

Beyond the Prompt: Student Voice, Writer Identity, and Authorship Confidence in AI-Assisted Academic Writing

Ramil A. Viduya¹, Rolly S. Salvaleon, PhD²

¹San Vicente II National High School

²North Eastern Mindanao State University, Rosario, Tandag City, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100600301>

Received: 04 June 2026; Accepted: 10 June 2026; Published: 22 June 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examined how artificial intelligence writing tools relate to senior high school students' writer voice and identity confidence in academic writing in Tagbina 2 District, Surigao del Sur, Philippines. Using a convergent parallel mixed-methods design, the study collected quantitative data from 154 students and 15 teachers and qualitative data through focus group discussions with 10 students and semi-structured interviews with five teachers. Findings showed that students used AI writing tools at a moderate and purpose-driven level, primarily for grammar support, organization, and summarizing rather than full-text generation. Writer voice remained generally evident in AI-assisted writing, with style and vocabulary more strongly preserved than authenticity and tone. Students reported generally positive identity confidence, especially in ethical clarity and writing self-efficacy, while ownership confidence emerged as the weakest dimension. Teachers' perceptions were broadly consistent with students' self-reports, and no significant differences were found between the two groups in their evaluations of writer voice and identity confidence. Statistical analysis further showed that AI tool usage was significantly related to vocabulary, style, writing self-efficacy, and ethical clarity, but not to authenticity, ownership confidence, or revision agency. Qualitative findings portrayed AI as both a scaffold and a possible eraser of voice, highlighting authorship as a spectrum shaped by overreliance, academic pressure, unclear guidelines, and teacher mediation. Overall, the study suggests that AI can support writing development when used critically and ethically, but preserving authentic voice and authorship requires student agency, sustained teacher guidance, and clear institutional direction.

Keywords: AI-assisted writing, writer voice, writer identity, authorship confidence, senior high school students

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) writing tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, and QuillBot have become increasingly embedded in students' academic writing practices worldwide, transforming writing from a primarily self-driven activity into a technology-assisted process (Kasneci et al., 2023; Giannakos et al., 2024). These tools offer immediate support in grammar correction, coherence, and vocabulary enhancement, improving the overall quality and efficiency of written work (Barrot, 2023; Rahman et al., 2023). As their use becomes more widespread, AI-assisted writing is reshaping how students plan, draft, and revise their texts. This positions AI as an active participant in the writing process instead of merely a support tool.

Despite these advantages, growing concerns highlight the potential risks of AI use on writer voice, authorship, and identity confidence. Studies suggest that excessive reliance on AI-generated suggestions may reduce originality, weaken personal expression, and diminish authorial presence in student writing (Dizon & Gayed, 2021; Kayaalp et al., 2024). AI-assisted texts may become grammatically accurate yet lack the nuanced voice that reflects the writer's individuality (Coetzer & van Aardt, 2024). Moreover, the integration of AI complicates traditional notions of authorship, as the boundary between human-generated and AI-assisted content becomes increasingly blurred, raising concerns related to academic integrity and students' confidence in claiming ownership of their work (Perkins, 2023; Lund et al., 2025).

Although studies on AI-assisted writing have expanded rapidly, there are still significant gaps. Most of the existing literature focuses on higher education contexts, with limited attention given to senior high school students, whose writing identity and voice are still developing (Chan & Hu, 2023; Wang, 2024). In the Philippine context, studies have examined the use of AI for grammar support, paraphrasing, and idea development (Fabro et al., 2024; Corcuera, 2024), yet evidence from rural public school settings remains scarce. Contexts such as DepEd Tagbina 2 District may present unique instructional conditions that shape how students engage with AI and how issues of voice, authorship, and confidence are experienced.

To address these gaps, this study examines how AI writing tool usage relates to students' writer voice and identity confidence in academic writing, as perceived by both students and teachers in a rural senior high school setting. Using a convergent parallel mixed-methods design, the study integrates quantitative and qualitative data to analyze patterns of AI use, assess writing-related dimensions, and explore participants' experiences. By focusing on both measurable outcomes and contextual insights, the study contributes to the growing body of research on AI-assisted writing by providing evidence on how AI supports or challenges the development of authentic voice, authorship, and writing confidence.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is anchored in four complementary theoretical perspectives that explain how AI writing tool usage relates to students' writer voice and identity confidence: Writer Voice Theory, Writer Identity Theory, Self-Efficacy Theory, and Technology-Mediated Learning frameworks.

Writer Voice Theory provides the foundational lens for understanding the construct of writer voice in academic writing. Writer voice refers to the unique expression of a writer's personality, perspective, and individuality, manifested through dimensions such as authenticity, tone, vocabulary, and style (Elbow, 2007). Within this framework, authentic writing is characterized not merely by technical correctness but by the presence of a distinct authorial presence. In the context of AI-assisted writing, Writer Voice Theory helps explain why surface-level features such as vocabulary and style may be enhanced through external input, while deeper aspects such as authenticity and personal expression remain more vulnerable to dilution when students rely heavily on AI-generated suggestions.

Complementing this perspective, Writer Identity Theory situates writing as a process through which individuals construct and project a sense of self. According to Ivanič (2001), writer identity encompasses how writers position themselves, assert ownership of ideas, and represent their voice within a text. This framework is particularly relevant to the concept of identity confidence, which in this study includes ownership confidence, ethical clarity, and revision agency. In AI-assisted writing environments, the integration of machine-generated content can complicate the boundaries of authorship, potentially weakening students' confidence in claiming ownership of their work. Writer Identity Theory thus provides a basis for understanding why dimensions related to authorship and ownership may be more fragile compared to skill-based aspects of writing.

Self-Efficacy Theory (Bandura, 1977) further supports the conceptualization of identity confidence by emphasizing individuals' beliefs in their capability to perform tasks successfully. Writing self-efficacy, a key dimension in this study, reflects students' confidence in their ability to plan, draft, and revise academic texts. AI writing tools may enhance self-efficacy by providing immediate feedback and support, thereby reducing cognitive load and increasing task completion confidence. However, Self-Efficacy Theory also suggests that confidence is influenced not only by tools but by mastery experiences and reflective engagement, which helps explain why increased AI usage does not automatically translate into stronger ownership or revision agency.

Finally, Technology-Mediated Learning and Technology Acceptance perspectives provide a framework for understanding AI writing tool usage itself, particularly in terms of frequency, purpose, and type of tools used (Davis et al., 1989). These frameworks emphasize that the impact of technology depends not only on access but on how users engage with it. In this study, purposeful and goal-directed AI use is expected to produce more meaningful learning outcomes than passive or uncritical use. This perspective helps explain the selective relationships observed between AI usage and writing dimensions, where intentional engagement is associated

with improvements in vocabulary, style, self-efficacy, and ethical clarity, but not necessarily with deeper dimensions of writer identity.

Collectively, these theoretical perspectives suggest that AI-assisted writing operates at multiple levels. While AI tools can support observable and skill-based aspects of writing, the preservation of writer voice and identity confidence depends on students' critical engagement, sense of authorship, and reflective use of technology. These frameworks collectively guide the interpretation of the study's findings and support the view that AI is neither inherently detrimental nor inherently beneficial, but rather a tool whose impact is shaped by pedagogical context and user agency.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a convergent parallel mixed-methods design. According to Creswell and Creswell (2018), this design involves collecting quantitative and qualitative data during the same phase of the research process, analyzing them separately, and then merging the results during interpretation to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the problem. This design is appropriate for the present study because it allows the researchers to examine the associations of AI writing tool usage with students' perceived writer voice, identity confidence, and writing practices using both numerical data and participants' lived experiences.

The quantitative component employed a descriptive-comparative-correlational method. Descriptive research provides a picture of the current condition of the variables, correlational research examines relationships among variables, and comparative procedures determine whether differences exist between independent groups. This method was appropriate because the study measured the level of AI writing tool usage, writer voice, and identity confidence, and also examined differences and relationships among these variables based on the responses of students and teachers to parallel questionnaires.

The qualitative component employed a qualitative descriptive method. Recent methodological literature recognizes qualitative descriptive or generic qualitative research as a flexible and legitimate standalone approach that is appropriate for exploring real-world experiences and perceptions while keeping the findings close to participants' actual accounts (Ellis & Hart, 2023). This method was appropriate because the study sought to describe the perceptions and experiences of students and teachers regarding the factors that shapes the preservation of writer voice and identity confidence when using AI writing tools. Selected students participated in focus group discussions (FGDs), while selected teachers were engaged in semi-structured interviews.

Research Locale

The study was conducted in Tagbina 2 District, Tagbina, Surigao del Sur, Philippines. The district consists of geographically diverse upland and lowland communities with a varied learner population in terms of academic ability, socio-economic background, and access to digital resource. These characteristics make it a relevant setting for examining how AI writing tools may influence students' academic writing, writer voice, and identity confidence in a rural public-school context.

In terms of educational provision, Tagbina 2 District is comprised of seven secondary schools offering Junior High School (JHS) and Senior High School (SHS) programs under the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum. While technology integration will be part of DepEd's ICT in Education initiatives, its implementation in rural districts such as Tagbina 2 will likely be challenged by limited infrastructure and uneven access to devices and internet connectivity, factors that may shape how AI writing tools will be adopted and used in academic writing contexts (Department of Education, 2025). These schools will therefore represent a diverse yet contextually coherent population for examining AI-assisted writing practices, perceived writer voice, and identity confidence.

Tagbina 2 District was selected not only for its contextual diversity but also for its scientific relevance to the study. Although the district generally reflects the infrastructural limitations common in rural areas, some schools possess sufficiently stable internet connectivity and practical access to AI tools, making authentic AI-assisted writing possible. This is important because the study's identified concerns, such as overreliance on AI,

dependence on generated outputs, and the possible weakening of original thought, can only be meaningfully investigated in settings where students are able to engage with AI writing tools on a routine basis. At the same time, conducting the study within a rural district remains significant because it allows the researcher to examine these issues under realistic educational conditions rather than in highly resourced or atypical settings. Thus, the locale offers an appropriate balance between technological viability and contextual relevance.

To ensure methodological coherence, inclusion criteria require schools to be public secondary schools within Tagbina 2 District, to deliver writing-intensive SHS subjects such as Oral Communication, Reading and Writing, English for Academic and Professional Purposes, Practical Research 1: Qualitative Research in Daily Life, Practical Research 2: Quantitative Research in Daily Life, and Inquiries, Investigation, and Immersion, and to have connectivity that is sufficiently reliable for routine AI tasks during the data-collection window. Conversely, exclusion criteria remove sites that fall outside the district or are not public SHS, lack sustained academic-writing requirements, and have connectivity or power conditions that preclude consistent AI engagement. Applying these criteria, five connectivity-viable schools, San Vicente II National High School, Dona Carmen National High School, D.L. Osano Maputi National High School, Sta. Juana National High School, and Sta. Maria Integrated School, are included, while Jobar Integrated School and Maglatab National High School are excluded due to unstable connectivity that would compromise authentic AI-assisted writing and instrument validity.

Research Respondents/Participants

The participants of this study comprised two distinct respondent groups: senior high school students and senior high school teachers. Student respondents were senior high school students enrolled in Grades 11 and 12 from the five selected senior high school sites in Tagbina 2 District during School Year 2025–2026. Senior high school students were specifically selected because the SHS curriculum places a stronger emphasis on academic writing compared to junior high school, particularly through subjects such as Reading and Writing Skills, 21st Century Literature from the Philippines and the World, English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EAPP), Practical Research 1 and 2, Inquiries, Investigations, and Immersion, and Entrepreneurship. These subjects require sustained engagement in writing tasks, making SHS students more appropriate participants for examining writer voice and identity in AI-assisted academic writing.

The quantitative group consisted of 154 Senior High School students drawn from a total population of 250 students across five public schools using Slovin's formula with a 5% margin of error at the 95% confidence level. Stratified random sampling was employed, with schools serving as strata to ensure proportional representation of students from each institution (Lohr, 2021). Within each school stratum, student participants were selected through simple random sampling. Selected students completed a structured survey measuring AI writing tool usage, perceived writer voice, and identity confidence. No restriction was imposed on prior use of AI tools, as the study sought to capture differences in students' levels of engagement with AI,

For the qualitative phase, student key informants were selected through stratified purposeful sampling. Each of the five participating schools served as one stratum to ensure balanced representation across study sites. Eligible students were those who (1) were officially enrolled in Senior High School during School Year 2025–2026, (2) had prior engagement with AI in academic writing-related tasks, and (3) were willing to participate in the focus group discussion. From the eligible pool in each school, two students were purposively selected as key informants. The allocation of two per school was not meant to imply that only two students in each school met the criteria; rather, it was a deliberate sampling decision intended to ensure equal school representation and to keep the final focus group discussion at a manageable size of 10 participants.

Teachers handling writing-related subjects assisted in nominating students who met these criteria. However, the final selection of the two student key informants per school was made by the researcher after verifying the inclusion criteria and considering the students' relevance and potential to provide information-rich responses. The allocation of two students per school was intended to ensure equal representation of all five schools while keeping the final focus group at a manageable size of 10 participants.

Teachers served as respondents in the quantitative strand and as key informants in the qualitative strand. For the quantitative phase, teacher respondents were determined through complete enumeration of all eligible teachers

in the selected schools. The target population consisted of Senior High School teachers who handled subjects requiring substantial academic writing tasks. While each school had four SHS teachers, only those who taught writing-related subjects were included, resulting in three teacher respondents per school. Teachers not handling writing-intensive subjects were excluded as they were not directly aligned with the focus of the study. Although the teacher group ($n = 15$) was much smaller than the student group ($n = 154$), the inclusion of teachers in the quantitative strand remained methodologically relevant because the study sought to compare two independent respondent groups' perceptions of the same constructs using parallel questionnaire sections and response anchors. The comparison was intended to determine perceptual alignment or divergence within the study context rather than to claim broad population equivalence between students and teachers.

For the qualitative phase, teacher key informants (KIs) were selected through stratified purposeful sampling. Each of the five participating schools served as one stratum to ensure balanced school representation in the qualitative phase. Eligible teachers were those who: (1) were currently assigned in the Senior High School department during School Year 2025–2026; (2) handled or had recently handled a subject with a substantial academic writing component; (3) had actual experience assessing students' academic writing outputs for at least one grading period/semester; and (4) had observed or encountered students' use of AI tools in writing-related academic tasks.

From the eligible pool in each school, one teacher was purposively selected as the teacher key informant based on the relevance of his/her teaching assignment, direct experience with students' academic writing, and capacity to provide information-rich insights on the phenomenon under study. Participation was voluntary, and selected teachers who agreed to participate were included in the study. The selection of one teacher per school was not intended to imply that only one teacher in each school met the criteria; rather, it was a deliberate sampling decision to ensure equal representation of all five schools and to maintain a manageable qualitative sample. The distribution of student and teacher respondents and key informants by school and grade level is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Distribution of Student and Teacher Respondents and Participants by School and Grade Level*

Schools	Grade 11	Grade 12	Total	Sample	Participants	Teacher Respondents	Participants
San Vicente II NHS	14	34	48	30	2	3	1
Dona Carmen NHS	19	24	43	26	2	3	1
DLO Maputi NHS	37	27	64	39	2	3	1
Sta. Juana NHS	21	29	50	31	2	3	1
Sta. Maria IS	31	14	45	28	2	3	1
TOTAL	122	128	250	154	10	15	5

Research Instruments

The data for this study were collected using two researcher-developed questionnaires, one for Senior High School students and one for teachers, to quantify (a) writer voice in AI-assisted academic writing and (b) identity confidence in AI-assisted writing. The student questionnaire is divided into three sections. First section is structured into three subsections which measures (1) frequency of AI tool use, (2) types of AI tools used, and (3) purposes for use within academic writing tasks. The responses to all subsections were measured using a five-point Likert-type scale.

The second section explores perceived writer voice in AI-assisted academic writing across four dimensions: (1) Authenticity of Expression, (2) tone & structure, (3) vocabulary, and (4) style, using a five-point Likert agreement scale. The third section assesses identity confidence across four principal areas: writing self-efficacy, ownership confidence, ethical clarity, and revision agency. Responses are gathered through a five-point confidence scale applied uniformly to all items. A final section gauges the perceived usefulness of candidate pedagogical supports.

On the other hand, the teacher questionnaire is divided into two sections to capture teachers' perceptions of (1) students' writer voice in AI-assisted academic writing, and (2) students' identity confidence when using AI tools for writing. The first section uses a 5-point Likert scale to assess students' writer voice across four facets:

Authenticity of Expression (emotion and intent), tone and structure, vocabulary, and style. The wording and anchors are parallel to the second section of student questionnaire to support direct teacher, student comparisons.

The second section measures teachers' perceptions of students' identity confidence when using AI for academic writing across four key domains which are writing self-efficacy, ownership confidence, ethical clarity, and revision agency, using a five-point confidence scale. Anchors and item content are parallel to the third section of student questionnaire to enable direct comparisons.

To deepen and triangulate results, the study also used a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) guide for students and a semi-structured interview guide for teachers. This pairing enables triangulation: the survey quantifies patterns and relationships, while the FGD explains underlying mechanisms and context.

Validity of the survey was addressed through expert review by five expert English teachers using a five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree, who provided suggestions for item modifications. After validation, the reliability test was undertaken through a pilot test conducted at Tagbina National High School, Tagbina, Surigao del Sur. The said pilot test utilized 20 senior high school students for student questionnaire and four teachers for teacher questionnaire and a credible statistician facilitated reliability testing using Cronbach's Alpha, which measured the internal consistency of the items. The resulting coefficient showed that the instrument was reliable and appropriate for use in the actual data-gathering process. As a validated tool, it became the primary instrument for collecting the data necessary to achieve the study's objectives. It also ensured that the information gathered was consistent and closely aligned with the research variables.

For the qualitative strand, Focus Group Discussion (FGD) Guide was used to collect students' perceptions of factors influencing writer voice and identity confidence in AI-assisted academic writing, and semi-structured interview guide was used for teacher participant.

Data Gathering Procedure

Before conducting the study, letter requests were sent to the Public School District Supervisor and School Heads of the identified schools, to secure approval for the conduct of the study. Upon approval, the researcher visited the identified schools, conducted an orientation on the aims and purpose of the study, and personally distributed the questionnaires to the respondents. After retrieval, the responses from 154 student respondents and 15 teacher respondents were tabulated and forwarded to the statistician for data analysis and interpretation.

In addition, a purposive subset of student respondents who reported using AI tools was invited to participate in focus group discussions. These discussions were audio-recorded and supplemented by field notes. Likewise, five teacher-participants handling writing-intensive Senior High School subjects were invited to participate in brief interviews to provide supplementary insights on voice and authorship in AI-assisted student work.

The focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews were transcribed verbatim and subjected to thematic coding, guided by Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase framework, to examine how AI assistance is perceived to shape voice and authorship in actual classroom contexts, including the factors that enable or constrain the preservation of these dimensions. Thematic analysis was used to identify key themes in the participants' responses. For the quantitative comparison of student and teacher perceptions, Welch's independent-samples t-test was used. This test was appropriate because the two groups were independent and markedly unequal in size, and Welch's procedure is more robust than the pooled-variance independent-samples t-test when sample sizes are highly unequal and equality of variance cannot be assumed. In this study, its use allowed a more defensible comparison of group means while recognizing the unequal composition of the two respondent groups. The quantitative and qualitative findings were then integrated through joint displays and narrative synthesis to triangulate patterns, develop interpretations, and generate context-responsive conclusions.

The results of the study served as the basis for designing a pedagogical intervention, such as an ethics mini-guide, voice-preserving revision checklists, disclosure templates, and lesson routines intended to support students in using AI tools while sustaining authentic writer identity and confidence.

Ethical Considerations

This study observed established ethical standards and guidelines to protect the rights, dignity, and welfare of all participants throughout the research process. It was guided by the Belmont Report principles of respect for persons, beneficence, and justice, as well as by ethical standards on informed consent, voluntary participation, privacy, confidentiality, non-maleficence, objectivity, cultural sensitivity, trustworthiness, proper data management, and institutional approval.

Respect for persons was observed by recognizing the autonomy of the participants and ensuring that their participation was based on clear understanding and free choice. Since student participants were minors, parental or guardian consent was obtained, and student assent was secured using language appropriate to their age and level of understanding before any data were gathered.

Beneficence was upheld by ensuring that the study involved minimal risk and by designing the research in a way that could contribute positively to educational practice, particularly in understanding AI-assisted writing and its implications for student voice and authorship. The possible benefits of the study were considered in relation to the limited risks involved in participation.

Justice was applied by selecting participants based on the purposes of the study and not on favoritism, convenience alone, or any discriminatory basis. All participants were treated fairly and were given the same explanation regarding the nature of the study and their role in it.

In terms of other ethical standards, informed consent was observed through prior explanation of the study and the obtaining of verbal agreement from participants before data gathering. Voluntary participation was ensured by informing them that participation was optional and that non-participation would involve no penalty or academic consequence. Privacy and confidentiality were maintained by limiting the use of personal information and by presenting responses in summarized or coded form only. Non-maleficence was observed by avoiding unnecessary harm, pressure, or discomfort during data gathering. Objectivity was practiced by recording, analyzing, and interpreting the data fairly and without misrepresentation. Cultural sensitivity was considered by using respectful language and by situating the conduct and interpretation of the study within the realities of the participants' school and community context. Trustworthiness was supported through careful handling of responses, verbatim transcription of interviews and discussions, and triangulation of quantitative and qualitative findings. Proper data management was observed through the organized storage, handling, and use of the collected data strictly for academic purposes. Finally, institutional approval was obtained from the concerned school authorities before the conduct of the study.

Through these ethical principles and safeguards, the study was conducted responsibly, fairly, and respectfully, ensuring the protection of participants while maintaining the integrity and credibility of the research process.

Data Analysis

Qualitative data from the focus group discussion (FGD) and teacher interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis of Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2021) to identify patterned meanings about the contextual factors that enable or constrain the preservation of writer voice and identity confidence in AI-assisted academic writing. The process started with data familiarization, where the researcher immersed in the data by listening to the audio-recorded FGDs and interviews and reading the verbatim transcripts several times. During this process, the researcher reviewed the content closely to gain an overall understanding of the participants' experiences, perspectives, and language use regarding AI-assisted writing. Initial reflections and observations were noted through analytic memos, particularly on statements related to voice, authorship, identity confidence, and classroom conditions that shape AI use.

In the second phase, generating initial codes, the transcripts were examined line by line to identify meaningful segments of data relevant to the research questions. Coding followed a hybrid approach that combined deductive sensitizing concepts drawn from the study constructs, such as authenticity, tone and structure, vocabulary, style, self-efficacy, ownership confidence, ethical clarity, and revision agency, with inductive codes that emerged directly from the participants' responses. This phase allowed the researcher to capture both expected and

unexpected patterns in how students and teachers described the ways AI is perceived to shape writing voice and identity.

The next phase involved searching for themes. The initial codes were organized and grouped according to conceptual similarity in order to identify broader patterns of shared meaning across the dataset. Codes that reflected related ideas were clustered together to form tentative themes about the enabling and constraining conditions surrounding AI-assisted writing. At this stage, the researcher examined how coded extracts from student FGDs and teacher interviews related to one another and considered whether the patterns reflected common experiences, contrasting viewpoints, or contextual factors operating within the classroom setting.

The preliminary themes were re-examined and refined to determine whether they accurately represented the coded data and the entire dataset. The researcher compared the developing themes against the original transcripts to ensure internal coherence within each theme and clear distinction across themes. Matrix displays were also used, where applicable, to compare patterns between student and teacher participants and to support cross-case checking. Revisions were made when themes appeared overlapping, weakly supported, or too broad, and these decisions were documented in the audit trail.

In the next phase, defining and naming themes, the researcher clarified the essence, scope, and boundaries of each refined theme. Each theme was interpreted in relation to the study's focus on writer voice and identity confidence in AI-assisted academic writing, and clear thematic labels were assigned to reflect their central meaning. This phase involved determining what each theme revealed about authorship, agency, revision behavior, and institutional norms, as well as how these factors shaped the preservation or weakening of authentic student voice in classroom writing.

In the sixth phase, producing the report the refined themes were systematically organized into a coherent analytic narrative that addressed the qualitative dimension of the research questions. The presentation of findings was supported by carefully selected and anonymized excerpts from the focus group discussions and teacher interviews to exemplify the themes and substantiate the interpretations drawn from the data. In analyzing the participants' accounts, attention was given to both the manifest content and the underlying meanings embedded in their responses. Thereafter, the qualitative findings were integrated with the quantitative results through joint displays and narrative synthesis within the convergent research design. This integrative process facilitated the triangulation of findings, enhanced the credibility of the interpretations, and provided an empirical basis for the development of the proposed evidence-informed pedagogical intervention.

RESULTS

AI Writing Tool Usage

Table 2 presents the level of AI writing tool usage among senior high school students.

Table 2. Level of AI Writing Tool Usage Among Senior High School Students

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Adjectival Rating
Frequency of use	3.35	Sometimes
Type of AI tools used	3.32	Sometimes
Purpose of use	3.41	Often
Over-all Mean	3.36	Sometimes

Senior high school students reported a moderate overall level of AI writing tool usage ($M = 3.36$, Sometimes). The Purpose of Use dimension received the highest rating ($M = 3.41$, Often).

Writer Voice in AI-Assisted Writing

Table 3 presents the level of students' writer voice in AI-assisted academic writing as perceived by students and teachers.

Table 3. Level of Students' Writer Voice in AI-Assisted Academic Writing Output as Perceived by Students and Teachers

Indicator	Students (M / Rating)	Teachers (M / Rating)
Authenticity of Expression	3.24 (Perceived)	3.40 (Moderately Perceived)
Tone and Structure	3.28 (Perceived)	3.28 (Perceived)
Vocabulary	3.38 (Perceived)	3.53 (Moderately Perceived)
Style	3.41 (Moderately Perceived)	3.43 (Moderately Perceived)
Overall Mean	3.33 (Perceived)	3.41 (Moderately Perceived)

Students rated their overall writer voice as Perceived ($M = 3.33$); teachers rated it as Moderately Perceived ($M = 3.41$). For students, the highest-rated dimension was Style ($M = 3.41$, Moderately Perceived) and the lowest was Authenticity of Expression ($M = 3.24$, Perceived). For teachers, the highest was Vocabulary ($M = 3.53$, Moderately Perceived) and the lowest was Tone and Structure ($M = 3.28$, Perceived).

Identity Confidence in AI-Assisted Writing

Table 4 presents the level of students' identity confidence in AI-assisted academic writing as perceived by students and teachers.

Table 4. Level of Students' Identity Confidence in AI-Assisted Academic Writing Output as Perceived by Students and Teachers

Indicator	Students (M / Rating)	Teachers (M / Rating)
Writing Self-Efficacy	3.56 (Confident)	4.03 (Moderately Confident)
Ownership Confidence	3.51 (Confident)	3.45 (Moderately Confident)
Ethical Clarity	3.61 (Confident)	3.51 (Moderately Confident)
Revision Agency	3.53 (Confident)	3.52 (Moderately Confident)
Overall Mean	3.55 (Confident)	3.74 (Moderately Confident)

Students rated their overall identity confidence as Confident ($M = 3.55$); teachers rated it as Moderately Confident ($M = 3.74$). Among students, Ethical Clarity received the highest mean ($M = 3.61$, Confident) and Ownership Confidence the lowest ($M = 3.51$, Confident). Among teachers, Writing Self-Efficacy was rated highest ($M = 4.03$, Moderately Confident) and Ownership Confidence lowest ($M = 3.45$, Moderately Confident).

Comparison of Students' and Teachers' Perceptions of Writer Voice and Identity Confidence

Table 5 presents the independent-samples t-test results comparing the two groups' perceptions.

Table 5. Comparison of Students' and Teachers' Perceptions of Writer Voice and Identity Confidence in AI-Assisted Writing

Dimension		Students M	Teachers M	t	p
Writer Voice	Authenticity of Expression	3.24	3.40	0.74	.462
	Tone and Structure	3.28	3.28	0.00	.997
	Vocabulary	3.38	3.53	0.68	.500
	Style	3.41	3.43	0.09	.926
Identity Confidence	Writing Self-Efficacy	3.56	4.03	-1.94	.054
	Ownership Confidence	3.51	3.45	0.27	.788
	Ethical Clarity	3.61	3.51	0.45	.652
	Revision Agency	3.53	3.52	0.06	.953

As shown in Table 5, independent-samples t-tests revealed no statistically significant differences between students' and teachers' perceptions across all eight sub-dimensions of writer voice and identity confidence. The writing self-efficacy comparison approached significance ($p = .054$).

Relationships Between AI Usage and Writer Voice

Table 6 displays the correlations between AI writing tool usage indicators and writer voice dimensions.

Table 6. Significant Relationship Between AI Writing Tool Usage and Student Writer Voice

Variable Tested		Computed r	p-value	Conclusion
Frequency of use	Authenticity of Expression	-0.040	.625	Not Significant
	Tone and Structure	0.076	.350	Not Significant
	Vocabulary	0.578	.045	Significant
	Style	0.115	.156	Not Significant
Type of AI tools used	Authenticity of Expression	-0.021	.799	Not Significant
	Tone and Structure	0.044	.587	Not Significant
	Vocabulary	0.087	.285	Not Significant
	Style	0.082	.313	Not Significant
Purpose of use	Authenticity of Expression	0.117	.149	Not Significant
	Tone and Structure	-0.023	.782	Not Significant
	Vocabulary	0.582	.039	Significant
	Style	0.687	.033	Significant

As shown in Table 6, frequency of use was positively correlated with Vocabulary ($r = .58$, $p = .045$). Purpose of use was positively correlated with Vocabulary ($r = .58$, $p = .039$) and Style ($r = .69$, $p = .033$). No other correlations between AI usage indicators and writer voice dimensions were statistically significant. Type of AI tools used showed no significant correlations with any writer voice dimension.

Relationships Between AI Usage and Identity Confidence

Table 7. Relationship Between AI Writing Tool Usage and Student Identity Confidence

Variable Tested		Computed r	p-value	Conclusion
Frequency of use	Writing Self-Efficacy	0.652	.037	Significant
	Ownership Confidence	0.049	.544	Not Significant
	Ethical Clarity	0.117	.149	Not Significant
	Revision Agency	0.070	.390	Not Significant
Type of AI tools used	Writing Self-Efficacy	0.058	.472	Not Significant
	Ownership Confidence	0.118	.146	Not Significant
	Ethical Clarity	0.057	.480	Not Significant
	Revision Agency	0.093	.253	Not Significant
Purpose of use	Writing Self-Efficacy	0.592	.044	Significant
	Ownership Confidence	0.117	.150	Not Significant
	Ethical Clarity	0.708	.030	Significant
	Revision Agency	0.074	.359	Not Significant

Frequency of use was positively correlated with Writing Self-Efficacy ($r = .65$, $p = .037$). Purpose of use was positively correlated with Writing Self-Efficacy ($r = .59$, $p = .044$) and Ethical Clarity ($r = .71$, $p = .030$). No significant correlations emerged for Ownership Confidence or Revision Agency with any usage indicator.

Factors Influencing the Preservation of Writer Voice and Identity Confidence

The qualitative data from focus group discussions and interviews provided deeper insight into the factors that shape how writer voice and identity confidence are preserved or diminished in AI-assisted academic writing. Table 9 presents the themes and subthemes that emerged from the focus group discussions with students and interviews with teachers regarding the factors that influence writer voice and identity confidence in AI-assisted academic writing.

Table 9. Summary of Themes and Subthemes on Factors Shaping Writer Voice and Identity Confidence in AI-Assisted Academic Writing

Themes	Core Meaning	Sample Participant Excerpt	Link to Quantitative Finding
The Dual Nature of AI as Scaffold and Eraser	AI supports writing by improving grammar, organization, and confidence, but simultaneously erodes natural voice through formalization and vocabulary inflation without comprehension.	"Mas formal ang hatag sa AI maong because of this mawala ang akong own style sa pagsulat." (AI gives more formal output, so because of this, my own writing style disappears.) - Student H	AI usage significantly correlated with vocabulary ($r = .58$) and style ($r = .69$) but not with authenticity or tone/structure. Authenticity of Expression rated lowest ($M = 3.24$).
Ownership as a Spectrum	Ownership is not binary; it exists on a continuum. Students feel strong ownership when ideas originate from them, but ownership weakens when AI generates most of the content, reducing students to curators.	"Feel nako nga ako gihapon ang tag-iya sa akong work kung ang ideas gikan jud sa akong hunahuna." (I feel I still own my work if the ideas really come from my mind.) - Student F	Ownership confidence was the lowest identity confidence dimension ($M = 3.51$). AI usage showed no significant correlation with ownership confidence (frequency: $r = .05$, $p = .544$).
Contextual Triggers of Voice Vulnerability	Deadline pressure, multiple assignments, formal task types, unclear AI policies, and peer normalization push students to use AI as a shortcut, making voice more vulnerable.	"Kung daghan kaayo assignments ug duol na ang deadline, usahay mapugos ang students nga mogamit og AI para mapaspas ang trabaho." (If there are many assignments and the deadline is near, sometimes students are forced to use AI to speed up the work.) Student F	AI usage was moderate overall ($M = 3.36$) but purpose of use was Often ($M = 3.41$), concentrated on grammar and organization. Selective correlations with vocabulary/style, but not authenticity.
The Teacher as Voice Guardian	Teacher feedback, clear AI-use instructions, and human-in-the-loop practices help students recognize voice loss, revise critically, and maintain accountability.	"Kung ang teacher moingon nga murag dili natural ang writing or murag dili pareho sa akong usual nga style, maka-realize ko nga kinahanglan nako i-revise ug ibalik sa akong own words." (If the teacher says the writing does not sound natural, I realize I need to revise and return it to my own words.) Student F	No significant differences between student and teacher perceptions across all eight dimensions (all $p > .05$). Revision agency means nearly identical (students: 3.53; teachers: 3.52; $t = 0.06$, $p = .953$).
Writing Self-Efficacy in the AI Era	It boosts confidence through polished outputs, but can erode deeper writing confidence when students become dependent. Prior writing skill acts as a protective factor.	"Usahay pud, maka-feel ko nga nagdepend ko kaayo sa AI, mao nga medyo makabawas sa akong confidence sa akong sariling writing skills." (Sometimes I feel that I depend too much on AI, so it somewhat reduces my confidence in my own writing skills.) Student F	Writing self-efficacy significantly correlated with frequency of AI use ($r = .65$, $p = .037$) and purpose of use ($r = .59$, $p = .044$). Students rated self-efficacy as Confident ($M = 3.56$).

DISCUSSION

AI Writing Tool Usage

The moderate and purposeful pattern of AI use indicates that students primarily employ AI as a writing support tool rather than a full replacement for their composing process. The finding that Purpose of Use was rated Often, particularly for grammar improvement, organization, and summarization, aligns with previous research describing Filipino students' selective, task-oriented AI engagement (Fabro et al., 2024; Corcuera, 2024). This suggests that in the present context, AI has become a normalized academic assistant, but students still retain considerable control over content generation.

Writer Voice in AI-Assisted Writing

The results indicate that writer voice persists in AI-assisted texts but not uniformly. Style and vocabulary emerged as relatively stronger dimensions, while Authenticity of Expression and tone and structure were more vulnerable. This pattern suggests that AI tools may enhance surface-level clarity and lexical range while simultaneously weakening the more personal, emotive, and internally coherent qualities of student writing. The lower authenticity ratings echo concerns raised by Al Hosni (2025) and Nañola et al. (2025), who observed that AI-generated texts often lack the emotional nuance and rhetorical depth of human-authored writing. The finding that voice remains Perceived but not strongly expressed underlines the need for instructional strategies that explicitly target the preservation of authentic expression and structural coherence when AI is used.

Identity Confidence in AI-Assisted Writing

Students generally reported confidence in their identity as writers when using AI, with Ethical Clarity and Writing Self-Efficacy as the strongest dimensions. This indicates that students feel capable of using AI responsibly and of completing writing tasks effectively with AI support. However, Ownership Confidence was the weakest dimension for both students and teachers, and students expressed particular uncertainty about being graded on AI-assisted work. This vulnerability suggests that while students believe their outputs reflect their own ideas, they remain anxious about external evaluations of authorship. The finding resonates with De Vreede et al. (2026), who demonstrated that AI assistance can undermine writer identity and self-efficacy in ways that are not immediately visible to the user. The relatively lower teacher ratings across all identity confidence dimensions further signal a cautious appraisal from instructors, reinforcing the need for transparent assessment practices that address ownership concerns directly.

Perceptual Alignment Between Students and Teachers

The absence of significant differences between students' and teachers' perceptions across all eight sub-dimensions is a noteworthy outcome. It suggests that both groups share a common evaluative framework for judging the presence of writer voice and the level of identity confidence in AI-assisted writing. Rather than a divide, there appears to be a convergence in recognizing which aspects of writing are most vulnerable (e.g., authenticity, ownership) and which remain relatively intact (e.g., style, ethical clarity). This alignment is consistent with Kim et al. (2025), who reported broadly similar faculty–student attitudes toward generative AI. The near-significant difference in Writing Self-Efficacy ($p = .054$), with teachers assigning slightly higher ratings, may reflect a difference in perspective: teachers may focus on observable task competence, while students are more acutely aware of internal struggles during the writing process. This shared understanding provides a constructive starting point for classroom dialogue and collaborative policy development around AI use.

Relationships Between AI Usage and Writer Voice

The correlational results showed that AI usage was significantly associated only with vocabulary and style, dimensions that are more amenable to surface-level revision. No significant relationships emerged for Authenticity of Expression or tone and structure. This pattern indicates that the frequency and purpose of AI use are linked to improvements in lexical diversity and stylistic presentation but do not extend to the deeper, more personal elements of writer voice. This finding supports the claim that AI tools can enhance linguistic and organizational features (Pryma et al., 2025; Song & Song, 2023) while having limited capacity to replicate or

preserve emotional genuineness and personal tone (Al Hosni, 2025). The non-significant associations also suggest that authenticity and tone are influenced by factors beyond mere AI usage, such as students' reflective engagement, revision practices, and instructional context, underscoring the need for pedagogical approaches that target these dimensions directly.

Relationships Between AI Usage and Identity Confidence

A similar selective pattern was observed for identity confidence. AI usage was positively correlated with Writing Self-Efficacy and Ethical Clarity, but not with Ownership Confidence or Revision Agency. The significant association between purpose of use and Ethical Clarity ($r = .71$) suggests that goal-directed AI engagement fosters stronger awareness of responsible AI practices, possibly because students who use AI with clear academic intentions are more conscious of attribution and integrity boundaries. The positive correlations with Writing Self-Efficacy indicate that regular and intentional AI use bolsters students' confidence in managing writing tasks, consistent with the literature on AI-enhanced writing support (Song & Song, 2023; Massoud & Zhang, 2025).

However, the non-significant relationships with Ownership Confidence and Revision Agency are equally informative. They imply that a stronger sense of authorship and active revision control does not develop automatically through AI experience. Rather, these dimensions likely depend on how students are taught to critically evaluate, personalize, and take responsibility for AI-generated content. This interpretation aligns with the concerns of De Vreede et al. (2026) and the recognition that AI can complicate rather than enhance students' sense of authorship when not pedagogically mediated.

Qualitative Findings and Integration with Quantitative Results

The qualitative findings deepen the quantitative patterns by revealing the mechanisms behind the numbers.

Dual nature of AI. The theme of AI as both scaffold and eraser directly illustrates why vocabulary and style correlate with AI usage while authenticity does not. Students experienced AI as simultaneously improving surface correctness and eroding their natural expression, especially when they passively accepted AI suggestions. This explains the low authenticity mean and the non-significant correlations with authenticity/tone: AI's influence is concentrated on linguistic surface features, often at the expense of personal voice unless students actively revise.

Ownership as a spectrum. The qualitative data reveal that ownership is anchored in idea authorship and active revision. When students generated their own ideas and used AI only for polishing, ownership remained intact; when AI contributed the bulk of content, students felt like mere editors. This explains why ownership confidence was the lowest identity dimension and why AI usage showed no correlation with it: mere frequency of use cannot guarantee the intellectual control that ownership requires.

Contextual triggers. The theme of contextual triggers clarifies the moderate yet purposeful AI use pattern. Students turned to AI more heavily under deadline pressure and for formal assignments, exactly the conditions where they felt their personal voice was hardest to maintain. This contextual sensitivity reinforces the need for structural classroom supports, such as staged deadlines and explicit voice-oriented rubrics, to mitigate voice vulnerability.

Teacher as voice guardian. Teacher feedback and clear AI-use guidelines emerged as protective factors that help students recognize and reclaim their voice. This theme provides a mechanism for the statistical alignment between student and teacher perceptions: the shared understanding likely reflects active teacher mediation rather than passive agreement. When teachers articulate expectations and model revision, they function as guardians of student voice, a role that the quantitative data alone could not capture.

Writing self-efficacy in the AI era. The qualitative data reveal a paradox: AI boosts confidence in the polished product but can erode confidence in unaided writing ability. Students who recognized their growing dependence expressed anxiety about writing without AI. Prior writing skill was identified as a protective factor, helping students direct AI rather than be directed by it. This explains the significant correlations with self-efficacy while also cautioning that such confidence may be fragile, tied to the presence of AI rather than to an internalized sense of competence.

Together, the quantitative and qualitative strands demonstrate that AI use supports externally visible dimensions of writing, vocabulary, style, task efficacy, and declarative ethical knowledge, but does not automatically strengthen deeper authorial dimensions such as authenticity, ownership, and revision agency. These deeper dimensions require teacher-guided reflection, process documentation, and explicit instruction in authorship. The perceptual alignment between students and teachers provides a foundation for implementing such pedagogical interventions collaboratively.

Pedagogical Implications and Proposed Intervention: The VOICE-AI Writing Program

The findings of this study suggest a clear pedagogical implication: while AI writing tools may support students' vocabulary, style, writing self-efficacy, and ethical clarity, they do not automatically strengthen deeper authorial dimensions such as authenticity, ownership confidence, and revision agency. These findings indicate that the educational value of AI in writing depends not simply on its use, but on how such use is guided, monitored, and integrated into classroom writing processes.

In response, the VOICE-AI Writing Program (Voice, Ownership, Integrity, Critical Evaluation, and Ethical AI Use) is proposed as an evidence-informed classroom support framework for writing-intensive Senior High School subjects. The program is designed to help students use AI responsibly while preserving authorial identity, strengthening revision judgment, and sustaining accountability for the final written output. Rather than prohibiting AI or accepting it uncritically, the program emphasizes guided use, process visibility, and reflective revision.

The proposed intervention consists of five interrelated instructional components aligned with the major findings of the study: AI ethics and voice awareness, draft-first writing, critical evaluation of AI suggestions, guided revision with teacher feedback, and process-based assessment for transparency and ownership. Taken together, these components aim to ensure that AI functions as a support tool rather than a substitute for student thinking and authorship.

Given the convergence of the quantitative and qualitative findings, the program may serve as a practical basis for integrating AI-related writing support into existing classroom routines in English, research, and other writing-intensive subjects. Detailed descriptions of the program modules, classroom tools, and implementation procedures are best presented in an appendix or supplementary material to keep the main discussion focused on the study's core pedagogical implications.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that senior high school students in Tagbina 2 District use AI writing tools moderately and purposefully, mainly as support for grammar, organization, and summarization rather than as substitutes for full academic writing. Writer voice remains visible in AI-assisted writing, particularly in vocabulary and style, but authenticity, tone, and ownership confidence remain vulnerable when students rely heavily on AI-generated suggestions. The absence of significant differences between student and teacher perceptions indicates a shared recognition that AI can support writing development while also complicating authorship. Correlational findings further suggest that AI use is associated with selected surface-level and confidence-related dimensions, but not with deeper authorial dimensions such as authenticity, ownership, and revision agency. Therefore, AI-assisted writing should be pedagogically mediated through clear ethical guidelines, process-based assessment, teacher feedback, and structured revision practices that keep students accountable as authors of their own work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author wishes to express sincere gratitude to the following individuals whose contributions were instrumental to the completion of this study. First and foremost, to the Almighty God for His guidance and blessings throughout this endeavor. To my adviser, Dr. Rolly G. Salvaleon, for your invaluable guidance, time, and insightful feedback throughout the research process. Your mentorship made this journey considerably lighter. I am also grateful to the panel members whose constructive comments and suggestions helped refine the quality of this work. To my wife, Jeciel Cris P. Viduya, and my daughter, Crissa Bella Liam P. Viduya, for your unconditional love, support,

and constant encouragement. You are the reason I persevered. To my parents, Domingo A. Viduya and Julieta A. Viduya, for your unwavering care and support. To my friends, Jonas P. Gunoy, for the constant encouragement and motivation; and Harry P. Jabahab, for patiently answering my queries even at the most inconvenient hours. To Marielyn R. Manglicmot and Dennis R. Manglicmot, for providing valuable insights regarding this study. To my SVNHS family, thank you for your cooperation and support. My special appreciation goes to Bonjovi R. Mula for facilitating critical connections at NEMSU Tandag, and to Jenecis M. Congreso and Glorisa G. Mula for your participation as respondents. To my friend and MAELT classmate, Amina M. Lad, for your guidance and support throughout the entire thesis journey and for your participation as a respondent. To all school heads in Tagbina 2 District, led by District Supervisor Dr. Wilma A. Premarion, for granting permission to conduct this study in your schools. Thank you also to Gloria M. Paraguay, Principal of Tagbina National High School, for allowing the pilot testing at your institution. To all senior high school students and teachers of Tagbina 2 District who served as respondents, your cooperation was invaluable to the success of this research. Finally, to all who supported me throughout this journey, whether directly or indirectly, thank you for being part of this significant milestone. Your presence has made a meaningful impact on this achievement.

REFERENCES

1. Al Hosni, J. (2025). Preserving Authorial Voice in Academic Texts in the Age of Generative AI: A Thematic Literature Review. *Arab World English Journal*, 16(3):244-258. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol16no3.14>
2. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191, 215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
3. Barrot, J.S., Aranda, M.R.R. (2025). Efficacy of AI-Text Detection Tools in Distinguishing Student-Produced, AI-Edited, and AI-Generated Essays. *Tech Know Learn* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-025-09884-0>
4. Barrot, J. S. (2023). Using ChatGPT for Second Language Writing: Pitfalls and Potentials. *Assessing Writing*, 57, Article 100745. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100745>
5. Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(43). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8>
6. Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2021). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. SAGE.
7. Coetzer, Z., & van Aardt, P. (2024). Unsilencing the student voice: Detecting and addressing ChatGPT-generated texts presented as student-authored texts at a university writing centre. *International Journal of*
8. Corcuera, L. C. (2024). Uncovering QuillBot: Filipino senior high school students' experiences and factors influencing its use in enhancing language writing skills. *International Journal of Scholars in Education*, 7(2), 67, 81. <https://doi.org/10.52134/ueader.1497368>
9. Cotton, D.R., Cotton, P.A. and Shipway, J.R. (2024) Chatting and Cheating: Ensuring Academic Integrity in the Era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61, 228-239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148>
10. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). SAGE.
11. Davis, F.D., Bagozzi, R.P. and Warshaw, P.R. (1989) User Acceptance of Computer Technology: A Comparison of Two Theoretical Models. *Management Science*, 35, 982-1003. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.35.8.982>
12. De Vreede, T., De Vreede, G. J., Siemon, D., Ebel, P., & Elshan, E. (2026). The developmental bypass: How AI assistance undermines human growth. In *Proceedings of the 59th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences* (pp. 1, 10). HICSS. <https://hdl.handle.net/10125/111418>
13. Department of Education. (2025, February 20). DepEd launches AI center for education. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2025/02/20/deped-launches-ai-center-for-education/>
14. Dizon, G., & Gayed, J. M. (2021). Examining the impact of Grammarly on the quality of mobile l2 writing. *Jalt Call Journal*, 17(2), 74–92. <https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v17n2.336>
15. Elbow, Peter. (2007). Reconsiderations: Voice in writing again: Embracing contraries. *College English*. 70. 168-188. 10.2307/25472259.
16. Ellis, J. L., & Hart, D. L. (2023). Strengthening the Choice for a Generic Qualitative Research Design. *The Qualitative Report*, 28(6), 1759-1768. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2023.5474>

17. 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), 107–126.
18. Giannakos, M., Azevedo, R., Brusilovsky, P., Cukurova, M., Dimitriadis, Y., Hernandez-Leo, D., Järvelä, S., Mavrikis, M., & Rienties, B. (2024). The promise and challenges of generative AI in education. *Behaviour & Information Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2024.2394886>
19. Ivanič, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(1, 2), 3, 33. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00034-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00034-0)
20. Kasneci, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, Article 102274. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274>
21. Kayaalp, M. Enes & Ollivier, Matthieu & Winkler, Philipp & Dahmen, Jari & Musahl, Volker & Hirschmann, Michael & Karlsson, Jon. (2023). Embrace responsible ChatGPT usage to overcome language barriers in academic writing. *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy*. 32. 10.1002/ksa.12014.
22. Kim, J., Klopfer, M., Grohs, J. R., Eldardiry, H., Weichert, J., Cox II, L. A., & Pike, D. (2025). Examining faculty and student perceptions of generative AI in university courses. *Innovative Higher Education*, 50, 1281, 1313. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-024-09774-w>
23. Lehman, I. M. (2014). The role of identity in student writing in English and in Polish. *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny*, 61(3), 602, 611.
24. Li, D. (2022). A review of EFL students' English writing self-efficacy. *IRA-International Journal of Education & Multidisciplinary Studies*, 18(3), 94, 109. <https://dx.doi.org/10.21013/jems.v18.n3.p4>
25. Lohr, S.L. (2021). *Sampling: Design and Analysis* (3rd ed.). Chapman and Hall/CRC. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429298899>
26. Lund, B., Mannuru, N. R., Teel, Z. A., Lee, T. H., Ortega, N. J., Simmons, S., & Ward, E. (2025). Student perceptions of AI-assisted writing and academic integrity: Ethical concerns, academic misconduct, and use of generative AI in higher education. *AI in Education*, 1(1), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.3390/aieduc1010002>
27. Nañola, E. L., Arroyo, R. G. L., Hermosura, N. J. T., Ragil, M., Sabanal, J. N. U., & Mendoza, H. B. (2025). Recognizing the artificial: A comparative voice analysis of AI-generated and L2 undergraduate student-authored academic essays. *System*, 130, Article 103611. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2025.103611>
28. Perkins, M. (2023). Academic integrity considerations of AI large language models in the post-pandemic era: ChatGPT and beyond. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 20(2). <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.02.07>
29. Rahman, N. A. A., Zulkornain, L., Azman, M., & Kustati, M. (2023). Assessing writing abilities using AI-powered writing evaluations. *Journal of ASIAN Behavioural Studies*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.21834/jabs.v8i24.420>
30. Song, C., & Song, Y. (2023). Enhancing Academic Writing Skills and Motivation: Assessing the Efficacy of ChatGPT in AI-Assisted Language Learning for EFL Students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 1260843. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1260843>
31. UNESCO. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research>
32. Wang, C. (2024). Exploring students' generative AI-assisted writing processes: Perceptions and experiences from native and nonnative English speakers. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning. Advance online publication*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-024-09744-3>
33. Welch, B. L. (1947). The generalization of 'Student's' problem when several different population variances are involved. *Biometrika*, 34(1/2), 28, 35.

APPENDIX

Appendix A. VOICE-AI Writing Program Modules and Tools

The program is grounded in a central principle: AI may assist the writing process, but the student remains the thinker, author, reviser, and accountable owner of the final text. It comprises five instructional modules implemented over six weeks, each directly addressing a specific finding from the study. Table 1 summarizes the alignment between study findings and program responses.

Target Users: Senior high school student, English, Practical Research, and academic writing teachers, and school heads and academic coordinators

Duration. Six weeks at the start of a semester, with continued integration in subsequent major writing tasks. Delivery is through 15-minute mini-lessons, short videos, in-class demonstrations, workshops, peer review, teacher conferences, and portfolio assessment.

Program structure. The intervention comprises five modules, each directly responding to a key study finding.

Table 10: Alignment of Study Findings with VOICE-AI Program Modules

Study Finding	Program Response	Module
Students' writer voice is perceived but not strongly expressed; Authenticity of Expression rated lowest	Voice fingerprinting, first-draft-before-AI rule, AI vs. Me rewrites	1, 2, 3
Teachers observe vulnerability in tone, structure, and coherence	Think-aloud revision, transition mapping, vocabulary tuning, teacher conferences	3, 4
Ownership confidence is lowest dimension, especially in graded contexts	AI disclosure statements, process portfolios, author accountability conferences	5
Ethical clarity is present but students may not consistently recognize integrity violations	AI ethics mini-guide, case scenarios, class AI-use agreement	1
AI usage significantly correlates with vocabulary, style, writing self-efficacy, and ethical clarity, but not with authenticity, tone, ownership, or revision agency	Structured revision workflows that require critical evaluation, rejection of AI suggestions, and defense of final output	2, 3, 4, 5

Module 1: AI Ethics and Voice Awareness

This module establishes the ethical foundation for AI-assisted writing. Students engage with an AI ethics mini-guide that categorizes AI use into three levels: allowed (e.g., brainstorming, grammar checking), allowed with teacher permission (e.g., paraphrasing, translation support), and prohibited (e.g., submitting AI-generated text as one's own). Through scenario analysis and the creation of a class AI-use agreement, students develop a shared understanding of acceptable practice. This module directly addresses the finding that while ethical clarity was the highest-rated identity confidence dimension ($M = 3.61$), teachers perceived it as only moderately evident ($M = 3.51$), and students acknowledged difficulty applying ethical rules under academic pressure. It also responds to the significant correlation between purpose of use and ethical clarity ($r = .71$, $p = .030$) by training students to approach AI with clear, ethically bounded intentions.

Module 2: Draft-First, AI-Second Workflow

This module operationalizes the principle that authorship must precede AI assistance. Students begin by creating a "voice fingerprint", a personal inventory of their typical tone, vocabulary preferences, sentence patterns, and writing habits. They then produce an idea map and a complete first draft without AI. Only after this baseline is established do they engage AI tools for revision support. This workflow responds to the quantitative finding that Authenticity of Expression was the lowest-rated writer voice dimension ($M = 3.24$ for students, 3.40 for teachers)

and to the qualitative insight that students who begin with their own ideas feel stronger ownership over the final output. It also addresses the significant correlations between purpose of use and both vocabulary ($r = .58$) and style ($r = .69$) by ensuring that the core lexical and stylistic foundation originates with the student before AI engagement begins.

Module 3: Critical Evaluation and Voice-Building Activities

This module makes AI influence visible and subject to student judgment. Using the "AI vs. Me" rewrite worksheet, students place their original draft alongside an AI-suggested revision and systematically identify changes in tone, vocabulary, structure, and meaning. Each AI suggestion is then marked as Keep, Revise, Reject, or Verify, and students produce a final voice-preserved paragraph that incorporates only those AI changes that genuinely improve clarity without weakening personal expression. This module directly targets the finding that vocabulary and style were the dimensions most strongly associated with AI usage, by training students to exercise critical control over those very features. It also responds to the qualitative theme of "formalization effect", the tendency for AI to inflate vocabulary and standardize tone, by requiring students to recognize and reverse such changes when they do not reflect the student's own voice.

Module 4: Guided Revision, Teacher Feedback, and Accountability

This module strengthens revision agency through structured feedback and metacognitive reflection. Students conduct think-aloud revisions, articulating in writing or orally why specific AI suggestions were accepted or rejected. They then engage in peer review focused exclusively on voice ("Does this sound like you?") before participating in brief teacher conferences in which they defend their revision decisions. This module responds to the non-significant correlation between AI usage and revision agency by embedding revision control within instructional practice rather than assuming it develops automatically through AI use. It also addresses the qualitative finding that students tend to under-utilize teacher and peer feedback when AI provides more immediate suggestions, by making human feedback a required, non-negotiable step in the writing process.

Module 5: Assessment, Transparency, and Process Evidence

The final module shifts assessment from product to process. Students compile a complete writing portfolio that includes their baseline sample, voice fingerprint, idea map, first draft, AI-use log, AI vs. Me worksheet, think-aloud notes, peer and teacher feedback forms, revised draft, final paper, disclosure statement, and writer identity reflection. They self-assess using the Voice and Ownership Rubric before submitting the portfolio for teacher evaluation. This module directly addresses the study's most pedagogically urgent finding: that ownership confidence, while still in the confident range ($M = 3.51$), was the lowest identity confidence dimension, and that students were notably hesitant about being graded on AI-assisted work ($M = 3.34$, "Somewhat confident"). By making the writing process transparent and assessable, the portfolio system gives students concrete evidence of their authorship and gives teachers a defensible basis for evaluating AI-assisted work.

Expected outputs. Each student produces an AI-assisted writing portfolio containing:

- Baseline writing sample
- Voice fingerprint sheet
- Idea map
- First draft (pre-AI)
- AI-use log
- AI vs. Me rewrite worksheet
- Think-aloud revision notes
- Peer and teacher feedback forms
- Revised draft
- Final paper
- AI disclosure statement
- Writer identity reflection

Teacher roles.

- Conduct mini-lessons and facilitate workshops
- Model critical AI evaluation and revision strategies
- Provide voice-focused feedback
- Hold brief author accountability conferences
- Assess portfolios using the Voice and Ownership rubric
- Participate in program orientation and periodic consistency meetings

M&E indicators

1. improvement in voice-preservation rubric scores;
2. increase in ownership confidence scores;
3. quality of AI-use logs;
4. student ability to justify accepted/rejected AI suggestions;
5. teacher rating of authenticity and revision agency.

Implementation and Sustainability

The program is designed for a six-week implementation period at the start of a semester, delivered through 15-minute mini-lessons, in-class demonstrations, writing workshops, peer review, and teacher conferences. It requires minimal technological infrastructure beyond access to school-approved AI tools, making it feasible for the rural school context in which this study was conducted. Supporting materials, including an AI ethics mini-guide, voice-preserving revision checklist, AI-use log, disclosure statement template, AI vs. Me worksheet, think-aloud revision prompts, and a Voice and Ownership rubric, are provided as ready-to-use classroom tools. Sustainability is supported by integrating the program's core tools into existing writing-intensive subjects and by conducting teacher orientation and periodic portfolio review through established professional development mechanisms such as learning action cell sessions.

The VOICE-AI Writing Program does not seek to prohibit AI use, an impractical and counterproductive goal given students' existing engagement with these tools, nor does it accept AI integration uncritically. Instead, it offers a structured, evidence-based pathway through which students can harness AI's efficiency while retaining the authorial presence, critical judgment, and ethical accountability that define meaningful academic writing. Future research should examine the program's effectiveness through controlled implementation studies, assessing whether structured pedagogical mediation can strengthen the very dimensions, authenticity, tone, ownership, and revision agency, that AI usage alone does not appear to support.