Teaching Writing Skills Using Generative AI: The Paradox of Adoption and Resistance Among Language Educators

Rawan Abdul Mahdi Neyef Al-Saliti[1], Abdelrahim Fathy Ismail[2], Ghada Nasr Elmorsy[3]& Samia Mokhtar Shahpo[4]

[1] Department of Psychological and Family Counseling, College of Educational Sciences, Ajloun National University, Ajloun, Jordan

[2] Curriculum and Instruction Department, Faculty of Education, King Faisal University, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia

[3] Department of Kindergarten, College of Education, King Faisal University, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia

[4] Department of Early Childhood, College of Sciences and Humanities, Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University, Jubail, Saudi Arabia

Correspondence: Abdelrahim Fathy Ismail, Curriculum and Instruction Department, Faculty of Education, King Faisal University, Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: afismail@kfu.edu.sa

Received: March 30, 2025 Accepted: June 9, 2025 Online Published: July 11, 2025

doi:10.5430/wjel.v15n8p28 URL: https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v15n8p28

Abstract

The professional identity of language educators has been significantly influenced by the integration of generative AI tools in teaching writing skills and processes. These tools have, to some extent, assumed roles traditionally held by teachers. This study explores the paradox of adoption and resistance among language educators regarding the use of generative AI in writing instruction. Adopting a quantitative, descriptive-analytical approach, the study utilized a tripartite rubric (adoption, neutrality, resistance) to examine teachers' attitudes across four AI-mediated writing stages: pre-writing, drafting/ initial writing, revising/editing, and publishing/feedback reception. In order to explore language educators' alignment with the dynamics of adoption, neutrality, and resistance, a total of 340 Arabic and English language teachers from secondary schools in Saudi Arabia participated in the study. Findings indicate that language educators demonstrated a neutral stance toward AI integration in the pre-writing and publishing/feedback reception stages, where AI serves as a supportive rather than a generative tool. This suggests that educators perceive AI as a facilitator in organizing ideas and refining final drafts without undermining their instructional role. Conversely, strong resistance emerged in the drafting/ initial writing and revising/editing stages, where AI directly engages in text production and modification. This reflects educators' concerns about diminished student engagement in writing development and the potential erosion of their professional role. Additionally, these findings reveal teachers' concerns about how AI might alter their role in teaching writing and their doubts about students' ability to use these tools responsibly. While adoption was present across all writing stages, it remained marginal, consistently overshadowed by neutrality or resistance. This suggests that, despite some recognition of AI's potential, most educators remain hesitant to fully embrace it.

Keywords: Generative AI, writing instruction, language educators, adoption and resistance, professional identity, ai-assisted writing

1. Introduction and Literature Review

The academic discourse on the impact of generative AI in education is shaped by two contrasting perspectives: one emphasizing the challenges it poses to teachers and their instructional roles, and the other highlighting the opportunities it offers to both educators and students. Between these viewpoints, an ongoing debate questions whether generative AI threatens traditional educational frameworks or serves as a transformative force that enhances teaching and learning quality (Cardon et al., 2023).

Generative AI, powered by large language models (LLMs), has revolutionized writing education by offering advanced tools for text generation, feedback provision, and content creation (Barrett & Pack, 2023). As part of a broader wave of technological innovation that has shaped education over the past three decades, AI-driven tools now support both language learners and educators in unprecedented ways (Baidoo-Anu & Ansah, 2023). Recent research highlights the need for targeted training to help educators and students integrate generative AI effectively into writing instruction, ensuring that its use complements rather than replaces traditional language learning processes (Creely, 2024).

These contrasting perspectives underscore the paradoxical nature of generative AI in education, as it simultaneously challenges and supports established teaching practices (Ferdig et al., 2023). This duality necessitates a deeper examination of how educators align with its integration, particularly in the domain of writing instruction. Writing is not merely a technical skill but a complex cognitive and communicative process, making it a crucial area for understanding the dynamics of AI adoption, neutrality, and resistance in teaching practices (Lim et al., 2023).

Writing is a complex skill that goes beyond basic linguistic competence; it involves cognitive, communicative, and cultural dimensions. Effective writing requires not only grammatical accuracy and coherence but also an awareness of audience, purpose, and context (Li et al., 2024). These elements make writing instruction a nuanced process that extends beyond teaching rules and structures to fostering critical

thinking, creativity, and personal expression (Washington, 2023). With the rise of generative AI, educators face new opportunities and challenges in teaching writing. While AI tools can assist with grammar, style, and idea generation, questions remain about their role in developing students' independent writing abilities (Marzuki et al., 2023). Teachers must navigate how these technologies can support learning without diminishing the depth of the writing process or the authenticity of student expression (Alkaissi et al., 2023). With the rapid advancement of generative AI, writing tools powered by artificial intelligence have become integral across various fields, particularly in education. Technologies such as ChatGPT, QuillBot, Grammarly, INK Editor, and Scribe have significantly reshaped writing instruction by offering automated text generation, refinement, and editing capabilities. The widespread adoption of these tools has raised critical discussions about their role in education, prompting educators and researchers to examine their influence on writing development (Cummings et al., 2024).

The emergence of AI-driven writing assistants has introduced both opportunities and challenges for language teachers. These systems can assist students in brainstorming ideas, drafting content, and revising texts, potentially enhancing writing fluency and efficiency. However, concerns remain regarding their pedagogical implications, particularly in relation to fostering genuine writing skills versus creating dependency. As these technologies continue to evolve, it is essential to explore how they can be integrated effectively to support meaningful learning while maintaining the integrity of writing instruction (Gasaymeh et al., 2024).

For language educators, generative AI has the potential to serve as a powerful assistive tool in teaching writing skills by facilitating the creation of interactive content managed collaboratively by both teachers and students, thereby sustaining learner engagement in the educational process (Stornaiuolo et al., 2024). AI can be envisioned as a virtual assistant that enhances rather than replaces the role of educators by supporting them in designing writing activities, providing linguistic guidance, suggesting textual refinements, correcting grammatical errors, and tailoring feedback to individual student needs. However, this technological advancement raises critical questions regarding the extent of adoption or resistance exhibited by educators toward these tools, particularly across the different stages of the writing process (Tang et al., 2024).

In the context of language educators' concerns, Shopovski (2024) highlighted both the advantages and potential risks of using Generative AI in academic writing. While these tools can enhance efficiency, support structured writing, and improve language accuracy, they also raise significant concerns. Language teachers may worry about students' over-reliance on AI, the generation of inaccurate or non-original content, and the diminishing role of critical thinking in writing. Additionally, the opaque nature of AI-generated outputs and the ethical challenges related to authorship and intellectual property contribute to skepticism (Jochim & Lenz-Kesekamp, 2025).

Söğüt (2024) explored the perspectives of pre-service English language teachers and teacher trainers regarding the integration of Generative AI tools in EFL writing instruction. The study highlighted several advantages, including AI's role in overcoming writer's block, providing language support, and offering instant, personalized feedback. However, concerns were raised about academic misconduct, the reliability of AI-generated content, and the necessity for ethical guidelines. Participants emphasized the need to reformulate assessment methods, shifting from result-oriented exams to process-based and performance-driven evaluations.

Barrett and Pack (2023) examined the perspectives of educators and university students on the appropriate use of generative AI in the writing process. Their study, based on a survey of 68 educators and 158 students, explored attitudes toward AI-generated content across six key writing stages: brainstorming, outlining, writing, revising, feedback, and evaluation. The findings revealed slight discrepancies between teachers and students regarding acceptable AI use, highlighting a general lack of preparedness at both the classroom and institutional levels. The study emphasized the need for clear guidelines and professional development to equip educators with strategies for integrating AI into writing instruction effectively.

Cummings et al. (2024) indicate that the rapid advancement of generative AI technologies has introduced significant challenges for language educators in designing, delivering, and adapting writing instruction. As AI-driven writing tools become more sophisticated, traditional pedagogical approaches may struggle to keep pace, making it difficult for educators to structure lessons, assess student progress, and maintain the integrity of writing skill development. This shift requires educators to reconsider their roles-not only as instructors of linguistic competence but also as mediators between human cognition and AI-generated outputs.

AI's increasing presence in writing education raises concerns about its potential effects on students' cognitive engagement, originality, and reliance on automated feedback (Shopovski, 2024). Educators may experience uncertainty in determining the appropriate balance between utilizing AI for efficiency and ensuring that students develop essential writing competencies, such as creativity, critical thinking, and revision strategies. The lack of clear pedagogical frameworks for AI integration further complicates instructional decision-making, leading to varying levels of acceptance, neutrality, or resistance among educators (Hossain & Al Younus. 2025; Song et al., 2025).

In contrast, Tran (2025) explores the impact of combining AI-generated and teacher-generated feedback on EFL writing revisions. The study found that AI feedback led to more frequent revisions by providing specific and actionable suggestions, while teacher feedback focused on higher-order concerns. Integrating both types of feedback proved most effective, with AI addressing surface-level issues first and teachers guiding content and organization improvements. Although no significant differences were found between feedback sequences, AI-first feedback slightly enhanced revision quantity. These findings underscore the potential of AI-teacher feedback integration in academic writing instruction.

Language educators may express concerns about the increasing role of Generative AI (GenAI) in teaching writing skills, particularly regarding its influence on various stages of the writing process (Söğüt, 2024). While AI-powered writing tools offer undeniable benefits,

such as enhancing efficiency and providing instant feedback, many teachers remain hesitant to fully integrate them into their instructional practices. This reluctance may stem from pedagogical uncertainties, psychological factors, or broader concerns about the implications of AI-mediated learning (Baidoo-Anu & Ansah, 2023).

One primary concern is the potential for over-reliance on AI-generated content, which could undermine students' development of independent writing skills. Without careful guidance, students may adopt AI-generated suggestions uncritically, leading to unintentional plagiarism or a diminished ability to engage in deep, reflective writing. Additionally, the lack of transparency in AI training data and decision-making processes raises concerns about biases in content generation. If AI models reinforce dominant linguistic norms while marginalizing diverse expressions, they could inadvertently limit students' exposure to varied writing styles and cultural perspectives (Varanasi et al., 2025).

Furthermore, some educators worry about the accuracy and reliability of AI-generated responses. Cases of AI hallucination-where the system produces plausible but factually incorrect information-could mislead students and complicate the teaching process (Tran, 2025). The absence of clear instructional frameworks for using AI in writing education also contributes to uncertainty. Teachers may struggle to define the boundaries of AI assistance, questioning whether its role should be limited to brainstorming and revision or extended to more substantive aspects of the writing process (Kim et al., 2025)

As a result, Language educators hold diverse perspectives on the integration of generative AI tools in writing instruction, reflecting a spectrum of attitudes shaped by pedagogical beliefs, technological familiarity, and concerns about student engagement. While some teachers view AI-driven writing assistants as valuable tools that can enhance specific writing skills-such as idea generation, text structuring, and language refinement-others express reservations about their impact on student autonomy and critical thinking. These differing perceptions align with varying orientations toward AI adoption, neutrality, or resistance. Educators who adopt AI tools may perceive them as supportive aids that streamline pre-writing activities and provide real-time feedback, thereby fostering more efficient drafting and revision processes. In contrast, those who remain neutral may acknowledge AI's potential while questioning its long-term effects on student learning. Meanwhile, educators who resist AI integration often raise concerns about over-reliance, the erosion of authentic writing skills, and the potential dilution of the cultural and cognitive depth inherent in writing. As AI continues to reshape writing instruction, understanding these nuanced perspectives is essential for developing balanced, pedagogically sound approaches that maintain the integrity of writing as both a cognitive and cultural skill.

In a different context, the current study examines academic writing through four key stages: Pre-writing, where ideas are generated and organized; Drafting/Initial Writing, focusing on structuring the main content; Revising/Editing, aimed at refining and enhancing text quality; and Publishing/Feedback Reception, where written work is evaluated and adjusted based on received feedback. Generative AI-powered writing systems provide continuous support throughout these stages, from generating research ideas and formulating questions to editing and proofreading by offering grammatical corrections and linguistic refinements. Additionally, these systems assist in literature review by identifying relevant research articles, providing background information on writing topics, summarizing texts, and offering personalized recommendations aligned with students' preferences and research styles. Furthermore, AI-driven writing tools offer both machine translation and real-time translation services, enabling students to overcome language barriers, access content in multiple languages, and engage with diverse academic perspectives.

To address these concerns, a deeper understanding of teachers' perceptions is essential. Investigating how educators navigate AI's potential benefits and limitations will provide valuable insights into their trust-or skepticism-toward these tools. By exploring the psychological and pedagogical factors that shape teachers' attitudes, this study aims to uncover the conditions under which GenAI can be effectively integrated into writing instruction, ensuring that its implementation aligns with sound educational principles. The significance of this study stems from the need to understand the extent to which language educators align with the integration of generative AI in teaching writing skills, particularly given the potential shifts in their professional roles. As AI-powered tools increasingly support various stages of the writing process-ranging from idea generation to drafting, revising, and final editing-educators may find themselves navigating a rapidly evolving instructional landscape. This transformation raises critical questions about their role as facilitators of learning, particularly in balancing traditional pedagogical approaches with AI-assisted methodologies.

Educators' responses to these advancements are likely to vary: some may view AI as an opportunity to enhance their teaching practices, leveraging its capabilities to personalize feedback and support students more effectively. Others may adopt a neutral stance, cautiously observing its implications before fully committing to its use (Simelane & Kittur, 2025). Conversely, some educators may resist AI integration due to concerns about diminished human interaction, the erosion of essential cognitive writing skills, or ethical considerations surrounding originality and authorship (Hesse & Helm, 2025).

This study explores the paradox of adoption and resistance among language educators in the context of teaching writing skills using generative AI. As AI-driven writing tools become increasingly integrated into educational settings, they introduce both opportunities and challenges that redefine the instructional landscape. While some educators embrace AI as a means to enhance student engagement, streamline feedback, and support personalized learning, others express concerns about the erosion of fundamental writing skills, the authenticity of student output, and the broader implications for pedagogical integrity. By investigating how language educators perceive and navigate AI-assisted writing across different stages of the writing process-pre-writing, drafting, revising/editing, and publishing/feedback reception-this study seeks to uncover the factors that influence their stance toward AI adoption, neutrality, or

resistance. The findings aim to contribute to a deeper understanding of how AI is reshaping writing instruction and to provide insights into the evolving role of educators in balancing technological integration with pedagogical effectiveness.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The rapid integration of generative AI into educational contexts has sparked both excitement and concern, particularly in the domain of writing instruction. While AI-powered tools offer new ways to support students in generating ideas, improving grammar, and revising content, they also raise fundamental questions about the evolving role of the teacher. For language educators, this shift represents more than just a technological development-it challenges the very heart of their professional identity and pedagogical purpose. As generative AI begins to influence each stage of the writing process, educators are placed in a paradoxical position. On one hand, they recognize the potential of these tools to enhance learning and streamline instruction. On the other hand, they face the unsettling possibility that such tools might diminish students' cognitive engagement, weaken critical writing skills, and blur the boundaries of authorship and originality.

Despite the growing presence of AI in schools and its increasing use by students, there remains a lack of clarity about how language teachers truly perceive this transformation. Do they see AI as a helpful partner or a disruptive force? Are they adopting it enthusiastically, resisting it with caution, or standing somewhere in between? This study seeks to address this pressing gap by exploring the nuanced responses of language educators to AI-assisted writing instruction. In doing so, it aims to shed light on how teachers are navigating this digital frontier-not just technologically, but emotionally and professionally. Understanding these perspectives is vital to ensuring that the integration of AI into writing education strengthens rather than undermines the human dimensions of teaching and learning.

1.2 Research Objectives

- The research aims to investigate language educators' attitudes toward the integration of generative AI tools in teaching writing skills across different instructional stages-namely pre-writing, drafting/initial writing, revising/editing, and publishing/feedback reception.
- To identify the extent of adoption, neutrality, and resistance among language teachers regarding the use of generative AI tools in supporting students' writing development.
- To examine the specific stages of the writing process where educators demonstrate higher levels of alignment or resistance to AI-mediated instruction.
- To explore the perceived impact of generative AI on the professional identity of language educators, particularly in terms of instructional roles, pedagogical authority, and student engagement.
- To assess the pedagogical and psychological factors shaping teachers' orientations toward AI integration, including concerns related to student autonomy, originality, ethical issues, and instructional effectiveness.
- To provide evidence-based insights into how generative AI tools can be meaningfully and responsibly integrated into writing instruction without compromising educational integrity.

1.3 Research Questions

RQ1: How do educators perceive and approach the use of generative AI in teaching writing at pre-writing stage?

RQ2: How do educators engage with generative AI tools during the drafting/ initial writing stage in their teaching?

RQ3: What are educators' attitudes toward using generative AI in the revising and editing stage in writing instruction?

RQ4: How do educators incorporate or respond to generative AI during the publishing/feedback reception stage of student writing?

2. Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This study aims to examine the paradox of adoption and resistance among language educators in teaching writing through generative AI tools. Specifically, it investigates teachers' varying levels of acceptance-adoption, neutrality, and resistance-regarding AI-assisted writing instruction. Specifically, it sought to explore the gradient levels of teacher acceptance-adoption, neutrality, and resistance-toward AI's role in mediating four core writing stages. To achieve this objective, the study adopts a quantitative research design, employing a descriptive-analytical approach to systematically analyze teachers' perceptions and responses (Creswell, 2015).

As a foundational framework, a Structured List of AI-Mediated Writing Stages was developed, identifying four key stages of the writing process:

- Pre-writing stage
- Drafting/initial writing stage
- Revising/editing stage
- Publishing/feedback reception stage

Based on this structured framework, a Tripartite Rubric for AI-Assisted Writing – Adoption, Neutrality, and Resistance was designed to assess teachers' stances on AI integration at each stage of the writing process.

The Tripartite Rubric for AI-Assisted Writing – Adoption, Neutrality, and Resistance utilized a three-tiered rating scale to assess teachers' attitudes toward AI integration in writing instruction. The scale was structured as follows:

- Adoption (1): Full acceptance and active use of AI tools in writing instruction.
- Neutrality (2): Partial acceptance, occasional use, or ambivalence toward AI-assisted writing.
- Resistance (3): Rejection or avoidance of AI tools due to pedagogical concerns or skepticism.

This structured rating system allowed for a nuanced analysis of educators' varying degrees of acceptance across the different AI-mediated writing stages.

2.2 Research Participants

This study focused on secondary school language educators specializing in Arabic and English across various educational institutions in Saudi Arabia. These educators were selected because they are directly responsible for teaching writing skills across different stages of the writing process. Given the growing presence of AI-assisted writing tools, their perspectives on adoption, neutrality, and resistance are crucial in understanding how AI integration affects writing instruction. The study specifically targeted secondary school teachers because this stage represents the final phase before students transition to higher education or professional pathways. At this critical point, students refine their writing abilities and require structured guidance to ensure responsible and ethical AI-assisted writing practices. Secondary school educators, therefore, play a key role in helping students navigate AI tools for brainstorming, drafting, revising, and publishing written content.

To ensure both accessibility and diversity in participant selection, a hybrid sampling approach was adopted:

- Convenience Sampling: Educators were initially recruited based on accessibility through professional networks, social media platforms, and institutional partnerships.
- Snowball Sampling: Recruited teachers were encouraged to refer colleagues from their professional circles. Through this cumulative process, the study successfully reached a broad and diverse sample of secondary school language educators.

A total of 340 language educators participated in the study, representing various levels of teaching experience and institutional backgrounds. The demographic details of the participants are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Study Participants (N=340)

Demographic Characteristics	Value	(N)	Percentage (%)	English proficiency level		years of teaching English	
Gender	Male	180	52.9%	Intermediate Level	**73** (40%)	Less than 5 years	49 (27%)
				Advanced Level	107 (60%)	More than 5 years	**131** (73%)
	Female	160	47.1%	Intermediate Level	41 (26%)	Less than 5 years	67 (42%)
				Advanced Level	119 (74%)	More than 5 years	93 (58%)
Subject Taught	Arabic Language	200	58.8%				
	English Language	140	41.2%				
School Type	Public Schools	230	67.6%	-	-	-	-
	Private Schools	110	32.4%				
Familiarity with AI Tools	Moderate	140	41.2%				
	High	200	58.8%				

2.3 Ethical Considerations

Participants provided informed consent before enrollment, ensuring their voluntary participation and the right to withdraw at any stage without penalty. Ethical approval for the study was obtained from King Faisal University under approval number KFU-REC-2024-ETHICS251036. Consent was acquired electronically before completing the tripartite rubric, with explicit acknowledgment of their participation. Anonymity and data confidentiality were strictly maintained, with no personally identifiable information (such as names or school affiliations) recorded. Participants were clearly informed that their responses would be used solely for academic research purposes. They were also fully briefed on all aspects of the study, with assurances that their data would be used exclusively for research purposes. This study adheres to principles of intellectual property rights, and all participants contributed voluntarily.

2.4 Study Instruments

First Instrument: Structured List of AI-Mediated Writing Stages

To investigate the paradox of adoption and resistance among language educators, the study employed a structured list of writing processes as its first instrument. This list aimed to identify the stages of writing using artificial intelligence. The insights gained from this categorization served as the foundation for the study's second instrument, a tripartite rubric (adoption, neutrality, resistance), which measured educators' varying levels of acceptance or reluctance toward AI-assisted writing instruction.

The writing process framework encompassed four key stages: pre-writing stage, drafting stage, revising/editing stage, and publishing/feedback reception stage. Each stage included a set of sub-skills that are essential for effective writing development. The list

was developed based on a review of literature related to writing processes using AI tools such as: (Barrett & Pack, 2023; Cardon el al., 2023; Alkaissi et al., 2023; Söğüt, 2024; Tang et al., 2024; Cummings et al., 2024; Gasaymeh et al., 2024; Hesse & Helm, 2025; Sain et al., 2025).

To ensure the validity of this instrument, the list was evaluated by five experts in curriculum and linguistic teaching methodologies. The experts' feedback was collected, and only sub-skills that achieved an agreement rate of 80% or higher were retained for inclusion in the study. The validated framework is presented in the table 2:

Table 2. Writing Stages and Sub-Skills

Writing Stage	Sub-Skills (≥ 80% Agreement) N = 5 (five experts in curriculum and linguistic teaching methodologies)
Pre-writing Stage	− Generating writing ideas using AI-powered brainstorming tools. − Developing structured outlines and concept maps with AI assistance. − Utilizing AI-generated key ideas as starting points for initial writing. − Classifying and organizing ideas in a logical sequence − Developing exploratory questions about the topic with AI assistance
Drafting / initial writing Stage	− Generating complete sentences and paragraphs with AI assistance − Rephrasing and restructuring sentences using AI suggestions − Expanding brief ideas into more detailed content with AI support − Improving word choice and sentence clarity with AI recommendations − Using AI-generated templates and sentence starters for structured writing
Revising/Editing Stage	− Identifying and correcting grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors using AI tools − Enhancing sentence structure and coherence with AI-generated suggestions − Refining word choice and style to improve clarity and readability − Checking text consistency and logical flow with AI feedback
Publishing/Feedback Reception Stage	− Correcting final text errors based on AI-generated feedback − Rephrasing sentences and improving clarity in response to AI suggestions − Adjusting tone and style to enhance readability before final submission

Second Instrument: A Tripartite Rubric for AI-Assisted Writing - Adoption, Neutrality, and Resistance

The researchers developed A Tripartite Rubric for AI-Assisted Writing to examine the constructs outlined in Teaching Writing Skills Using Generative AI: The Paradox of Adoption and Resistance Among Language Educators. This rubric was structured based on a Structured List of AI-Mediated Writing Stages, which was previously developed to categorize AI's role across different stages of the writing process. Each subskill within these stages was assessed using a three-tiered performance scale: Adoption, Neutrality, and Resistance.

To ensure content validity, the rubric was reviewed by five expert evaluators specializing in language education, writing instruction, and AI in pedagogy. Their feedback was used to refine descriptors, clarify scale anchors, and ensure alignment with AI-mediated writing practices. For reliability assessment, the internal consistency of the rubric was measured using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, ensuring the instrument's coherence and stability across responses. Additionally, inter-rater reliability was established by having multiple evaluators independently score a sample of teacher responses, with Cohen's Kappa used to determine the level of agreement. The measured alpha for the overall scale-encompassing all four AI-mediated writing stages (Pre-writing, Drafting/Initial Writing, Revising/Editing, and Publishing/Feedback Reception)-was 0.87, indicating suitable internal consistency across items. Additionally, inter-rater reliability was established through independent scoring of a representative sample of teacher responses by three trained evaluators. The level of agreement among raters, calculated using Cohen's Kappa, was 0.84, which reflects a high degree of agreement and supports the rubric's scoring reliability. The finalized rubric was then pilot-tested with a subset of participants to confirm its practical applicability before full-scale implementation in the study. Table 3 shows the stages of the writing process and the graduated scale in front of each skill.

Table 3. Performance Scale (rubric) for AI-assisted writing Phases

Writing Stage	Subskill	Adoption	Neutrality	Resistance
Pre-writing Stage	Generating writing ideas using AI-powered brainstorming tools	I actively integrate AI brainstorming tools into my teaching, encourage students to use them for idea generation, and provide structured guidance on their effective use.	I allow students to use AI brainstorming tools but do not actively promote or discourage their use in my lessons.	I discourage or restrict the use of AI brainstorming tools because I believe they hinder students' independent thinking and creativity.
	Developing structured outlines and concept maps with AI assistance	I guide students in using AI to create structured outlines and concept maps to organize their ideas before writing.	I acknowledge the potential of AI in outlining but leave its use up to students without specific guidance.	I avoid using AI-generated outlines, as I believe they may lead to rigid or formulaic thinking.
	Utilizing AI-generated	I encourage students to use	I allow students to	I discourage reliance on

Writing Stage	Subskill	Adoption	Neutrality	Resistance
	key ideas as starting points for initial writing	AI-generated key ideas to initiate their writing process and expand on them.	reference AI-generated key ideas but do not require their use.	AI-generated key ideas, as I believe it limits students' originality.
	Classifying and organizing ideas in a logical sequence	I actively teach students to use AI tools for organizing and structuring their ideas logically.	I acknowledge AI's potential in organizing ideas but leave its use optional.	I discourage AI-based idea structuring, as I believe it prevents students from developing independent organizational skills.
	Developing exploratory questions about the topic with AI assistance	I encourage students to use AI to generate exploratory questions that guide deeper thinking about their topics.	I allow students to use AI-generated questions but do not incorporate them explicitly into my teaching.	I discourage AI-assisted question development, as I believe students should formulate their own inquiries.
Drafting /Initial Writing Stage	Generating complete sentences and paragraphs with AI assistance	I encourage students to use AI to generate complete sentences and paragraphs while guiding them in making meaningful revisions.	I allow students to experiment with AI-generated text but do not make it a structured part of the drafting process.	I discourage AI-generated text, as I believe it undermines students' ability to develop their own writing skills.
	Rephrasing and restructuring sentences using AI suggestions	I integrate AI-based rephrasing tools into my instruction to help students refine sentence structure.	I allow students to use AI for rewording but do not actively encourage it.	I discourage AI-based rephrasing, as I believe it weakens students' ability to improve sentence variety independently.
	Expanding brief ideas into more detailed content with AI support	I teach students to use AI-generated expansions to develop their ideas more comprehensively.	I acknowledge AI's role in idea expansion but do not emphasize its use.	I discourage AI-driven content expansion, as I believe it fosters dependency rather than skill development.
	Improving word choice and sentence clarity with AI recommendations	I encourage students to refine vocabulary and sentence clarity through AI suggestions.	I allow students to use AI for word choice improvement but do not make it a requirement.	I discourage AI-based vocabulary enhancement, as I believe it inhibits students' lexical growth.
	Using AI-generated templates and sentence starters for structured writing	I use AI-generated templates and sentence starters to organize my ideas and write well-structured, coherent texts.	I sometimes use AI-generated templates and sentence starters, but I prefer to modify or rewrite them in my own style.	I do not use AI-generated templates or sentence starters because I believe they reduce students' ability to develop their independent writing style.
Revising/Editing Stage	Identifying and correcting grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors using AI tools	I teach students how to use AI-based grammar and spell-checking tools for self-editing.	I allow students to use AI for grammar and spell-checking but do not integrate it into my instruction.	I discourage AI grammar tools, as I believe they reduce students' ability to self-correct their writing.
	Enhancing sentence structure and coherence with AI-generated suggestions	I incorporate AI tools to help students improve coherence and readability.	I allow students to use AI for sentence enhancement but do not emphasize it.	I discourage AI-driven sentence structuring, as I believe it prevents students from developing their own writing flow.
	Refining word choice and style to improve clarity and readability	I encourage students to utilize AI for improving their word choices and writing style.	I acknowledge AI's role in refining style but do not actively promote its use.	I discourage AI-based style refinements, as I believe students should develop their own stylistic awareness.
	Checking text consistency and logical flow with AI feedback	I guide students in using AI-generated feedback to enhance text coherence and logical sequencing.	I allow students to check AI suggestions but do not structure it into the revision process.	I discourage AI-driven coherence checks, as I believe it limits critical thinking in revision.
Publishing/Feedback Reception Stage	Correcting final text errors based on	I encourage students to review and apply	I acknowledge AI's usefulness in final	I discourage AI-assisted final corrections, as I

Writing Stage	Subskill	Adoption	Neutrality	Resistance
	AI-generated feedback	AI-generated feedback for final error correction before submission.	proofreading but leave its use optional.	believe they reduce students' accountability for their writing.
	Rephrasing sentences and improving clarity in response to AI suggestions	I encourage students to refine their final drafts using AI-generated rephrasing suggestions.	I allow students to utilize AI-based rewording but do not make it a requirement.	I discourage AI-assisted rephrasing in final drafts, as I believe students should demonstrate independent revision skills.
	Adjusting tone and style to enhance readability before final submission	I guide students in using AI to align their writing tone with the intended audience.	I acknowledge AI's role in adjusting tone and style but do not explicitly teach it.	I discourage AI-driven tone adjustments, as I believe students should develop their own stylistic expression.

2.5 Data Collection and Analysis

Data Collection:

The data collection procedure involved the administration of the Tripartite Rubric, where educators self-assessed their stance on AI-assisted writing instruction across various Phases and sub-skills. The rubric measured three levels of adoption: Adoption (1) for full acceptance and active use of AI tools, Neutrality (2) for partial acceptance or occasional use, and Resistance (3) for rejection or avoidance of AI due to pedagogical concerns. The rubric was distributed electronically via Google Forms, WhatsApp, and professional educator forums in Saudi Arabia to maximize accessibility. Participants were given a four-week response window, with weekly reminders sent to encourage completion and minimize attrition. These reminders emphasized the study's academic purpose and assured participants of data confidentiality. All responses were tracked so that none were missed for all participants.

Data Analysis:

The collected data were analyzed using SPSS to examine response distributions through descriptive statistics, including frequency counts, standard deviations, and percentage distributions. The analysis focused on calculating the frequency and percentage of responses within the three rubric categories (Adoption, Neutrality, and Resistance) across all writing stages, providing insights into educators' varying levels of AI adoption in writing instruction.

In this study, the researchers adopted a streamlined approach to analyzing the outcomes obtained from educators. By focusing explicitly on quantifying the distribution of responses across the three core categories-Adoption, Neutrality, and Resistance-the analysis aligned directly with the study's primary objective: to uncover educators' implicit attitudes toward AI integration in writing instruction. The methodology intentionally avoided extraneous statistical comparisons that fell outside the scope of the research aims, ensuring clarity and precision in interpreting the data.

The intent was to move beyond mere descriptive statistics, endeavoring to elucidate the nuanced interplay between cognitive biases, pedagogical beliefs, and the perceived affordances and constraints of AI tools. By focusing on the distribution of responses within the adoption-resistance spectrum, the analysis sought to reveal the implicit tensions and contradictions that characterize educators' engagement with this emerging technology. This approach allows for a deeper exploration of the adoption-resistance paradox, moving beyond simple categorization to a more nuanced understanding of the factors that influence educators' willingness to integrate AI into their instructional practices. The findings are intended to offer insights into the complex motivations and reservations that drive educators' adoption or resistance, ultimately contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of the psychological and pedagogical dimensions of AI integration in language education.

3. Results and Discussions

Educators' Alignment with Teaching Writing Skills Using Generative AI in the Pre-Writing Stage

Table 4. Educators' Alignment with Teaching Writing Skills Using Generative AI (Pre-Writing) (Total N=340)

Writing Stage	Subskill	Adoption		Neutrality		Resistance	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Pre-writing Stage	Generating writing ideas using AI-powered brainstorming tools	60	17.6	215	63.2	65	19.1
	Developing structured outlines and concept maps with AI assistance	55	16.2	220	64.7	65	19.1
	Utilizing AI-generated key ideas as starting points for initial writing	50	14.7	210	61.8	80	23.5
	Classifying and organizing ideas in a logical sequence	45	13.2	230	67.6	65	19.1
	Developing exploratory questions about the topic with AI assistance	65	19.1	205	60.3	70	20.6
Total average		55	16.2	216	63.5	69	20.3

The quantitative results in Table 4 indicate that Neutrality had the highest percentage, averaging 63.5%, suggesting that the majority of language educators neither fully adopt nor outright resist the use of generative AI in the pre-writing stage. Meanwhile, Adoption was relatively low at 16.2%, while Resistance accounted for 20.3%, reflecting some hesitancy regarding AI integration at this stage. This tendency towards neutrality may be attributed to the preparatory nature of the pre-writing stage, which focuses on idea generation and

organization rather than actual writing production. For instance, regarding the skill of "classifying and organizing ideas in a logical sequence," 67.6% of educators expressed neutrality, while only 13.2% fully adopted AI tools for this purpose, and 19.1% resisted their use. This could indicate that some educators see AI as a supportive tool for organizing thoughts but not as an essential component of teaching writing.

Similarly, when examining educators' responses to "generating writing ideas using AI-powered brainstorming tools," 63.2% remained neutral, while 19.1% resisted the idea, possibly due to concerns that such tools might discourage students from developing their own critical and creative thinking skills. Nevertheless, 17.6% of educators embraced this approach, suggesting a growing awareness of AI's potential in stimulating creativity and expanding the range of ideas available to students. Conversely, there was a higher tendency toward resistance when using AI-generated key ideas as starting points for writing, with 23.5% rejecting this approach-the highest resistance rate observed in this stage. This resistance may stem from educators' concerns that relying on AI-generated content could reduce students' ability to think independently and develop original ideas.

These findings suggest that educators align more comfortably with AI-assisted writing in the pre-writing stage, likely because they perceive these tools as supportive rather than disruptive to their professional roles. Since AI in this phase primarily aids students in brainstorming, structuring ideas, and planning-rather than generating full written texts-educators may not see it as a direct threat to their instructional autonomy. However, despite this alignment, the results still indicate a neutral stance rather than full adoption. This neutrality suggests that deeper psychological and pedagogical concerns might be influencing educators' perceptions. While they recognize AI's potential as a facilitative tool, they remain hesitant to fully integrate it into their teaching practices. This hesitation could stem from underlying fears about dependency on AI, skepticism about its long-term impact on students' cognitive development, or uncertainty about how to effectively regulate AI use in educational settings.

Furthermore, the variation in resistance rates across different sub-skills within the pre-writing stage reinforces the idea that educators may be selectively open to AI assistance-supporting its role in idea generation and organization, while remaining cautious about allowing it to influence students' original thinking and problem-solving abilities. These findings suggest that language educators are not highly enthusiastic about adopting AI in the pre-writing stage, yet they do not entirely reject it either. This balanced stance may reflect their belief that AI can be a valuable assistive tool but should not replace critical thinking and traditional practices in developing students' writing skills.

Educators' Alignment with Teaching Writing Skills Using Generative AI in the Drafting /Initial Writing Stage

Table 5. Educators' Alignment with Teaching Writing Skills Using Generative AI (Drafting /Initial Writing) (Total N=340)

Writing Stage	Subskill	Adoption		Neutrality		Resistance	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Drafting /Initial Writing	Generating complete sentences and paragraphs with AI assistance	45	13.2	30	8.8	265	78.0
	Rephrasing and restructuring sentences using AI suggestions	38	11.2	22	6.5	280	82.3
	Expanding brief ideas into more detailed content with AI support	50	14.7	28	8.2	262	77.1
	Improving word choice and sentence clarity with AI recommendations	42	12.3	24	7.1	274	80.6
	Using AI-generated templates and sentence starters for structured writing	47	13.8	26	7.6	267	78.5
Total average		44.4	13.0	26	7.6	269.6	79.3

The results in Table 5 reveal a strong resistance among educators toward integrating generative AI into the Drafting/Initial Writing Stage. The overall resistance rate stands at 79.3%, significantly higher than in the pre-writing stage. This suggests a clear discomfort and skepticism about allowing AI to play a role in the actual composition process. One likely reason for this resistance is that AI-generated text at this stage encroaches upon the core responsibility of educators-teaching students how to construct meaningful and coherent writing. Unlike the pre-writing stage, where AI merely aids in structuring ideas, the drafting stage involves direct text generation, which may lead educators to fear that students will rely entirely on AI instead of developing their own writing skills. For instance, 82.3% of educators resisted AI tools for rephrasing and restructuring sentences, indicating a strong belief that such tasks should be student-driven rather than AI-assisted. Another possible explanation is a lack of trust in AI's ability to teach writing effectively. While AI tools can generate grammatically correct sentences, educators may worry that they lack contextual awareness, rhetorical nuance, and the ability to foster critical thinking. The 78.5% resistance to AI-generated templates and sentence starters further highlights this concern, as educators might feel that these tools produce formulaic writing that does not encourage authentic expression.

Additionally, these findings could reflect broader anxieties about AI replacing traditional pedagogical roles. With AI taking on aspects of drafting, sentence formation, and revision, some educators might perceive it as a challenge to their professional authority, fearing that their expertise in guiding students through the writing process could be diminished. The high resistance levels in this stage suggest that educators perceive generative AI as more of a threat than a support when it comes to actual text production, reinforcing the need for further discussions on how AI can be integrated into writing instruction without undermining fundamental literacy skills.

These findings regarding the Drafting/Initial Writing Stage highlight the underlying motivations of language educators in their stance toward AI-assisted writing. Despite previous studies such as (Cardon et al., 2023; Gasaymeh et al., 2024; Kim et al., 2025; Sain et al., 2025) emphasizing the potential benefits of generative AI in enhancing writing skills, educators in this study appear to hold a different perspective.

One possible reason for this divergence is the fundamental difference between theoretical expectations and classroom realities. While AI tools have been praised for their ability to provide instant feedback, suggest vocabulary improvements, and aid in sentence restructuring, educators may view these benefits as superficial if they do not align with deeper pedagogical goals, such as fostering originality, creativity, and critical thinking. The high resistance rate suggests that educators see writing as more than just a mechanical process of constructing sentences-it is a cognitive and rhetorical skill that AI may not be fully equipped to nurture.

Additionally, these results might indicate a discrepancy between research findings and practical concerns. While AI is often portrayed as a revolutionary tool in writing instruction, educators on the ground grapple with ethical dilemmas, assessment challenges, and concerns about over-reliance. If students lean too heavily on AI during the drafting stage, there is a risk of eroding essential writing competencies, making it harder for them to develop independent composition skills.

Moreover, this resistance could be shaped by a broader skepticism toward technology-driven pedagogies, particularly among educators who have limited exposure to AI tools or doubt their adaptability to traditional writing instruction frameworks. Unlike other technological advancements that have seamlessly integrated into education (such as grammar checkers or digital brainstorming tools), generative AI operates at a level that directly influences textual production, making educators more cautious about its long-term implications.

These findings suggest that while AI has promising applications in writing instruction, its role in drafting remains contentious among educators. The tension between pedagogical integrity and technological convenience continues to shape their perspectives, emphasizing the need for a balanced, research-informed approach to AI adoption in language education.

Educators' Alignment with Teaching Writing Skills Using Generative AI in the Revising/Editing Stage

Table 6. Educators' Alignment with Teaching Writing Skills Using Generative AI (Revising/Editing) (Total N=340)

Writing Stage	Subskill	Adoption		Neutrality		Resistance	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Revising/Editing Stage	Identifying and correcting grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors using AI tools	45	13.2	25	7.3	270	79.5
	Enhancing sentence structure and coherence with AI-generated suggestions	38	11.2	30	8.8	272	80.0
	Refining word choice and style to improve clarity and readability	50	14.7	22	6.5	268	78.8
	Checking text consistency and logical flow with AI feedback	42	12.3	28	8.2	270	79.5
Total average		43.8	**12.9**	26.2	7.7	270	79.4

The quantitative findings in Table 6 highlight a continuation of educators' resistance to integrating generative AI into the Revising/Editing Stage of writing instruction. With an average resistance rate of 79.4%, this phase closely aligns with the high levels of resistance observed in the Drafting/Initial Writing Stage. For instance, 79.5% of educators resisted using AI tools for identifying and correcting grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors, while 80.0% rejected AI-generated suggestions for enhancing sentence structure and coherence. This consistent resistance suggests that educators remain skeptical about AI's role in the later stages of writing, where human oversight and cognitive engagement are considered essential.

One possible explanation is that educators lack confidence in students' ability to critically engage with AI-generated edits. Unlike the Pre-Writing Stage, where AI is used as a supportive brainstorming tool, revising and editing require deeper cognitive reflection, critical judgment, and nuanced decision-making-skills that educators may believe AI cannot adequately develop. There is a concern that students might blindly accept AI-generated revisions without fully understanding why certain changes were made, ultimately weakening their own editorial skills.

Additionally, educators may perceive writing as a deeply human and context-dependent skill, where AI cannot fully grasp the subtleties of meaning, tone, or rhetorical intent. Revising and editing involve more than just grammar correction or structural improvements-they require a nuanced understanding of the author's intent, audience expectations, and overall coherence of the text. The fact that nearly 79.5% of educators opposed using AI for checking text consistency and logical flow suggests that they trust human judgment more than automated tools in maintaining the integrity of student writing.

Another possible reason for the high resistance could be concerns about AI's reliability and accuracy in revising text. While AI can identify surface-level errors, educators may feel that it lacks the ability to make meaningful improvements to a student's unique writing style. AI-generated feedback may be formulaic, contextually inappropriate, or even misleading, leading to skepticism about its effectiveness as a substitute for teacher-led feedback.

Furthermore, this resistance may reflect a broader apprehension about over-reliance on AI in education. Some educators might worry that if students consistently rely on AI for revision, they will struggle to develop their own self-editing skills, ultimately becoming passive recipients rather than active learners. Writing is a recursive process, and trial-and-error learning is crucial for developing strong writing habits-something that cannot be outsourced entirely to AI. These results underscore educators' belief that revising and editing require more human intervention than AI can provide. Despite the potential efficiency of AI-powered editing tools, trust in human judgment, skepticism about AI's capabilities, and concerns about student dependence continue to drive resistance to AI integration in this stage.

Educators' Alignment with Teaching Writing Skills Using Generative AI in the Publishing/Feedback Reception Stage

Table 7. Educators' Alignment with Teaching Writing Skills Using Generative AI (Publishing/Feedback Reception) (Total N=340)

Writing Stage	Subskill	Adoption		Neutrality		Resistance	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Publishing/Feedback Reception Stage	Correcting final text errors based on AI-generated feedback	78	22.9%	198	58.2%	64	18.8%
	Rephrasing sentences and improving clarity in response to AI suggestions	65	19.1%	212	62.4%	63	18.5%
	Adjusting tone and style to enhance readability before final submission	82	24.1%	190	55.9%	68	20.0%
	Total average	75	22.03%	200	58.83%	65	19.10%

Table 7 illustrates that educators exhibit a predominantly neutral stance (58.83%) regarding the use of generative AI in the Publishing/Feedback Reception Stage-a pattern similar to what was observed in the Pre-Writing Stage. Unlike the Drafting and Revising/Editing Stages, where resistance was significantly higher, this stage does not appear to provoke the same level of concern. This suggests that educators perceive AI as an assistive tool rather than a replacement for human input when it comes to finalizing written work.

One key factor behind this neutrality could be that the Publishing/Feedback Reception Stage does not involve generating original text but rather refining and improving what has already been written. Unlike drafting, where AI-generated content might threaten students' writing independence, this phase primarily involves corrections, stylistic adjustments, and final refinements, which educators may feel pose minimal risk to students' writing development. For instance, 58.2% of educators remained neutral about using AI for correcting final text errors, and 62.4% showed neutrality regarding AI-generated suggestions for rephrasing sentences and improving clarity. These figures suggest that educators do not perceive AI's role at this stage as overly intrusive or detrimental to students' learning.

Additionally, educators may see AI as a supportive tool rather than a primary agent of change in this phase. When students use AI to adjust tone, style, and clarity (a task where 55.9% of educators showed neutrality), it is likely that the final responsibility still rests with the student. Unlike earlier stages where AI might take a more generative role, here it functions as an editorial assistant rather than a writing substitute. Neutrality in this stage might stem from the nature of publishing and feedback as collaborative processes. Educators might believe that AI's involvement in offering feedback or refining writing does not fundamentally alter students' authorship but rather complements their ability to make independent improvements. Since finalizing a text is less about content creation and more about polishing existing work, teachers may feel that AI's contributions here are neither overwhelmingly beneficial nor particularly harmful-hence the neutral stance.

This shift from resistance to neutrality could also reflect a growing pragmatic acceptance of AI's utility for post-writing tasks. While educators remain wary of AI replacing cognitive writing processes, they might acknowledge that AI can help streamline minor refinements, saving time for both students and teachers. This practical recognition aligns with findings from prior stages, where teachers tended to resist AI in areas involving deep cognitive engagement but showed more flexibility when AI was used for structural support or enhancement. Educators' neutral alignment with AI in this stage likely stems from a perception that AI is merely an assistive tool, rather than a writing agent. Since publishing and feedback do not involve AI-generated content creation but rather improvements on existing work, educators may not view AI as a significant threat in this phase. However, the presence of a 19.1% resistance rate indicates that some skepticism persists, possibly due to concerns about students over-relying on AI for final refinements instead of developing independent self-editing skills.

4. Implications of the Study

This study offers both practical and theoretical implications for the evolving landscape of language education in the age of generative AI. Practically, the findings provide educators, curriculum designers, and policymakers with insight into the specific stages of writing instruction where AI integration is more welcomed (e.g., pre-writing and publishing) and where it is met with resistance (e.g., drafting and revising). This awareness can guide the development of professional training programs that help teachers leverage AI tools meaningfully—without compromising the cognitive, creative, and instructional depth of writing education.

Furthermore, the rubric introduced in this study may serve as a diagnostic tool for educational institutions seeking to evaluate teacher readiness, concerns, and support needs in relation to AI-assisted writing instruction. By mapping educators' orientations across adoption, neutrality, and resistance, the rubric can inform tailored interventions that foster more balanced and ethically guided technology integration.

Theoretically, the study contributes to the discourse on professional identity and technological mediation in pedagogy. It highlights how educators' responses to AI are not solely based on technological competence, but are also shaped by their pedagogical beliefs, ethical considerations, and perceptions of student agency. As such, the findings underscore the need for a nuanced, human-centered framework that accounts for the emotional, professional, and cognitive dimensions of AI adoption in writing education.

5. Conclusion

The findings of this study provide a nuanced understanding of language educators' attitudes toward using Generative AI in teaching writing skills across different stages of the writing process. A clear pattern emerges: educators are more accepting of AI when it serves as

an assistive tool in pre-writing and publishing/feedback reception stages, but they strongly resist its role in drafting and revising/editing stages, where AI engages in actual text production and refinement. This pattern reveals a fundamental concern among educators-protecting their professional role in guiding students through the writing process and ensuring authentic student engagement in writing development.

Neutrality in the Pre-Writing and Publishing/Feedback Reception Stages: The study found that educators remained predominantly neutral in their stance toward AI in both the pre-writing (63.5%) and publishing/feedback reception (58.83%) stages. This suggests that educators do not perceive AI as a significant threat in these stages, likely because these phases focus on support and preparation rather than actual content generation. In the pre-writing stage, AI assists in brainstorming, organizing ideas, and structuring outlines-tasks that facilitate writing without replacing students' cognitive engagement. Similarly, in the publishing and feedback reception stage, AI's role is more advisory, offering error correction, stylistic refinement, and clarity improvements rather than generating original content. Educators appear to accept AI in these phases because it acts as a facilitator rather than an author, reinforcing the notion that AI is a tool to enhance students' writing process rather than a replacement for their writing skills.

Resistance in the Drafting and Revising/Editing Stages: In stark contrast, educators demonstrated high resistance to AI's involvement in the drafting (79.3%) and revising/editing (79.4%) stages. This heightened opposition can be attributed to several factors. First, in the drafting stage, where AI generates sentences, paragraphs, and expands content, educators may fear that students will become overly dependent on AI, diminishing their own writing abilities. The idea that students might use AI-generated text as a substitute rather than a guide seems to be a major concern, threatening the fundamental role of writing instruction in developing authentic composition skills. Similarly, in the revising and editing stage, AI plays a more direct role in refining sentence structure, coherence, and word choice, which educators may see as requiring human intervention and judgment rather than algorithmic suggestions. The high resistance here suggests that teachers may lack trust in AI's ability to evaluate and refine writing with the same level of nuance as a human instructor.

A Middle Ground: Partial Adoption: While neutrality and resistance dominated educators' responses, the study also highlights a consistent, albeit limited, level of adoption across all four stages. Although adoption never surpassed 25% in any stage, its presence-ranging from 12.9% to 22%-indicates that some educators recognize the potential benefits of AI in writing instruction. This suggests that not all teachers reject AI outright; rather, their acceptance is conditional on its role as an enhancement tool rather than a replacement for traditional writing instruction.

Interpreting the Broader Implications: These findings point to a deeper psychological and pedagogical tension regarding AI in writing education. Educators do not reject AI wholesale; instead, they navigate a careful balance between leveraging AI as a supportive tool and resisting it as a potential disruptor to students' learning autonomy and teachers' instructional roles. Their willingness to integrate AI in preparatory and finalization stages suggests an emerging openness to AI's role in scaffolding writing tasks. However, their resistance to AI in drafting and revising reflects an enduring belief that writing is a cognitive, human-driven skill that cannot be effectively outsourced to AI without consequences for students' learning and creativity.

Ultimately, this study highlights both the promise and the paradox of AI adoption in writing education. While AI holds potential for enhancing the writing process, its full-scale integration is met with skepticism when it challenges educators' perceived role in fostering authentic student writing. Future research and professional development efforts should therefore focus on finding pedagogically sound ways to integrate AI without compromising students' independent writing abilities, ensuring that AI augments rather than replaces human instruction.

The conclusions of this study are deeply informed by and contribute back to the growing body of research on the integration of generative AI in education. The observed neutrality among educators in the pre-writing and publishing stages aligns with findings by Barrett and Pack (2023) and Söğüt (2024), who reported cautious optimism regarding AI's role in brainstorming, outlining, and surface-level revisions. This supports the notion that educators perceive AI as a supplementary tool when it facilitates organization or feedback without replacing students' intellectual labor.

Conversely, the high levels of resistance identified in the drafting and revising/editing stages reflect concerns raised by Shopovski (2024) and Cummings et al. (2024), who highlighted teachers' apprehension toward AI-generated content diminishing students' critical thinking and authentic authorship. The present study extends these concerns by demonstrating that such resistance is not merely theoretical but strongly represented in actual teacher responses. Furthermore, the findings echo Kim et al. (2025) and Tran (2025) in underscoring educators' preference for teacher-guided feedback over automated revisions, especially in contexts demanding higher-order writing competencies. The study also reinforces Creely (2024) and Cardon et al. (2023) by affirming that teachers' orientations toward AI are not solely technical, but deeply intertwined with professional identity, pedagogical values, and trust in students' ethical use of technology.

6. Limitations of the Study

While this study provides valuable insights into language educators' alignment with AI-assisted writing instruction, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the study primarily relied on self-reported perceptions from teachers, which may not fully capture their actual behaviors or the complexities of classroom dynamics when integrating AI. Educators' stated positions on adoption, neutrality, and resistance might be influenced by personal biases, institutional policies, or a lack of direct experience with AI tools in writing instruction. Second, the study focused on secondary school language teachers in Saudi Arabia, which limits the generalizability of the findings to other educational contexts. Cultural, technological, and pedagogical factors may shape AI adoption differently in other regions or

educational levels. Future research could explore how these attitudes compare across diverse linguistic and academic settings. Third, this research examined AI integration at a broad level without distinguishing between specific generative AI tools or their varying capabilities. Some AI applications may be more effective or acceptable in different writing stages, and a more granular analysis could yield deeper insights into educators' selective acceptance or rejection of AI assistance. Lastly, this study did not incorporate direct student perspectives or learning outcomes, which are crucial in understanding the impact of AI on writing instruction. Future research should investigate how students perceive AI's role in their writing development and how its use influences their engagement, creativity, and skill acquisition.

Despite these limitations, the study provides a foundational understanding of how language educators navigate the paradox of AI adoption and resistance in writing instruction, paving the way for further empirical investigations into this field.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to all the teachers who generously shared their time, insights, and experiences to make this study possible. Their contributions were invaluable to the success of this research. The authors also extend their appreciation to King Faisal University for its financial support in covering the publication fees, which facilitated the dissemination of this work.

Authors' contributions

Dr. Rawan Al-Saliti was responsible for reviewing and synthesizing the literature. Dr. Ghada Elmorsy and Dr. Samia Shahpo were responsible for collecting the quantitative data. Dr. Abdelrahim Ismail designed the study, developed the methodology, finalized the manuscript, and served as the corresponding author. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding

This work was supported by the Deanship of Scientific Research, Vice Presidency for Graduate Studies and Scientific Research, King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia (Proposal Number: KFU251283).

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Informed consent

Obtained.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Sciedu Press.

The journal's policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

References

Alkaissi, H., McFarlane, S. I., & February (2023). Artificial hallucinations in ChatGPT: Implications in scientific writing. *Cureus*, *15*(2). https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.35179

Baidoo-Anu, D., & Ansah, L. O. (2023). Education in the era of generative artificial intelligence (AI): Understanding the potential benefits of ChatGPT in promoting teaching and learning. *Journal of AI*, *7*(1), 52-62. https://doi.org/10.61969/jai.1337500

Barrett, A., & Pack, A. (2023). Not quite eye to AI: Student and teacher perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence in the writing process. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1), 59. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00427-0

Cardon, P., Fleischmann, C., Aritz, J., Logemann, M., & Heidewald, J. (2023). The challenges and opportunities of AI-assisted writing: Developing AI literacy for the AI age. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, *86*(3), 257-295.

https://doi.org/10.1177/23294906231176517

Creely, E. (2024). Exploring the Role of Generative AI in Enhancing Language Learning: Opportunities and Challenges. *International Journal of Changes in Education*, *1*(3), 158-167. https://doi.org/10.47852/bonviewIJCE42022495

Creswell, J. W. (2015). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. UK: Pearson.

Cummings, R. E., Monroe, S. M., & Watkins, M. (2024). Generative AI in first-year writing: An early analysis of affordances, limitations, and a framework for the future. *Computers and Composition*, *71*, 102827. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2024.102827

Ferdig, R., Gandolfi, E., & Oh, O. (2023, March). Preservice teachers' responses to AI-generated images in relation to fears and goals of future teaching. In *Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* (pp. 850-855). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE). Retrieved from https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/221936/

Gasaymeh, A. M. M., Beirat, M. A., & Abu Qbeita, A. A. A. (2024). University Students' Insights of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Writing Tools. *Education Sciences*, *14*(10), 1062. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14101062

Hesse, F., & Helm, G. (2025). Writing with AI in and beyond teacher education: Exploring subjective training needs of student teachers across five subjects. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, *41*(1), 21-36. https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2024.2431747

Hossain, M. K., & Al Younus, M. A. (2025). Teachers' perspectives on integrating ChatGPT into EFL writing instruction. *TESOL Communications, 4*(1), 41-60.

Jochim, J., & Lenz-Kesekamp, V. K. (2025). Teaching and testing in the era of text-generative AI: exploring the needs of students and teachers. *Information and learning sciences, 126*(1/2), 149-169. https://doi.org/10.1108/ILS-10-2023-0165

Kim, J., Yu, S., Detrick, R., & Li, N. (2025). Exploring students' perspectives on generative AI-assisted academic writing. *Education and Information Technologies*, *30*(1), 1265-1300. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10639-024-12878-7

Li, Z., Liang, C., Peng, J., & Yin, M. (2024, May). The value, benefits, and concerns of generative AI-powered assistance in writing. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*m. 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642625

Lim, W. M., Gunasekara, A., Pallant, J. L., Pallant, J. I., & Pechenkina, E. (2023). Generative AI and the future of education: Ragnarök or reformation? A paradoxical perspective from management educators. *The international journal of management education*, *21*(2), 100790. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100790

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

Sain, Z. H., Serban, R., Abdullah, N. B., & Thelma, C. C. (2025). Benefits and Drawbacks of Leveraging ChatGPT to Enhance Writing Skills in Secondary Education. *At-Tadzkir: Islamic Education Journal*, *4*(1), 40-52. https://doi.org/10.59373/attadzkir.v4i1.79

Shopovski, J. (2024). *Generative artificial intelligence, AI for scientific writing: A literature review.* Preprints, 2024060011. Retrieved from https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202406.0011/v1

Simelane, P. M., & Kittur, J. (2025). Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Teaching and Learning: Engineering Instructors' Perspectives. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*, *33*(1), e22813. https://doi.org/10.1002/cae.22813

Söğüt, S. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence in EFL writing: A pedagogical stance of pre-service teachers and teacher trainers. *Focus on ELT Journal*, 6(1), 58-73. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3395-7445

Song, Y., Kim, J., Xing, W., Liu, Z., Li, C., & Oh, H. (2025). Elementary school students' and teachers' perceptions toward creative mathematical writing with Generative AI. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2025.2455057

Stornaiuolo, A., Higgs, J., Jawale, O., & Martin, R. M. (2024). Digital writing with AI platforms: the role of fun with/in generative AI. *English Teaching: Practice & Critique, 23*(1), 83-103. https://doi.org/10.1108/ETPC-08-2023-0103

Tang, A., Li, K. K., Kwok, K. O., Cao, L., Luong, S., & Tam, W. (2024). The importance of transparency: Declaring the use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) in academic writing. *Journal of nursing scholarship, 56*(2), 314-318. https://doi.org/10.1111/jnu.12938

Tran, T. T. T. (2025). Enhancing EFL Writing Revision Practices: The Impact of AI-and Teacher-Generated Feedback and Their Sequences. *Education Sciences, 15*(2), 232. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15020232

Varanasi, R. A., Wiesenfeld, B. M., & Nov, O. (2025). AI Rivalry as a Craft: How Resisting and Embracing Generative AI Are Reshaping the Writing Profession. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2503.09901

Washington, J. (2023). The impact of generative artificial intelligence on writer's self-efficacy: a critical literature review. *Available at SSRN 4538043*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4538043