and to varying degrees.

The findings show that variations in AI detection levels are closely related to differences in student writing characteristics. Documents with higher AI detection levels generally have very high AI involvement in their academic writing process. Conversely, documents with lower AI detection rates show varying degrees of AI involvement in their writing, reflecting stronger student involvement in the writing process. These differences suggest that AI detection results reflect writing patterns and levels of AI assistance rather than definitive judgments about authenticity.

Overall, this study concludes that AI detection tools identify trends in language use in students' academic writing rather than providing definitive conclusions about authenticity or plagiarism. High or low AI detection rates should be interpreted as indicators of different writing approaches and levels of AI support. Therefore, AI detection tools such as ZeroGPT are more appropriately used

to support academic evaluation and understanding of students' writing practices.

REFERENCES

Buku :

- Creswell, J. W. (2019). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia. (2025). *Pedoman penggunaan kecerdasan buatan dalam penulisan karya ilmiah di perguruan tinggi keagamaan*. Jakarta: Kementerian Agama RI.
- Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi. (2024). *Pedoman penggunaan kecerdasan buatan generatif dalam pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Kemendikbudristek.
- Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Artikel in Press :

- Cardona, M., Rodríguez, R. J., & Ishmael, K. (2023). *Artificial intelligence and the future of teaching and learning: Insights and recommendations*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Jurnal :

- Algaraady, J., & Mahyoob, M. (2023). The impact of artificial intelligence tools on EFL students' writing performance. *Journal of Language*

- Teaching and Research*, 14(2), 345–352.
- Bagus Purnomo, A., et al. (2024). The relationship between critical thinking and academic writing in the use of AI tools. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 11(2), 88–102.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40.
- Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: The state of the field. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1), 1–22.
- Dwivedi, Y. K., et al. (2023a). So what if ChatGPT wrote it? Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, 71, 102642.
- Galaczi, E., & Luckin, R. (2023). AI in education: A review of the state of the art. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 30(2), 1–18.
- Guistillo, M. A., et al. (2024). Acceptable use of artificial intelligence in academic writing: Thresholds and implications for higher education. *Journal of Educational Technology and Innovation*, 12(1), 45–60.
- Kasneci, E., et al. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, 102274.
- Malik, M., et al. (2024). The impact of AI-assisted writing tools on student learning and academic integrity. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 52(1), 45–60.
- Ningsih, R., et al. (2023). Student engagement and writing improvement in technology-assisted academic writing. *Journal of English Language Teaching Studies*, 5(3), 145–158.
- Ramanda, R., et al. (2026). The use of AI tools in academic writing among English Education students at UIN Sjech M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Educational Technology*, 8(1), 34–49.
- Rianto, A., & Syafitri, D. (2024). AI-assisted feedback in academic writing: Supporting students' writing development. *Journal of English Education and Technology*, 6(2), 101–115.
- Roza, H., et al. (2026). The effectiveness of AI-generated feedback combined with teacher and peer feedback in academic writing. *Indonesian Journal of Language and Education*, 12(1), 66–80.
- Slimi, Z., et al. (2025). Students' perceptions and attitudes toward the use of AI in academic writing. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 100123.
- Toar, J., et al. (2022). Academic integrity in the era of artificial intelligence: Challenges and implications. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 20(3), 345–360.

- Waked, I., & Ashraf, H. (2024). Critical engagement with AI-generated text in academic writing. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 29(1), 78–92.
- Wei, M., Chen, H., & Adawu, A. (2012). EFL learners' writing difficulties and strategies: A study of Chinese students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(6), 1059–1067.
- Yi, Y. (2009). Adolescent English language learners' writing development: A sociocultural perspective. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(2), 97–112.