

Practices and Ethical Concerns of English Language Teachers on Ai Use

Mariel B. Cuntapay

University of Saint Anthony, City of Iriga, Camarines Sur, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.1026EDU0384>

Received: 20 May 2026; Accepted: 25 May 2026; Published: 25 June 2026

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to create a teachers' guide to facilitate ethical and effective integration of Artificial Intelligence by high school educators in academic writing. The study also explored on the practices and ethical concerns of high school educators regarding the roles of this technological advancement in academic writing. The study used a Mixed-Method of Explanatory Sequential type of research to describe the general findings of the research study in the form of a survey questionnaire made up of combination of a 5-Point Likert Scale as patterned on AI and Academic Writing Questionnaire (AI-AWQ) and Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) framework to collect information from high school educators of Oas Polytechnic School. After the first phase of the data collection, a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was conducted to support and collect evidence of the responses gathered from the survey questionnaire. The respondents are high school educators handling Language, Humanities and Social Sciences and Research-related subjects. The practices adapted by high school educators are In-Class Writing (4.30) and Oral-Assessment (4.30). These also require teachers to physically validate the authenticity of students' writings helping as well to combat the potential risks of plagiarism and misuse of Artificial Intelligence. High School teachers prefer to adapt Process-Based Assessment (4.17) because it helps them monitor the writing process and progress of the learners making sure that learners are aware of the process and fundamental skills of writing. The ethical concerns of the respondents on how Artificial Intelligence is being integrated in writing, is its risks in the loss of unique creative expression (4.47) and the potential decline in fundamental research skills (4.43). High school educators recognize the usefulness of AI (4.23) and understand that it is an inevitable evolution (4.20). Schools and institutions should create guidelines and technical assistance for educators to be fully equipped to functional and ethical literacy of AI and to also equip high school educators on best practices on how to properly utilize Artificial Intelligence inside the classroom.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Academic Writing, Ethical Concerns, Practice

INTRODUCTION

The integration of technology into learning and education has become a crucial part of the 21st century. Artificial Intelligence has been finding its place in the classroom not just a provider of knowledge and information but a facilitator of learning. Aside from its quick features for providing answers from wide resources, it also provides personalized learning experiences where it has the capacity to address on the needs of the diverse students. It can assist most specifically in academic writing through generating writing prompts, providing suggestions for improvement and automated feedback on grammar and style giving teachers the benefit to focus more on student's interaction and writing skills. However, it also presents significant challenges specifically with the increased risk of plagiarism and ethical considerations in writing.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is a computer science branch which has the capacity of reasoning skills, perform problem-solving, and simulate human intelligence. It has the capacity to identify patterns through algorithms, identify large data sets and understand language dependent to prompts and inputs that are being fed. It is changing the way people learn things, strategies of work and the exploration of innovations. This technological advancement started its emergence during the mid-20th century from Alan Turing's theoretical inquiries into machine's capacity to relate data into subjective experiences such as feelings of humans or different point of views, (*The Birth of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Research. Science and Technology, n. d.*).

Academic writing is a foundational skill and a requirement for students' success and professional development. It enhances the problem-solving skills of the learners creating a space where they can freely express themselves, to showcase their creativity, discover new things and develop their skills and passion in writing. It also helps students in enhancing their communications skills and aids to improve their analytical and critical thinking skills since they are exposed in comprehending and analyzing information.

In the Philippines, the Intellectual Property Code or Republic Act No. 8293, is the primary governing law that covers copyrights and related rights issues on AI-generated content. This law also protects the authorship and ownership of content creators and writers which is a major concern in writing. The Data Privacy Act of 2012 or Republic Act No. 10173 is concerned with the process on how Artificial Intelligence is processed, collected, used and stored data for writing tools. This law secures consumers from scams, fraud, unfair and deceptive practices most specifically when writing tools are sold and marketed to consumers.

The Education center for AI Research (E-CAIR) was recently launched by the Department of Education which aims to improve the innovation in the Philippine Education System. This was also aligned with the 5-Point Reform Agenda (Department of Education. (2025, February 20), The 5-Point Reform Agenda supports teachers' welfare and improves the learning environments of the students, making sure that students' well-being is at top priority. Through the General Education Curriculum (GEC), the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) emphasizes how important academic writing is and included courses that targets the goal to enhance students' writing skills, making sure to attain effective writing both in academic and professional settings. The Purposive Communication course is an example designed to enhance the importance of clear and concise persuasive writing. In the classroom, educators provide academic writing activities to evaluate concerning level of mastery of the students. Academic writing are structured writing exercises that helps learners develop skills to communicate ideas and viewpoints ethically. It is an avenue where educators allow learners to write, organize and synthesize ideas that aided by different sources but with proper citation. It also assists learners to formulate thoughts and arguments to practice their analytical and critical thinking skills.

Nowadays, learners have relied on the use of Artificial Intelligence tools rather than using and enhancing critical thinking and analytical skills in writing compositions. Writing process is no longer in a traditional sense where thorough manual review for grammar, ideas and punctuations is necessary. In fact, AI tools created a way on how automated answers following correct grammar rules be generated in just a click away making students less involved in the writing process resulting in poor academic writing abilities. In just one click away, AI has the capacity to generate answers that has a close resemblance and copyrighted materials. It also can paraphrase texts which makes it more difficult to trace plagiarism creating a new set of problems in the academic field.

In the classroom, writing activities are time-consuming. That's why high school educators left w no choice but to prefer giving the writing activities as take-home tasks. Even if students are given adequate time to finish tasks, most of the student's outputs are still dependent to AI adding teachers with burdens on checking the authenticity of the student's academic writing outputs. The practices and ethical concerns on AI integration and the availability of tools and advance technology are the necessities of high school educators however; these are the restrictions that are common problems in public schools. Teachers are burdened with challenges on the proper implementation and integration of AI while making sure that academic integrity is observed.

Hence, this study is important to explore on the practices and ethical concerns encountered by English teachers because the rapid improvement and evolution of AI require a deeper understanding and skills to effectively mitigate the benefits to combat potential challenges it poses. It is with the teachers' practices and response on how concerns of plagiarism and authorship be addressed. This readiness also involves crucial understanding of teachers regarding ethical utilization of Artificial Intelligence in academic writing. In fact, the effective integration is dependent to the teachers' guidance on how students use AI in an ethical manner and responsible usage.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to create a teacher's guide to facilitate ethical concerns and practices of the high school educators of Oas Polytechnic School, SY 2025-2026 in the integration of AI tools in academic writing. Specifically, it sought answers to the following queries:

1. What are the practices of English teachers on students' use of AI in academic writing?
2. What are the ethical concerns encountered by English teachers regarding the use of AI in academic writing?
3. What material can be proposed based on the findings of the study?

METHODOLOGY

Research design

The researcher utilized an explanatory sequential mixed-methods research design to conduct this study. This design was deemed highly appropriate as it offered a comprehensive empirical and thematic analysis of the respondents' classroom practices and ethical considerations. To gather the foundational data required to address the research objectives, a structured survey questionnaire was deployed as the primary quantitative instrument.

As outlined by Creswell and Plano Clark (2018), the explanatory sequential approach is a two-phase mixed-methods framework wherein quantitative data is collected and analyzed first, followed by the collection and analysis of qualitative data. In this study, the qualitative phase, executed through a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and was specifically designed to elaborate on, expound upon, and contextualize the statistical results obtained from the initial survey.

Population and Sample of the Study

The respondents of this study were thirty (30) educators from Oas Polytechnic School in the Municipality of Oas Albay. The researcher utilized purposive sampling to ensure that all the participants are handling subjects that require significant academic writing outputs. Specifically, the respondents are the teachers handling English, Filipino, Humanities and Social Sciences and Research-related subjects across the Junior and Senior High Department. The researcher complied with the following; Informed Consent, the researcher sought permission to the respondents and explained the purpose and nature of the study; Confidentiality, the researcher assured the respondents that all responses was kept confidential; Ethical Guidelines, the researcher also made sure that there was a voluntary participation and adhere to ethical guidelines involving human subjects; Permission and Approval, the researcher sought for the permission from relevant authorities and Professional Standards, the researcher followed Professional standards set by the organizations involved.

To systematically analyze and interpret the empirical data gathered from the respondents, both quantitative statistical treatments and qualitative thematic coding were employed.

For the quantitative data obtained from the 5-point Likert scale survey, the following statistical tools were utilized. Frequency and Percentage Distribution was employed. This descriptive statistic was used to summarize the raw count and proportion of responses across each category of the profile variables, establishing the baseline distribution of the participant sample. The weighted mean was calculated to determine the average response score for each item on the survey instrument. This central tendency measure allowed the researcher to highlight specific areas where educators demonstrate prevalent classroom practices or experience intense ethical concern.

The formula for the weighted mean is:

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\sum f \cdot w}{N}$$

Where:

\bar{x} = Weighted mean

w = weight

f = frequency of responses

N = Total number of respondents

Statistical ranking was applied to organize the calculated mean scores from highest to lowest. This prioritization highlighted the most dominant ethical concerns and the most frequently utilized instructional responses among the educators, providing a clear hierarchical view of classroom realities.

To interpret the calculated weighted means regarding the Ethical Concerns encountered by the high school educators, the following statistical scale and verbal interpretations were applied

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree
4	3.41-4.20	Agree
3	2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree
2	1.81-2.60	Disagree
1	1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree

To interpret the data gathered regarding the Pedagogical Practices adapted by the language teachers, the following statistical scale and verbal interpretations were utilized.

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.21-5.00	Extremely Evident
4	3.41-4.20	Highly Evident
3	2.61-3.40	Moderately Evident
2	1.81-2.60	Slightly Evident
1	1.00-1.80	Not Evident

To analyze the descriptive narratives generated during the Focus Group Discussions (FGD), the researcher utilized Braun and Clarke’s (2006) framework for thematic analysis. The qualitative audio-recorded data was transcribed verbatim, reviewed for accuracy, and assigned initial codes. These codes were subsequently collated and clustered into overarching themes and sub-themes. This qualitative treatment served an explanatory purpose, providing contextual depth to clarify the "how" and "why" behind the quantitative patterns established by the survey means.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter is a presentation from the high school educator-respondents. The findings are analyzed and organized according to the statement of the problem, using tables for quantitative data and textual description for the analysis and interpretation of the gathered data.

Table 1 Practices Adapted by Educators on the Role of AI in Academic Writing

Strategies	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
In Class-Writing: I require students to write significant portions of their essays during class time without devices.	4.30	Extremely Evident	1.5
Process-Based Assessment: I grade the stages of writing (outline, drafts, annotated bibliographies) rather than just the final product.	4.17	Highly Evident	3
AI Disclosure: I require students to submit an “AI Disclosure Statement” explaining if and how they used AI tools.	3.70	Highly Evident	5
Modified Prompts: I design writing prompts that require personal reflection or reference to specific, recent classroom discussions.	3.80	Highly Evident	4

AI Critique: I ask students to generate an AI essay and then write a human critique for its limitations or biases.	3.53	Highly Evident	6
Oral Assessment: I conduct one-on-one interviews with students to verify their understanding of the arguments made in their papers.	4.30	Extremely Evident	1.5
Local Context: I assign topics that require references to very recent events (last 30 days) that AI models may not yet be trained on.	3.47	Highly Evident	7
Collaborative Writing: I use Google Docs Version History to monitor the real time progress and human growth of student’s essay.	3.23	Moderately Evident	8
Average Weighted Mean	3.81	Highly Evident	

Legend:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.21-5.00	Extremely Evident
4	3.41-4.20	Highly Evident
3	2.61-3.40	Moderately Evident
2	1.81-2.60	Slightly Evident
1	1.00-1.80	Not Evident

Table 3 presents the pedagogical strategies adapted by high school educators. The results indicate that indicator 1, the In-Class Writing where educators require students to write significant portions of their essay during class without devices, and indicator 6; Oral Assessment or the conduct of one-on-one interviews with students to verify their understanding of the arguments made in their writing, share the highest weighted mean of 4.30, both interpreted as “Extremely Evident”.

These are followed by indicator 2 (Process-Based Assessment; grading the stages of writing such as outlines, drafts and annotated bibliographies) with a mean of 4.17 with a verbal interpretation of Highly Evident. Conversely, indicator 8 which is the Collaborative Writing via Google Docs Version History (use to monitor the real time progress and human growth of students’ essay), receives the lowest weighted mean of 3.23, interpreted as “Moderately Evident”. The composite mean of 3.81 suggests that, overall, these pedagogical strategies are “Highly Evident” by the respondents.

The findings reveal a strong preference for “low-tech” interventions. Educators are prioritizing In-Class Writing and Oral-Assessments as the most reliable methods to ensure academic integrity. The role of teachers is evolving from the facilitators as evaluators because it increases teachers’ workload. This suggest that although AI is hard to detect, teachers believe that physical presence and verbal verifications are the most effective ways to validate a students’ true authorship. By moving writing tasks back into the classroom, educators are effectively creating a controlled environment that prevents the overreliance of AI as mentioned by Giray (2024). This also makes sure that the fundamental skills necessary for the students to learn and acquired are not being compromised.

This was revealed during an interview with a respondent stating that *“It is very hard to check if the works of the students are not plagiarized so I really prefer to see them doing the actual writing process with no gadgets but sometimes it is very difficult due to time constraints.”* This really suggests that high school educators prefer to return to the basics to make sure that authentic writing has been achieved. This also lessens their hesitations on the authenticity of the written outputs of the learners.

In addition, the heavy reliance in Oral Assessment implies that the role of educators is evolving from facilitators to validators and conducting a one-on-one interview for every student is labor-intensive, giving teachers extra administrative tasks and loads. This is only applicable to smaller class sizes or more flexible schedules to accommodate all learners for consultations on their writing. It also suggests that human touch is indispensable. This mirrors Done’s (2022) assertion that AI cannot understand reality in a way humans do, and verbal defense becomes the ultimate test for authorship.

The lower ranking of Google Docs Version History (Rank 8) and AI Critique (Rank 6) indicates that educators may find digital monitoring or integrated AI activities more time-consuming or less effective than traditional classroom-based supervision. The indicators of In Class-Writing (requiring students to write significant portions of their essays during class time without devices) and Oral-Assessment (conducting one-on-one interviews with students to verify their understanding of the arguments made in their papers), with the weighted mean of 4.30 as the highest weighted mean was interpreted to be Always Adapted by high school educators. This signifies that teachers prefer a direct and in person verification to ensure that the works produced by the learners are authentic and truly reflect the writing capabilities of the learners.

With the 4.17 weighted mean on the Emphasis on Writing Pedagogy such as the Process-Based Assessment where each stage of writing is given grades such as outlines, drafts, annotated bibliographies etc., this suggests that a transition from the checking of drafts, process and final output is necessary in order to check the authenticity of the works making it also difficult for learners to copy paste responses from AI. This helps the teachers to ensure that authentic writing is achieved from the written outputs of the students. The high rank of In Class-Writing implies a return to the basics where everything should be checked manually.

This also supports the findings of Tran (2025) when he stated that scaffolding in writing can significantly contribute to the performance of the learners. By grading the drafts and outlines, educators are following a careful strategy suggested by Malon et al., (2024) to maintain integrity through continuous monitoring of the writing stages. This pedagogical strategy helps minimize the tendency of students to copy paste AI-generated responses and gives legitimate evidence by presenting the different developmental phases of writing.

High school educators prefer to move away from take-home assignments to minimize the opportunity for learners to seek writing assistance in AI leading to academic dishonesty and ethical concerns (Shabbir et al., 2024). Through take home writing activities, learners are given opportunities to utilize Artificial Intelligence neglecting the use of critical and analytical thinking because answers and compositions can be automatically generated through the help of Artificial Intelligence.

This gives the idea to modify and restructure the lesson plan in order for the learners to have ample time for actual writing during class as supported by Ateneo De Naga University (2025) This also ensures that the writing process remains a central learning skill rather than just a communication tool, a necessity highlighted on the study of Lira San Martin & Sanchez (2024). This also lessens the dependency of the students to Artificial Intelligence into writing and focuses more on the proper integration of Artificial Intelligence in academic writing.

Collaborative Writing via Google Docs Version History to monitor the real time progress and human growth of student's essay, had been recorded as the lowest mean 3.23, which interpreted as "Moderately Evident". This indicates that while all digital tools are available, educators find it time-consuming and hassle if they will conduct manual tracking or manual verification of each writing outputs. While AI Disclosure Statements or the requirement to students to submit a disclosure explaining what and how Artificial Intelligence was used in the paper, (Rank 5) are often used, AI Critique: asking students to generate an AI essay and then write a human critique of its limitations or biases (Rank 6) is less frequent.

This suggest that educators are currently focused on regulating AI use rather than integrating it as a subject for critical analysis which emphasizes a greater focus on how to manage it in the classroom to assist students in academic writing. This reflects a gap in the technical ability and upskilling mentioned by the ASEAN University Network (2023) that teachers are using guardrails to prevent misuse but are not yet fully utilizing AI as a subject for critical thinking.

The thematic analysis of the data revealed that educators are actively adapting their instructional strategies to mitigate the pervasive use of artificial intelligence in student submissions, emerging primarily through Theme 1: Shifting toward Process-Oriented and In-Class Assessments. This theme defines the tactical movement of teachers away from traditional take-home essays toward live, monitored writing phases to ensure authentic student output. In practice, teachers are reverting to traditional pen-and-paper writing activities and integrating multi-stage grading frameworks.

As Participant 1 noted, *"Well, so far, [In-Class Writing] is the only way to be sure that they are really submitting original works but to be honest, it is very hard due to time-constraints."* To make this strategy functional, educators are shifting their focus from the final product to the improvement of writing.

Participant 5 shared, *"I try to grade the outline, the draft and even the sources and references. I really want to see the process so I can make sure the authenticity of their works."* By focusing on these live phases, educators attempt to safeguard academic integrity, although Participant 2 reiterated the underlying struggle, stating that *"it is very difficult due to time constraints"* to constantly monitor students doing the actual writing process without gadgets.

A secondary practice identified is captured by Theme 2: Utilization of Ad-Hoc Technical and Digital Verification. This theme encompasses the manual, unstandardized methods teachers use to investigate suspected AI text, such as auditing digital footprints and fact-checking citations.

Participant 3 explained, *"I can spot those fake citations. Although with the format, it may sometimes look real but of you are to search it on the web, it does not appear."* Furthermore, some educators attempt to inspect digital footprints to verify text ownership.

Participant 2 explained, *"I tried checking their Google Docs Version History but it is very time-consuming and I think it is also a little off since we might be invading their privacy if we are to do it."* As a result, these diagnostic practices are largely perceived as unsustainable because digital tracking is labor-intensive and creates ethical dilemmas regarding student privacy boundaries

Participant 2 explained, *"I tried checking their Google Docs Version History but it is very time-consuming and I think it is also a little off since we might be invading their privacy if we are to do it."* As a result, these diagnostic practices are perceived as unsustainable for everyday academic responsibility. The volume of data generated by a single student's writing process means that is highly labor-intensive, requiring a more amount of time that instructors simply do not have. Furthermore, this level of checking creates significant ethical dilemmas regarding student privacy boundaries, forcing educators to interfere in an uncomfortable line between maintaining academic integrity and overstepping into a student's private digital workspace.

Table 2 Ethical Concerns on the Role of AI Academic Writing

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
Using AI to get ideas for an essay is dishonest if the student does not develop those ideas on their own.	4.03	Agree	6.5
It is cheating when a student passes off an argument written by AI as their work.	4.07	Agree	5
Student should always tell their teacher if they used AI to clean up their grammar and sentence structure.	4.23	Strongly Agree	3
Submitting an essay that relies heavily on AI reduces honesty and personal voice of the student.	4.47	Strongly Agree	1
Using AI as a spell-checker is okay, if the AI is not the one making up the actual content.	4.20	Agree	4
It is fair enough and ethically right for language learners to use AI to help level up their writing.	2.57	Disagree	8
Using AI shortcuts raises safety concerns because AI often invents fake facts or wrong references.	4.43	Strongly Agree	2
Using AI to write a personal essay is a breach of trust because AI is making up fake life experiences.	4.03	Agree	6.5
Average Weighted Mean	3.88	Agree	

Legend:

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation
-------	-------	-----------------------

5	4.21-5.00	Strongly Agree
4	3.41-4.20	Agree
3	2.61-3.40	Moderately Agree
2	1.81-2.60	Disagree
1	1.00-1.80	Strongly Disagree

Table 1 presents the ethical concerns of high school educators regarding the impact of Artificial Intelligence on academic writing. From the data presented, while teachers recognize the utility of AI as a technical tool, they also express profound concerns regarding its effect on the cognitive and skills in writing.

The results shows that Indicator 4 or the heavy reliance on AI reduces honesty and personal voice, achieves the highest weighted mean of 4.47, followed by Indicator 7 (The use of AI shortcuts raises safety concerns because if fake facts or wrong references) with a mean of 4.43, both receiving a verbal interpretation of “Strongly Agree”. Educators also strongly believe that students should always tell their teacher if they used AI to clean up their grammar and sentence structure, as shown in the data with 4.23 mean and it is also suggested that it is fair and ethically right for language learners to use AI to help level up their writing, with 4.20 mean. Interestingly, the lowest weighted mean was recorded for Indicator 6 (Using AI shortcuts raises safety concerns because AI often invents fake facts or wrong references) at 2.57, interpreted as “Disagree”. The findings suggest that while teachers accept the presence of AI, they are highly worried for its long-term impact on student’s academic and writing performance.

The top ranking of heavy reliance on AI reduces honesty and personal voice of the student (4.47) suggest that teachers observe similarities in students’ works. This aligns with Hind (2024), stated that while AI helps with style, creativity is compromised. This also suggest a decline and erosion of research skills. Learners will no longer be interested in learning the basics since there are AI-generated responses available. Educators see AI as “Co-editor” (Rank 3) rather than a mentor. This supports Santiago et al., (2023) who found AI elevates standards for clarity and grammar, but it contrasts with the findings of Atinay et al. (2024), who suggested that AI enhance the critical thinking of learners.

In this study, the respondents disagree that it is fair and ethically right for language learners to use AI to help level up their writing because they feel that for local ESL students, AI acts as a “crutch” or something students heavily relies to making them totally dependent. To further explain, the respondents said that AI prevents true language acquisition rather than a bridge that fosters it. The high concern for creative expression implies that writing pedagogy must remain through personalized learning experience (Haleem et al., 2022). Assessment should also be redesigned to promote unique perspective and emotional intelligence traits.

Since teachers fear a decline in research and writing skills of the learners, educators must teach students how to use AI as starting point for research without abandoning traditional source verification. This supports Panit (2025), who argues that technology should challenge students to think critically rather than passively accepting generated texts. Artificial Intelligence is an inevitable evolution (Rank 4) and it implies that a total ban in unrealistic. Schools should adopt guidelines like the University of the Philippines (n.d.) and Ateneo de Manila (2025), which emphasize transparency and accountability.

The implication is that, students must be taught the Ethics of assistance where there is an immense highlight on academic integrity not just solely on the capabilities and limitations of artificial intelligence in academic writing because learners are becoming dependent on this innovation, giving fears to educators since learners are not required to navigate manually the necessary and fundamental skills in academic writing.

The disagreement on AI to be used language learners in writing activities suggest that the local educators still prefer and trust the traditional remedial reading and writing interventions over digital ones. This implies that, human-led intervention plans remain the preferred method for bridging learning gaps as AI is perceived potentially mask a student’s true language deficiencies rather than solving them.

In addition, the disagreement of AI as a bridge in language learners was mentioned by a respondent during the interview revealing that learners have fully relied on the use of AI. In fact, the respondent stated that “*If AI can*

fix the grammar error or create a polished product instantly then, there is no need for learners to practice and learn the fundamentals because they think that they can fully rely on AI, sadly it produces learners with poor fundamental communication and writing skills." This sentiment explains why Indicator 6 received the lowest mean because high school educators see AI as a barrier towards authentic learning and it serves a mask on the true language deficiencies rather than truly solving the gaps present. To add, it prevents high school educators from clearly seeing what the learners need to master and the pedagogical strategies the teacher should really employ. Consequently, a mismatch on the approaches cannot be addressed if these deficiencies are not given attention and is not properly evaluated by the concerning institutions.

Regarding the ethical dilemmas surfaced by artificial intelligence, the analysis generated three prominent themes, the first being Theme 1: Intellectual Dishonesty and the "Masking Effect." This theme describes the ethical dilemma where highly polished AI outputs conceal a student's lack of comprehension and actual writing capability. Teachers expressed deep concern over the superficial brilliance of AI-generated compositions, noting that students frequently submit work that does not accurately reflect their actual cognitive or linguistic capabilities. Participant 2 conceptualized this issue, noting: *"It is like a masking effect like it does not really address the true needs of the students. We can definitely see a perfect paper but if we ask them a few question, they cannot even defend their writings."*

This practice is viewed as a form of deception that interferes with the authenticity of student achievement and produces a reliance on copied ideas, a sentiment echoed by Participant 3, who stated, *"I also believe that they always copy paste the ideas from AI."*

The second ethical dilemma is identified as Theme 2: Stagnation of Skill Development and the "Flattening" of Creative Expression. This theme defines the long-term cognitive and linguistic consequences of AI dependency, specifically the loss of individual voice and the bypass of foundational language learning. Educators observe an alarming homogenization in student writing, which Participant 3 described as a problem because *"almost all their works are the same. Some are literally copy pasted and some our paraphrased but it's still very obvious."*

Participant 4 agreed, adding, *"Literally, all their works are the same. And you can also see the same patterns of their writings."* For learners of English as a Second Language (ESL), teachers argue that while AI is often commercialized as a learning aid, it functions as a pedagogical barrier. Participant 5 emphasized this critical issue: *"...for me, it's actually a barrier. If AI can fix the grammar error or create a polished product instantly, there is no need for learners to practice and learn the fundamentals. It produces learners with poor communication skills."*

The final ethical theme involves Theme 3: Pedagogical Helplessness and Institutional Constraints. This theme captures the systemic vulnerability of teachers caused by a personal digital literacy gap, severe time constraints, and a complete lack of institutional detection tools. Teachers experience vulnerability due to a widening digital divide between tech-savvy students and educators who lack confidence in their own digital literacy.

Participant 1 admitted, *"As an educator, I am fully aware of this but to be honest, unlike our students today, I am not tech-savvy, and I am not that confident."* This anxiety is compounded by institutional gaps, specifically the total absence of verified institutional software or legitimate applications to detect AI text. As Participant 2 pointed out, *"...sad to say, I really do not have a software or a legit application to check if their works are plagiarized."* Caught between a lack of detection tools and strict classroom time constraints, educators feel unequipped to ethically regulate AI use in a systematic manner.

Proposed Output: The AI-READY EDUCATOR Teacher's Guide Booklet

Drawing from the quantitative and qualitative insights gathered in this study, it is evident that while high school educators are vigilant, there is a necessity for a structured, technical and pedagogical intervention.

To bridge the gap between awareness and functional proficiency, this study culminates the development of a specialized Teacher's Guide Booklet. This booklet serves as a practical guide for high school educators of Oas Polytechnic School making sure that students and teachers are fully involved in the writing process and does not

fully rely on the generation of ideas through Artificial Intelligence. This booklet also contains practices and teaching strategies that would help high school educators to integrate Artificial Intelligence in academic writing while mitigating the risks of plagiarism and ethical considerations of educators inside the classroom.

To address the empirical gaps and challenges identified in the educators' practices and concerns, the data produced Theme 1: Institutional Policy, Alternative Assessment, and Verification Framework. This theme dictates that any proposed material must move past passive observation and offer a structured, a guide containing explicit policy rules, time-efficient process rubrics, and ethical validation protocols. This baseline need was explicitly stated by the participants when asked what the final output must prioritize. Participant 4 stated, *"We need guidelines of course. Of course, there should be a clear policy on how to integrate it ethically."*

CONCLUSIONS

Reflecting on the data gathered and analyzed, this study arrives at the following conclusions.

Teachers are reverting to traditional and labor-intensive methods such as In-Class Writing and Oral-defenses to verify the writings of the students. This was seen as the most effective ways to ensure authentic writing yet increases the professional burden among teachers. Although High school educators acknowledge the inevitable and useful tool in academic writing, there is a profound fear that it flattens the creativity and erodes the analytical faculties and proficiency in composition and writing skills of the learners. Furthermore, the rejection of AI as a bridge to ESL learning suggest that AI is a barrier to authentic language learning. While these manual verification method addresses immediate concerns, the lack of a standardized policy remains a challenge. The "Moderately Agree" stance on policy and technical training, the integration levels suggest that without a proper policy that would guide on the use of AI, the evaluation on AI-output could be unfair and inconsistent.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are offered for implementation and consideration as findings and conclusion from the conducted study.

High school educators of Oas Polytechnic School should continue the use of Process-Based grading but should begin integrating "AI-Critique" activities to teach students the boundaries and ethical use of AI in academic writing. This also sets minimal use of AI in the writings of the learners. The High School educators of Oas Polytechnic School should also explore on prompts that require local context and personal reflection which are hard for AI to discuss and generate responses. The Oas Polytechnic School should develop a policy establishing a school-wide policies that discusses the boundaries on "AI-assisted" and "AI-generated" outputs. The administration should also conduct workshops for teachers specifically in AI literacy in using AI-detection tools to help ease in manual verifications of academic writing outputs. Instead of total rejection to AI for ESL learners, educators should develop a scaffolded integration strategies where AI is used only for specific grammar feedback while the core teacher and facilitator is still the teacher. This prevents the tool from being a "crutch" while still using its efficiency as a co-editor. The Oas Polytechnic School high school educators should adopt the "The AI-Ready Educator Teacher's Guide Booklet" developed in this study. This guide should be used to establish clear "Principles of Responsible AI", ensuring that both students and teachers have a unified understanding on what constitutes "ethical assistance" and "ethical dishonesty".

REFERENCES

1. Aljuaid, H. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence tools on academic writing instruction in higher education: A systematic review.
2. Arab World English Journal, 1, 26-55. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/ChatGPT.2>
3. Al-Raimi M, Mudhsh BA, Al-Yafaei Y, Al-Maashani S. (2024). Utilizing artificial Intelligence tools for improving writing skills: Exploring Omani EFL learner's perspectives. Forum for Linguistic Studies. 6(2):1177 <https://doi.org/10.59400/fls.v6i2.1177>

4. Altinay, Z., Altinay, F., Sharma, R. C., Dagli, G., Shadiey, R., Yikici, B., & Altinay, M. (2024). Capacity building for student teachers in learning, teaching artificial intelligence for quality of education. *Societies*, 14(8), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc14080148>
5. Asio, J. M. (2024). Artificial intelligence (AI) literacy and academic performance of tertiary level students: A preliminary analysis. *Social Sciences Humanities and Education Journal (SHE Journal)*, 5, 309-321. <https://doi.org/10.25273/she.v5i2.20862>
6. Bulante, K., JR, D., Balagan, A., & Torres, M. (2024). AI-assisted and non AI assisted writing performances of grade 10 students. *Azal Arts and Humanities*, 1, 65-94. <https://doi.org/10.55687/aah.v1i1.74>
7. Capinding, A. T., & Dumayas, F. T. (2024). Transformative pedagogy in the digital age: Unraveling the impact of artificial intelligence on higher education students. **Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 82*(5), 530. <https://doi.org/10.33225/pec/24.82.630>
8. Chai, Ching & Lin, Pei-Yi & Jong, Morris & Dai, Yun & Chiu, Thomas K.F. & Huang, Biyun. (2020). Factors Influencing Students' Behavioral Intention to Continue Artificial Intelligence Learning. 147-150. 10.1109/ISET49818.2020.00040.
9. Chea, S. L., Kim, H.J. (2025). Perceptions and preparedness of K-12 educators in adopting generative AI. *Research in Learning Technology*, 33. <https://journal.alt.ac.uk/index.php/rtl/article/view/3448>
10. Dones VC (2022) Systematic Review Writing by Artificial Intelligence: Can Artificial Intelligence Replace Humans?. *J Musculoskelet Disord Treat* 8:112. doi.org/10.23937/2572-3243.1510112
11. Eagar, J., & Eagar, J. (2024, April 23). From copycats to creativity and authenticity: Why AI isn't the future of writing - Original Mac Guy. Original Mac Guy. <https://www.originalmacguy.com/from-copycats-to-creativity-and-authenticity-why-ai-isnt-the-future-of-writing/>
12. Estrellado, C. J. (2023). Artificial intelligence in the Philippine educational context: Circumspection and future inquiries. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Publications (IJSRP)*, 13(4), 16. <https://doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.13.04.2023.p13704>
13. Fabro, R. B. B., Rivera, J. C., Sambrano, L. C., Dinoy, L. J. M., Alcozer, N. G., & Agustin, M. C. (2024). Perceptions and extent of utilization of generative artificial intelligence (AI) among Filipino students. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 12(7), 126. <https://risejournals.org/index.php/imjrise/article/download/637/1018/1853>
14. Fontanilla, J. B., Bautista, K. H., Lactao, M., Villacorte, M. A., & Santos, R. (2023). Educators' perspectives on the impact of artificial intelligence on writing competence. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, 6(6), 29-34.
15. Funa, A. A., & Gabay, R. A. E. (2025). Policy guidelines and recommendations on AI use in teaching and learning: A meta-synthesis study. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101221>
16. Garbarine, R. (2023, March 27). How is AI Changing How We Write and Create? | College of Humanities and Social Sciences. College of Humanities and Social Sciences. <https://chass.ncsu.edu/news/2023/03/27/how-is-ai-changing-how-we-write-and-create/>
17. Giray, L., De Silos, P. Y., Adornado, A., Jan, R., Buelo, R. J. V., Galas, E., Reyes-Chua, E., Santiago, C., & Ulanday, M. L. (2024). Use and impact of artificial intelligence in Philippine higher education: Reflections from instructors and administrators. *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, 28, online. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/10875301.2024.2352746>
18. Haleem, A., Javaid, M., & Singh, R. P. (2022). An era of ChatGPT as a significant futuristic support tool: A study on features, abilities, and challenges. *BenchCouncil Transactions on Benchmarks, Standards and Evaluations*, 2(4), 100089. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tbench.2023.100089>
19. Jen, S., Rahim, A., & Hj Salam, A. R. (2024). A systematic review on the use of artificial intelligence in writing. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 13(1), 10-60. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v13-i1/20584>
20. Kouam, F. & William, A. (2024). AI in Academic Writing: Ally or Foe?. *International Journal of Research Publications*. 148. 353-358. 10.47119/IJRP1001481520246427.
21. Khojasteh, L., Karimian, Z., Nasiri, E., Kafipour, R., & Farahmandi, A.Y. (2024). Artificial intelligence and academic writing questionnaire (AI-AWQ): development and validation among medical students' experiences using exploratory factor analysis. *BMC Medical Education*, 24(1), 1250. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-06100-y>

22. Konecki, M., Baksa, T., & Konecki, M. (2024). Teachers' Perception of AI and Their Attitudes Towards AI. *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Computer Supported Education*, 1, 564-568. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0012739300003693>
23. Laird, J., Dwyer, M., & Woefel, J. (2025). AI Use in School is Quickly Increasing but Guidance Lags Behind: Findings from the RAND Survey Panels. RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA4180-1.html
24. Lin, Yun & Tang, Yi & Zhu, Yanfei & Song, Fangbin & Tang, Wenzhe. (2023). Correction: Lin et al. A Perception Study for Unit Charts in the Context of Large-Magnitude Data Representation. *Symmetry* 2023, 15, 219. *Symmetry*. 15. 892. [10.3390/sym15040892](https://doi.org/10.3390/sym15040892).
25. Lira San Martín, D., & Sánchez, J. (2024). Educational uses of AI in learning to write at school level. *Nuevas Ideas en Informática Educativa*, 18, 106-116. Universidad de Chile.
26. Malik, A. R., Pratiwi, Y., Andajani, K., Numertayasa, I. W., Suharti, S., Darwis, A., & Marzuki. (2023). Exploring artificial intelligence in academic essay: Higher education student's perspective. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 5, 100296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2023.100296>
27. Malon, J. C., Virtudazo, J., Vallente, W., Ayop, L., & Malon, M. F. O. (2024). Expressing ideas: AI-integrated paraphrasing to students' writing skills. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 10(4), 542. <https://www.ijem.com/>
28. Marzuki, M., Widiati, U., Rusdin, D., Darwin D., & Indrawati, I. (2023). The impact of AI writing tools on the content and organization of students' writing: EFL teachers' perspective. *Cogent Education*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2236469>
29. Panit, N. (2025). Can critical thinking and AI work together? Observations of science, Mathematics, and language instructors. *Environment and Social Psychology*. 9. [10.59429/esp.v9i11.3141](https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i11.3141).
30. Piedad, E. Jr.; Tabud, S. L.; Alina-Llabado, J.; Danao, D.; G.; Lim, J.; Francisco, A. S.; and Yong, T. K., "Regulating Generative AI in Scholarly Works: A Policy Brief for Academic Institutions in the Philippines" (2025). *Asia-Pacific Intellectual Property Management and Innovation Book Series*. 6. Retrieved from <https://animorepository.dlsu.edu.ph/apipmibookseries/6>
31. Pineda, M. A. A., Esguerra, J. A., & De Vera, R. A. (2024, January 22). Impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on the labor market. Institute for Labor Studies (ILS), Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE). <https://ils.dole.gov.ph/2024-research-papers/impact-of-artificial-intelligence-ai-on-the-labor-market>
32. Rane, N. L., Choudhary, P. S., & Rane, J. (2023). Education 4.0 and 5.0: Integrating artificial intelligence (AI) for personalized and adaptive learning. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4638365>
33. Ratnesh, K., & Ratnesh, s., (2024). Open AI Application Tools Utilization for Improving Academic Writing: A Study. 6.
34. Tillmanns, T., Filho, A., Rudra, S., Weber, P., Dawitz, J., Wiersma, E., Dudenaite, D., & Reynolds, S. (2025). Mapping tomorrow's teaching and learning spaces: A systematic review on GenAI in higher education. *Trends in Higher Education*, 4(2), [10.3390/higheredu4010002](https://doi.org/10.3390/higheredu4010002). <https://doi.org/10.3390/higheredu4010002>
35. Tran, T. (2025). Enhancing EFL Writing Revision Practices: The Impact of AI- and Teacher-Generated Feedback and Their Sequences. *Education Sciences*. 15. 232. [10.3390/educsci15020232](https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15020232).
36. Santiago, C., Embang, S., Acanto, R., Ambojia, K. W., Aperocho, M. D., Balilo, B., Cahapin, E., Conlu, M., Lausa, S., Laput, E., Malabag, B., Paderes, J., & Romasanta, J. (2023). Utilization of writing assistance tools in research in selected higher learning institutions in the Philippines: A text mining analysis. 22, 259-284.
37. Shabbir, A., Rizvi, S., Alam, M. M., & Su\u0219ud, M. M. (2024). Beyond boundaries: Navigating the positive potential of ChatGPT, empowering education in underdeveloped corners of the world. *Heliyon*, 10(16), e35845. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e35845>
38. Talili, Z. R. J. (2024). Integrating Artificial Intelligence in Academic Writing. *International Multidisciplinary Journal of Research for Innovation, Sustainability and Excellence (IMJRISSE)*, 1*(8), 292. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13610696>
39. Umamah, A., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2022). EFL university students' use of online resources to facilitate self-regulated writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 23(1), 108–124. <http://callej.org/journal/23-1/Umamah-Cahyono2022.pdf>

40. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology, Artificial Intelligence and Future of Teaching and Learning: Insights and Recommendations, Washington, DC, 2023.
41. Utami, S., Andayani, A., Winarni, R., & Sumarwati, S. (2023). Utilization of artificial intelligence technology in an academic writing class: How do Indonesian students perceive? *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 15, ep450. <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13419>
42. Vacalares, S. T., Baron, A. M. P., Medina, R. G. B., Mugot, J. D., Pacheco, A. J. A., Penarejo, M. L., & Ura-ura, A. R. P. (2024). Artificial Intelligence: Tertiary Students Perception of Using ChatGPT in Writing Tasks. *International Journal of Research in Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(6), 38-41. <https://journal.ijris.com/index.php/ijris/article/view/56>
43. Wass, Rob & Golding, Clinton. (2014). Sharpening a tool for teaching: the zone of proximal development. *Teaching in Higher Education*. 19. 671-684. 10.1080/13562517.2014.901958.
44. Woo, D., Susanto, H., Yeung, C. H., Guo, K., & Fung, A. (2023). Exploring AI-generated text in student writing: How does AI help? *arXiv*, arXiv:2304.02478. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2304.02478>
45. Zhai, X.; Chu, X.; Chai, C.S.; Jong, M.S.Y.; Istenic, A.; Spector, M.; Liu, J.B.; Yuan, J.; Li, Y. A Review of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education from 2010 to 2020. *Complexity* 2021, 2021, 8812542.

Internet Articles and Websites

1. AI Writing Tools: Definition, Uses & Implications <https://www.scribbr.com/category/ai-tools/>
2. Ateneo de Manila University. (2025, January). GenAI in higher education. <https://www.ateneo.edu/sites/default/files/202501/GenAI%20in%20Higher%20Education%20-%20Ateneo%20de%20Manila.pdf>
3. BYJU'S. (n.d.). Mean. Retrieved October 26, 2023, from <https://byjus.com/maths/mean/>
4. (CHED) emphasizes the importance of writing through General Education Curriculum (GEC)
5. Data Privacy Act of 2012 or the Republic Act No. 10173
6. DepEd launches AI center for education | Department of Education. (2025, February 20). <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2025/02/20/deped-launches-ai-center-for-education/>
7. IOT Philippines Inc. (2022, November 28). The future of artificial intelligence: A basic guide to AI in the Philippines. <https://www.iotphils.com/artificial-intelligence-philippines/>
8. Laird, J., Dwyer, M., & Woefel, J. (2025). AI Use in School is Quickly Increasing but Guidance Lags Behind: Findings from the RAND Survey Panels. RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA4180-1.html
9. Likert, R. (1932). A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 22(140), 1-55
10. Lib Guides: Gordon Rule: Home. (n.d.). <https://libraryguides.mdc.edu/gordonrule>
11. Purposive Sampling. (n.d.). In *Statistics How To*. Retrieved from <https://www.statisticshowto.com/random-sampling/>.
12. The Intellectual Property Code or Republic Act No. 8293
13. Student Guidelines on the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence. Far Eastern University
14. University of the Philippines. (n.d.). University of the Philippines principles for responsible and trustworthy artificial intelligence. Retrieved from <https://example.up.edu.ph/ai-principles.pdf>