

Usefulness and Ease of Using AI Tools for Writing Thesis: A Survey of Graduate Students

Atiqa Khalid

MPhil Linguistics Air University Islamabad

Email: atiqakhan730@gmail.com

Dr. Naveed-Ur-Rehman Khattak

Associate Professor, Air University Islamabad.

ABSTRACT

The rapid rise of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education has also profoundly changed students' experience when dealing with academic writing, particularly at graduate research and thesis level. The current study aims to explore the beliefs of MPhil English students at Islamabad based universities on AI tools functionality in thesis writing and its ease of use. Based on Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), it is a quantitative type of research, and the data was collected from 100 graduates' students of different universities in Islamabad by using a structured Likert scale questionnaire via google form. To recognize patterns of perceptions and attitudes, descriptive statistics was analyzed by means of SPSS. Results of the study revealed that students perceive AI tools as primarily helpful and user-friendly in enhancing productivity, coherence, grammatical accuracy and effectiveness in their writing. Also graduate students have shown positive attitude towards AI adoption in research oriented tasks particularly thesis writing. From the findings, it can be inferred that perceived usefulness and ease of use play a crucial role in the acceptance of AI tools like ChatGPT, Gemini, Writesonic, Quillbot, Microsoft co-pilot, Scispace, and Deepseek in academic writing.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tools, Thesis Writing, Graduate Students, and English Studies.

INTRODUCTION

The development of AI has revolutionized the landscape of academic writing on a global scale. Tools such as ChatGPT, Gemini, SciSpace, Microsoft Copilot and WriteSonic have proven useful to researchers and students because they support idea generation, coherence improvement or even grammar correction and literature synthesis. These AI-powered writing assistants are designed to help you speed up the process of researching and drafting by offering instant feedback, recommendations and prompt language improvements. The digital transition of higher education 1.0 and its implications for artificial intelligence in academic writing. As a consequence of the impact of digitalization on higher education, AI in academic writing represents an evolution from traditional manual writing practices towards truly technology-assisted writing (Thompson & Harris, 2025). The process is not simply faster than writing, but

also raises fundamental issues about authorship, expression and the synthesis of information in an era of artificial intelligence. Technology and education became each other, got into a symbiotic relationship where the development in one aspect causes the development in the other (Potasheva, Kuzmenko, and Plutova, 2019). Education has become more accessible and flexible due to the emergence of the internet and learning management systems and online libraries, as now students can not only receive information within the geographical and time constraints but also beyond geographical boundaries (Alam, 2021). Among the newest sources of technological revolution that has affected the modern academic life, artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly taking on a leading role due to the current transformation of the education practice. Syahnaz and Fithriani (2023) found in their study on academic English writing that Quillbot users appreciated the web-based paraphrasing features next to the side corrections done by the tool, and that they specifically appreciated the paraphrased suggested, when it came to reformulation and ease of reading.

At the university level, AI-based applications have become increasingly popular among graduate students in particular (because they tend to do more complex and time-consuming writing). More particularly, graduate students, and especially those in the process of writing a thesis, face numerous problems related to structuring an argument, maintaining coherence, following academic standards for citation and referencing, submitting on time etc. To counter these challenges, several writers have tapped artificial intelligence tools to address writer's block, improve drafts and ensure linguistic accuracy. Also, other empirical evidences support that these latter technologies could support writing efficiency, confidence and productivity (Khalifa & Albadawy, 2024). But the increasing dependence on AI-made text also poses pedagogical and ethical problems. That is overuse (or even abuse), copied words and sentences accidentally plagiarized, and students' academic voices being tended to be diluted. In spite of these obstacles, reliance on AI in academia is growing, especially amongst graduate students who are trying to strike a balance between rigorous research and the convenience technology affords (Chaurasia, 2025).

While the popularity of AI-powered writing continues to escalate, little is known regarding how graduate students perceive the ease of use and usefulness of such tools for thesis writing. Previous inquiries have typically investigated broad attitudes toward AI in academic work yet, with few exceptions, rarely have they specifically addressed its potential as an aid to the generation of long-form scholarly output that requires originality, critical synthesis and methodological rigour (Lin & Chen, 2024). This area of inquiry suggests the need for a dedicated focus on how AI tools are influencing the writing practices of graduate students (specific to English Studies). The aim of this study is, therefore to analyze the perceptions of MPhil English students about the usefulness and ease of using AI Tools in thesis writing at Islamabad based universities. This study is grounded by Davis's (1989) Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), and intends to provide theoretical benefits for the educational practice, responsible AI usage, and institutional policies about digital academic transformation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

AI writing tools are a host of digital tools featuring machine learning algorithms and

natural language generation (NLP) which help users to write, edit, and assess written text (Zhao, 2025). The application of AI to academic writing broadly has elicited an academic debate, particularly following the emergence of generative AI powered writing engines such as ChatGPT, Gemini, SciSpace, Microsoft Copilot, and WriteSonic. These tools can be used to allow students to develop ideas, write, edit and even cite, i.e., new possibilities of becoming more productive regarding academic performance and the quality of writing can be provided (Holmes and Tuomi, 2022; Lim, Gunasekara, Pallant, Pallant, and Pechenkina, 2023). However, the problem of increasing authorship has also put ethical, pedagogical, and epistemological pressure on authorship, originality, and integrity of academic work (Anders, 2023; Crawford, Cowling, and Allen, 2023). Raheem et al(2023)'s systematic review, for example, curated tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly or Quillbot, under the category of "AI applications" in English academic writing, and emphasized their chronological implementation according to the type of task, from generating to editing to paraphrasing. Purposeful classification shows how each of the categories serves a specific function in the graduate student's writing workflow as well as the ways in which they combine to support different stages of the writing process. In terms of validating ChatGPT for academic writing, some mixed results emerge from empirical studies: while Zheng, (2024) found discourse markers and critical nuance absent, an AI-generated version of an argumentative essay was rated more highly in terms of overall coherence and lexical richness than its human counterpart, a large scale human versus AI comparison. Syahnaz and Fithriani (2023) found in their study on academic English writing that Quillbot users appreciated the web-based paraphrasing features next to the side corrections done by the tool, and that they specifically appreciated the paraphrased suggested, when it came to reformulation and ease of reading. Students of English studies are the ones who must demonstrate high rates of writing and critical thinking, thus, AI technologies can offer them the opportunity to enhance the level of clarity in their writing and organization. Alam (2021) found that by using this type of technologies, the academic efficiency might be enhanced since mechanical writing could be automated, and students could participate in thought and analytical activities. Nevertheless, it is now feared that cognitive development and innovation may be the bottlenecks to AI overuse. Lim et al. (2023) warned that even though AI can contribute to the quality of writing on the surface, it can also undermine the in-depth analysis of the source materials and reduce obtaining the critical thinkings that are expected to be generated in the process of the academic inquiry. In addition, Lockey, Gillespie, Holm, and Someh (2021) asserted that trust to AI is one of the most troubling issues of its application in education. The accuracy and reliability of the AI generated writing is the most important aspect which will determine how students will adopt such tools when writing. Thus, AI may enhance efficiency, although the users should be able to review and interpret AI results critically. The growing use of AI in writing has also caused the concern of academic integrity, plagiarism and authorship. Anders (2023) also posed whether the use of ChatGPT is a form of cheating or plagiarism or a logical extension of the learning process, and said that this is a question that depends on the context that needs to be transparent. The boundary between what can be said as assisting and misconduct is barely noticeable especially when the AI-generated content is being presented without credit.

The studies of educational AI have found that the attitude of students is largely dictated by the perception of the value and ease of use of the technology (Foster, 2023; Baidoo-Anu and Owusu Ansah, 2023). As an illustration, Nguyen Bich Dieu (2024) contrasted the perceptions of Vietnamese English language teaching (ELT) students towards the application of ChatGPT as a writing assistant and found that the majority of the interviewed students thought that it was a convenient source to generate ideas and improve the quality of writing. Dependence and loss of originality were also the concern of other students. Similarly, a research conducted by Imran and Lashari (2023) in Pakistan found out that university students appreciated the presence and effectiveness of ChatGPT in education and doubted its reliability and morality. Crcek and Patekar (2023) in another similar article talked about the use of ChatGPT among university students in the United States, and they discovered that a high percentage of them were using it to brainstorm and edit academic manuscripts. Although students acknowledged that it could be helpful in improving quality writing, they demanded that the institutional guidelines were provided to ensure that they were not abused. Combining these studies, it can be stated that, overall, there are no concerns among students regarding the acceptability of AI tools as valuable tools since they are implemented in an ethical and transparent manner. In the UK, some of the top institutions including Oxford, Cambridge and King's College London have clearly stated policies in place consenting to AI use, as long as students acknowledge the tools and avoid the misrepresentation of AI-generated content as their own (Atkinson-Toal & Guo, 2024). Graduate students, and English studies in particular, frequently use ChatGPT to brainstorm potential research questions, frame, make structural outlines, and sharpen thesis statements. A University of Liverpool survey found that while 54percent supported the use of tools like Grammarly, there was only about 30percent support for using ChatGPT to produce whole essays (Goh, 2024). Tools developed on top of the LLM framework like Elicit and Scite are also emerging from the literature review side. Elicit makes use of AI to identify relevant papers and summarize studies to fast track the discovery of thematic clusters. Scite is a platform for discovering and evaluating scientific articles via Smart Citations (Khalid et al., 2025). While research in this area is still relatively nascent, the first case reports offer encouraging signs that these tools can greatly enhance our ability to map research landscapes, at least at the expense of ongoing human vigilance around issues of accuracy and interpretative integrity. When kids are writing their theses, they will increasingly rely on proofreading tools like Grammarly and Wordtune and Quillbot etc Wordtune suggests tone recommendations as well as alternatives for phrasing, not just grammar. In one comparison study, Wordvice AI caught 77% of the revisions that found by its human proofreaders; a great but not perfect result (Heintz et al., 2022). AI also has a role in the citation format. AIs are now monitoring citation practises in Zotero (and similar reference management software), despite backlash that composite creation in response to AI work is "unsound," and AI-derived papers simply would be "hallucinated." An analysis on AI-generated research papers revealed that up to 70% of citations were wrong or just made up, requiring human beings writing thesis to manually replicate the verification process (Kacena et al., 2024). With such risks, there are AI tools providing an evident alleviation for the amount of time spent proof reading and formatting, liberating cognitive resources for deeper analytical reflexion.

The emerging best practice is to encourage students to treat AI as an editorial assistant, providing the mechanistic final polish, rather than a conceptual author (Krajka & Olszak, 2024). The higher the level of trust in AI, the lower their self-confidence (i.e., insecure students tend to overuse AI), which leads to concerns about possible overreliance. In the study of English, where authorial voice and an effective use of rhetoric is necessary, creative practice and academic values may be informed by this discourse (Abdelhalim & Alsahil, 2025).

Additionally, though there is an increasing body of literature on the use of AI in undergraduate education, fewer studies emerge at the graduate level, especially in the context of independent research writing in the form of theses and dissertations (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Graduate students play a specific role in academic life, one that is more or less characterised by autonomy and independence, methodological rigour and originality. Writing a thesis, as a culmination of academic work, also requires revising and reflecting on how analysis has emerged and been grounded in conversations. The student's point of view is one of the ethical implications of using ChatGpt in academic writing. Schwenke, Sobke, and Kraft (2023) conducted a review of the chatbot assisted thesis writing and observed the risk of the ambiguous ownership, with the student work partially being forged by the AI-generated text. Their study revealed the urgency to make educational institutions develop clear policies and education to promote healthy AI practices. Moving on the same topic, Crawford et al. (2023) also highlighted the importance of ethical leadership in the academic setting and claimed that universities are the ones that must take active steps to mitigate the ethical and pedagogical impacts of AI. The problematic aspect of ethical consciousness among the groups of students is rather distinct. Others take AI responsibly to polish languages and others use it to make an entire text without even having to know that they are committing academic misconduct (Anders, 2023). Lim et al. (2023) suggested the inclusion of digital ethics in the course in the institutions with the emphasis on responsible AI use and critical view on machine-generated content. In a philosophical approach, the discourse is further extended to the issues of authorship and creativity other than plagiarism. How far can a student go with the argument that they have owned the end product in case AI generates ideas or phrases? The question challenges traditional constructs of originality in academic writing, especially in such academic disciplines as English studies, the emphasis of which is placed on the skills of critical and interpretive thinking. The final problem is however bias and accuracy. ChatGPT and other stable AI applications are trained using huge amounts of data, which they can contain errors or cultural bias (Lockey et al., 2021). When graduate students use such devices, they can still spread incorrect arguments or invalid data in the event that they fail to confirm the information that is produced by the artificial intelligence. Moreover, the lack of institutional guidance system leads to the situation when students do not realize what limits the permissible usage (Crcek and Patekar, 2023).

A missing aspect in the previous work is how AI generated contents are perceived and their implications for creativity, critical thinking and authorship (Yusuf et al., 2024). In English Studies, where academic selfhood is founded upon critical voice and originality, the introduction of AI tools complicates the question of authorship. The current state of research can do little to elucidate how students negotiate the

convenience of AI with their disciplinary values, leaving questions about what constitutes academic writing, and how it is to be judged, in the wake of generative AI, very much unanswered. The ethics of AI writing tools is a topic that is now being more visibly hashed out in opted pieces and policy documents, but it is not substantively addressed in empirical studies (Hosseini et al., 2023). Most of the literature draws from the western or most digitized academic settings, especially in North America, East Asia and parts of Europe. These cases often take for granted high-speed internet, cutting-edge digital infrastructure, and pedagogically- integrated AI applications. But in many parts of the world, particularly parts of the Global South, students are dealing with a different set of challenges that include restricted access to high-end AI software, no formal training, and outdated hardware. In Pakistan, where this thesis is located, institutional narratives on AI in education are not completely articulated yet (Manan, 2019). But few institutions currently have formal policies about AI use, or provide training in AI-assisted academic writing. Accordingly, user experiences and uses are more characterized by peer networks, informal learning and trial-and-error use than institutional support (and regulation). Such contextual reality is seldom mentioned in literature, and thus the findings of these global AI integration studies are less relevant to non-Western academic settings. In addition, although TAM is a widely reviewed framework for studying technology adoption, its use in the context of AI writing tools for dissertations remains limited and undertheorized. In education, most TAM-papers are related to system usability and behavioral intention with acceptance frequently being measured using questionnaire on Likert scale. Very few researchers used a fundamentally grounded TAM, along with a qualitative data of practices, experiences of the pedagogical encounters to observe student writers lived experiences, doubts, and reflections (Mines, 2024). What's more, many applications of TAM neglect to distinguish between types of AI tools, lumping together things like grammar checkers, paraphrasing tools and generative AI systems like ChatGPT as though they all work the same way. Yet, in practice, such tools differ significantly in their affordances, outputs, and learning implications for students. The current study aims to fill in this gap by decomposing AI tools into different sub-categories and trying to explore how students view and utilize them in different tasks, such as writing thesis. Foremost among these are the existence of disciplinary neglect of English Studies, the focus on graduate research writing to the exclusion of more general writing studies, the lack of theoretical attention to ethical and authorship dimensions, and the absence of contextually specific, longitudinal, and student-centered studies of academic writing.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research is grounded in the positivist research paradigm. Within this framework, the study adopted a quantitative research method to explore graduate students' perceptions of the usefulness and ease of using AI tools in thesis writing. This study is based upon the theory of Technology Acceptance Model 3 (TAM 3) by Venkatesh and Bala (2008), which in turn extends Davis's (1989) original TAM. TAM 3 embodies the behavior of technology acceptance using two fundamental constructs: Perceived Usefulness (PU) and Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU), which determine users' attitudes, intentions and real system use. The population was graduate students

(M.Phil. or MS) enrolled in English Studies programmes at different universities of Islamabad and the sample comprised 100 students chosen through purposive sampling by including students have either previously used or are using AI tools for thesis writing. The instrument for collecting data was a structured questionnaire, which comprised two sections: socio-demographic characteristics and perception-related items. The second part is Likert-scale questions (1- Strongly Disagree, 5- Strongly Agree) measuring the perceived usefulness and ease of use. Quantitative data was collected online using Google Forms, an instrument that was circulated among participants via university email addresses and through student groups for ease of access to participate in the study voluntarily. Ethical considerations were strictly followed. After the data collection, SPSS was used for analyzing the responses. The data analysis procedure involved descriptive statistics, including mean scores, standard deviations, and percentage distributions, to summarize students' perceptions of the usefulness and ease of AI tools. The results were interpreted in light of TAM 3 to understand how these perceptions influence students' perceptions and adoption of AI tools in thesis writing.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Table 4.1: Graduate students' perceptions towards adopting AI tools as an AI writing-assistant tool under the construct of Perceived Usefulness

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Median	Mode	SD
1. Using AI tools improves my performance in thesis writing.	4 (4%)	2 (2%)	14 (14%)	59 (59%)	21 (21%)	3.93	4	4	0.878
2. Using AI tools increases my productivity during thesis writing.	4	2	11	58	25	3.98	4	4	0.847
3. AI tools are useful for retrieving relevant Information and resources for my research.	2	2	13	59	24	4.03	4	4	0.888

Frequency distribution and descriptive statistics for perceived usefulness (PU) of AI tools in respondents are shown in Table 4.1. The responses to three items: PU1, PU2, and PU3 are presented in the table and measured on a 5-point Likert scale from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (5). Regarding PU1, which examine whether use the system will help increase performance in job of users), most respondents respond positively. In particular 59 (59%) and 21 (21.0%) perceived that

AI tools help to improve their job performance and strongly agree respectively, while 14% are neutral about this statement, 2% disagree, and only four respondents (4%), as well as five participants of the training agreed or strongly with this statement in neither case. The average PU1 was 3.93 with median/mode of 4.00, which means there were moderate variability and very strong agreement between the participants with a standard deviation of 0.878, indicating overall tendency towards agreement.

For PU2, testing whether AI tools increase Thesis-writing productivity, the distribution also mirrors a positive movement. 53 (53.0%) responders agreed with the statement and another 25 responders (25.0%) strongly agreed, providing convincing evidence of how AI tools actually push productivity levels up for a proportion of the majority. Less participants, however, expressed neutrality (13; 13%), disagreement (2; 2.0%) or strong disagreement (4; 4.0%). An average score of 3.98 and a median/mode of 4.00 suggests that most respondents believe that AI tools were effective as productivity aids for thesis writing. The standard deviation of 0.847 indicates that, even though there was generally a positive response, there was somewhat less variation in comparison to PU1.

PU3 investigated the applicability of AI tools when information and resources need to be located for research purposes. The results show strong consensus on this item agreeing and submitting, (59.0%) and not disagreeing/strongly agree' respectively to this issue. Thirteen (13.0%) provided neutral response, while disagreement was reported by two respondents (2.0%), and also by only 2(2.0%) with strong disagreement. The average of 4.03, as well as a median and mode value of 4.00 confirms that most participants felt AI tools were useful for resource retrieval in research. The standard deviation was relatively high (0.888), which means that responses were more clustered around this item than PU1 and PU2, implying a strong agreement with AI tools in research among the respondents.

Discussion:

The results provided in Table 4.1 show that English studies graduate students find AI tools very useful for improving their thesis writing skills. For the three perceived usefulness items, participants mostly agreed or strongly agreed to these dimensions. Participants agreed or strongly agreed (mean=3.93, SD=1.08) that they AI is useful for improving their performance in thesis-related tasks (PU1) with 59% agreeing and 21.0% strongly agreeing to the statement. Likewise, 58 percent and 25.0 percent expressed agreement (PU2) that AI tools enhance productivity when writing up a thesis with an average of 3.98. Finally, AI tools were helpful to retrieve relevant information and research resources (PU3) (Mean = 4.03), 59.0% agreed and 24% strongly agreed with this positive statement about the usefulness of AI-tools for clinician-scientists in retrieving relevant information and research resources. Thus, AI tools overall are viewed by the participants as a useful tool that increases effectiveness and quality of academic writing. Low standard deviations reveal consistency in positive perceptions towards AI across the sample.

Taking into consideration these outcomes and combining them with previous findings in the literature, these results are consistent with prior studies which emphasized the role played by AI in academic reinforcement. For instance, (Silva et al., 2025) state that AI supported tools may facilitate search for and synthesis of literature, which is in

line with PU3 finding in the present study. Similarly, research on productivity improvement with AI, such as by (Khalifa & Albadawy 2024), showed students who use AI in their writing processes find themselves working more efficiently - a finding consistent with what was found in PU2. Furthermore, PU1's results of improved performance are consistent with the findings of (Aljuaid, 2024) who found that AI tools have a positive impact students' ability to perform complex writing tasks and produce structured academic content. In general, findings of the current study are consistent with prior literature in terms of AI tools being considered as useful, helpful, and supportive for research and thesis writing.

Table 4.1.2: Graduate students' perceptions towards adopting AI tools as an AI writing-assistant tool under the construct of Output Quality

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Median	Mode	SD
7. The responses generated by AI tools are clear, coherent, and useful for my thesis work	4 (4%)	5 (5%)	22 (22%)	51 (51%)	18 (18%)	3.85	4	4	0.908
8. The output produced by AI tools meets the requirements of my thesis writing.	3 (3%)	6 (6%)	20 (20%)	55 (55%)	16 (16%)	3.84	4	4	0.944
9. AI tools improve the overall quality of my thesis	3 (3%)	4 (4%)	13 (13%)	63 (63%)	17 (17%)	3.94	4	4	0.893

The frequency distribution and descriptive statistics for perceived quality of AI tools outputs on thesis writing are shown in Table 4.1.2. The table consists of 3 items (OUT1-OUT3), which provide an index for clarity, fulfilling requirements and improvement in quality of the thesis. A five-point Likert scale (Strongly disagree to Strongly agree) was used to rate each item and a total of 100 respondents participated in the study. Regarding OUT1, over half of respondents (51.0%) agreed and 18% strongly agreed that the AI responses are clear, coherent and useful. Only a minute percentage of citizens disagreed (5%) or strongly disagreed (4%), with 22% expressing neutral opinions. The average 3.85, median and mode of 4.00 suggests that this content quality measure was largely positively evaluated by most respondents with AI output being within clear or useful (even though there is a fair amount of variance in these evaluations as shown by the standard deviation of .908).

As for the second item (OUT2) that AI-generated output is necessary in the writing of

thesis, the results are similar to those of the first one. More participants agreed (55%) to that statement, and 16% of the students strongly agreed with it, indicating that most thought AI tools can generate content usable for their academic work. Twenty percent had neutral responses while low percentages expressed disagreement (6%) or strong disagreement (3%). This positive perception is confirmed by the high mean score of 3.84, and the fact that both the median and mode scores are equal to 4.00 (with a significant central tendency toward agreement). The low standard deviation of 0.944 shows almost the same consistency as that found for OUT1.

Regarding OUT3 looking at an increased thesis quality due to the new AI tools, a slightly higher agreement among participants can be found. Most (63%) believe AI tools improve thesis quality, 17% do so strongly. Fewer respondents remained neutral (13%) or disagreed (4%), and only 3% strongly disagreed. An average of 3.94 suggests high overall satisfaction from the contribution that AI tools have made to thesis quality. The median and mode of 4.00 suggest a central tendency around the “Agree” level with moderate variation as indicated by the standard deviation of 0.893. Taken together, these results reinforce the notion that respondents view AI-based tools as valuable for enhancing clarity and relevance or overall quality in their thesis work.

Discussion:

Table 4.1.2 demonstrates that students in the graduate program of English studies share the perception towards AI tools as useful in increasing quality of their thesis output. The majority of respondents agreed (51.0%) or strongly agreed (18.0%) with OUT1 about whether AI-generated responses are clear, coherent, and useful, with few who disagreed (5.0%), and 22.0% being neutral. Additionally, concerning similarly OUT2, determining if the graduation documents meet the expectations on their thesis writing work: 55.6% responded affirmatively and in some way, while 16.0% strongly agreed. Disagreement was less than 10%. The greatest consensus was however in OUT3 that addressed the general improvement in thesis quality; 63% agreed and another 17% strongly agreed. Means for all three variables (ranging from 3.85 to 3.94) hovered just below neutral, while medians and modes were at the midpoint of the response scale (4.00), and standard deviations were less than 1.0 across all cases, suggesting overall positivity with little variability among participants semiclassical. These findings indicate that, as regarded output quality is concerned, AI-based tools are effective and useful for the thesis writing amongst most of the postgraduate students.

If we cross-reference theses results with other previous ones, it is consistent with already mentioned studies evidencing how helpful can be AI tools for academic writing. For example, (Sharshova et al., 2025) showed that AI writing tools enhance text clarity and coherence in academic second language contexts specifically. Similarly, research by (Kim et al., 2025) noted a positive perception of AI-generated outcomes among graduate students who found them beneficial for creating and editing documents connected to academic content. The papers reported “reduced cognitive load” and an increase in throughput. The consistency of the present findings with these studies suggests that graduate students understand how they can benefit from AI tools in practice as not only add-on aids but also as instruments for

significantly improving the quality of their scholarly writing.

In terms of inference, the data suggest that graduate students' perceptions of output quality would be expected to affect both their intentions and behavior to use. Strong levels of agreement from OUT1–OUT3 suggest that students are keen to use AI tools in ways that would advance writing accuracy, clarity and quality of the thesis as a whole. This implies a direct connection between perceived usefulness and the adoption of AI tools, in line with technology acceptance models (e.g. Davis, 1989). In addition, by the same range of variation in answers serves as a confirmation that most see AI positively and in contrast for a minority to be hesitant or with no attitude, possibly offering broad worries about over-reliance/ critical perspectives on its outputs. Conclusion This study can be seen as support for the proposition that AI tools, in addition to being positively evaluated with respect to output quality, also motivate graduate students from writing practices; and effective thesis-writing performance.

Table 4.1.3: Graduate students' perceptions towards adopting AI tools as an AI writing-assistant tool under the construct of improving writing skills.

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Median	Mode	SD
10. AI tools help in improving my academic writing skills.	1 (1%)	9 (9%)	15 (15%)	55 (55%)	20 (20%)	3.94	4	4	0.915
11. AI tools improve my understanding of the coherence and cohesion in writing different sections and chapters in a thesis.	3 (3%)	2 (2%)	13 (13%)	63 (63%)	19 (19%)	4.02	4	4	0.879
12. Using AI tools helps me in improving my grammar and vocabulary for thesis writing.	1 (1%)	3 (3%)	13 (13%)	59 (59%)	24 (24%)	4.02	4	4	0.879

Frequency distribution and descriptive statistics for participants' perceptions of the function of AI-related tools for enhancing their academic writing skill. Table 4.1.3 shows the numerical value related to responses from that part measuring participants'

perceptions around the role of AI-tools in helping them to develop their academic writing ability. The table displays three items (IWS1, IWS2, IWS3) and shows both total valid number of responses (N = 100), frequency and percentage for each Likert-scale category as well as mean, median, mode and standard deviation per item. The information indicates the students' perceptions of AI-supported tools as means to develop their writing, coherence and grammar) in a general context of academic writing.

The first result, IWS1: "AI tools support me to enhance my academic writing skills," indicates that most of interviewees agreed with the statement (55.0%), or strongly agreed (20.0%), in sum 75.0% positive answers. A minority disagreed, 1.0% strongly and 9.0% disagreeing; with a further 15.0% reporting not knowing or other. The mean (3.94) and median/mode (4.00) indicate a strong overall perception of the assessment and it's this cluster is toward agree then we can state that perceptions are positive, with participant's answers strongly in one direction. Moderate variation, as indicated by the relatively high 0.915 standard deviation, suggests that although a majority of participants viewed AI tools positively contributing to writing skills, there were some who viewed it differently.

For IWS2, "AI tools enhance my comprehension of coherence and cohesion in writing various sections and chapters in a thesis," the trend toward agreement is higher so that 63.0% agree and 19.0% strongly agree, together adding to total positive responses of 72.0%. A few disagreed (2.0%) or strongly disagreed (3.0%), while 13% were neutral. The strong positive usefulness of the adoption intention (M = 4.02, MD, Mo = 4.00 and SD = 0.879) convey a subjective impression both in mean usefulness and in variance dimensions between subjects supported with agreement. Items IWS3, "AI tools help me to improve my grammatical or vocabulary errors for the writing thesis" had higher agreement scores (59.0% agreed and 24.0% strongly agreed—total of 83.0%). A mean of 4.02, median and mode of 4.00, and standard deviation of .879 indicate respondents consistently believe AI tools to be effective in improving grammar/pronunciation/ vocabulary with a little more agreement than the other two items.

Generally, as shown in Table 4.1.3), the participants find AI tools beneficial for enhancing their writing skills, coherence and cohesion and language command. For all three items the sample scores were in the favourable range with means above 3.9 of a maximum possible 5, and median and mode also set higher at 4.00, suggesting relative homogeneity amongst participants for these measurements' categories. These results point out the potential of AI-powered tools in thesis writing, indicating that students perceive them as a useful aid for both technical and structural aspects of academic writing.

Discussion:

From the results of Table 4.1.3, it was found that the English studies graduate students consider AI tools to be significantly useful to improve on their skills in writing thesis. Most people had positive experiences on all three counts. In particular, 55.0% agreed and 20.0% strongly agreed that using AI tools improved their academic writing skills (IWS1), resulting in a mean value of 3.94. Again, for IWS2 that investigated the improvement of understanding coherence and cohesion between the thesis sections,

63.0% agreed and 19.0% strongly agreed with a mean score of 4.02. In IWS3 a high proportion of students (over 83 %) agreed or strongly agreed on the extent that grammar and vocabulary is improved (mean = 4.02), suggesting a strong belief in AI tools support for linguistic and structural enhancement to their academic writing. Our findings show that students perceive AI tools primarily as useful support mechanisms for developing core writing skills in an English-studies environment.

Compared to previous studies, the results are correlated with research identifying AI to be a means to support academic language. For example, the study in (Mustafa et al., 2025) demonstrated that AI writing assistance increases the clarity and grammatical correctness of graduate writing assignments. In the same line, (Malik et al., 2023) found that students who used AI tools reported better understanding of text order and structure especially in long academic writing, like thesis. Our high agreement levels replicate these results, supporting the hypothesis that while AI tools do not directly generate text, they may promote an understanding of writing structures and coherence. This crossover indicates a matching of the attitudes between the E studies graduate students in this study and the larger trends of educational technology utilization documented in literature.

From these findings, it seems that perceived usefulness of AI tools is closely associated with students' adaptation to writing practices. The prevalence of "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" answers in IWS1–IWS3 indicates that graduate students will very probably include AI tools in their routine writing process, contributing to improved quality and content of the form. What is more, the standard deviations are relatively low (0.879-0.915), which means that respondents had not differing to say about the three attitudes above implying general acceptance of AI tools among those sampled from the English studies graduate population. In general, the findings confirm that AI tools are not only supplementary epistemic editing supports but also considered as indispensable to enhancing academic writing skills, coherence, and language competency in response to our first research question on utility and ease of adopting the AI tool for thesis work.

Table 4.2: Graduate students' perceptions towards adopting AI tools as an AI writing-assistant under the construct of Perceived Ease of Use

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	Median	Mode	S D
4. AI tools have a user-friendly interface.	3 (3%)	0 (0%)	12 (12%)	58 (58%)	27 (27%)	4.03	4	4	0.890
5. AI tools require minimal effort to interact with.	2 (2%)	5 (5%)	12 (12%)	60 (60%)	21 (21%)	3.93	4	4	0.922

6.	AI tools	2	3	8	55	32	3.69	4	4	0.990
	make the thesis	(2%)	(3%)	(8%)	(55%)	(32%)				
	writing process									
	faster and									
	easier.									

Table 4.2 illustrates the descriptive statistics of perceived ease of use for AI tools in thesis writing and frequency distribution. Three elements are considered in Table 4.2: the ease of using AI interface (PEOU1), the amount of effort expended on tools use (PEOU2) and ease prior to better writing) faster writing (PEOU3). For each item, frequencies and percentages as well as descriptive statistics such as the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation are used to allow a more extensive interpretation of participants' attitudes.

As for PEOU1, which evaluates whether the AI tool is easy to use, most of the participants held positive attitudes. More precisely, 58 (58.0%) participants agreed and 27 (27%) strongly agreed; only a minority partially or totally disagreed. The fact that the average is 4.03 and both median and mode are 4.00 suggests, in general, participants find user interfaces of AI tools intuitive and easy to use. The SD value of 0.890 indicates a moderate variation in positive attitudes towards the user-friendliness of AI tools among most participants.

For PEOU2, when considering if AI tools do not require a lot of effort to be manipulated, participants mainly agreed (n = 60 participants, 60.0%) or strongly agreed (n = 21 participants, 21%), meaning that the tools are seen as easy to work with. Very few respondents strongly disagreed (2%) or disagreed (5.0%). The average of 3.93, median and mode of 4.00 serve to strengthens the perception that this system is quite easy to use while the low standard deviation value of 0.922 indicates that there was a trend in responding.

Finally, PEOU3 regarding whether AI tools facilitate the process of writing a thesis faster and easier was scored with significantly higher positive responses (55 participants, 55.0%) agreeing but 32 participants (32.0%) strongly agreeing. At 3.69, the average score demonstrates strong agreement in terms of AI tooling's potential for increasing efficiency, which is further indicated by a standard deviation of 0.990, showing a low level of spread amongst participants.

In summary, the Table 4.2 shows that for the users of the AI tools, these are seen as easy to be used by not too much effort being needed and thesis writing process is found to be quicker and easier. The predominance of "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" responses for all three items, together with the mean scores which are close to 4.0 or greater than 4.0 indicates favourable acceptance of AI tools in usability perspective. The findings offer empirical support for the speculation that AI tools are considered easy to use, and suggest their potential impacts on academic writing tasks while maintaining participant satisfaction and engagement.

Discussion:

The first research question identified how useful and easy to use AI life tools is from the point of view of graduate students' enhanced thesis writing skills in English studies. The frequency distribution and descriptive statistics of perceived ease of use (PEOU) among 100 postgraduate students is presented in Table 4.2. The statistics show that students generally find the AI tools are friendly and efficient for writing thesis. For example, 58.0% of respondents agree with and 27.0% strongly agree that the AI apps have a user-friendly interface (PEOU1) and very small portions of respondents disagree (3% strongly disagrees, 0% disagree). Moreover, PEOU2, that evaluates the effort of interaction with AI tools reveals 60% agree and 21% strongly agree that it is done at minimum effort, only 5% disagree. PEOU3, relating to the perceived increase in speed and ease with which theses can be written using AI tools, was also strongly supported, at 55% agreeing and 32% strongly agreeing. Means on all items ranged from 3.933 to 4.03, with median and mode of responses again consistently at 4.00, reflecting an overall prevalently agreement tendency. Moderate consensus among respondents is indicated by standard deviations from 0.89 to 0.990. Together, these results suggest that students in the English domain view AI tools as more or less usable, resource-effective and capable of providing support with thesis writing.

Referencing these findings with previous research demonstrates strong convergence with the existing literature on technology acceptance in academic contexts. The study of (Ibrahim & Shiring, 2022) also indicates on the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) that perceived ease of use has a great impact on attitudes toward using technology. In line with this perspective, participants in this study mostly identified AI tools as being easy to use and at some point effort saving, implying that usability is important in their engagement. Moreover, research done by (Chen & Gong, 2025) on AI-assisted writing in higher education show that the students highly appreciate systems which simplify writing and decrease cognitive burden, a fact consistent with the relatively high endorsement of TAM3 in this study. By contrast, even if earlier studies sometimes mention resistance in particular related to learning curve and interface complexity toward AI integration (Mehdaoui, 2024), such criticisms were scarcely present among the sample at hand as only few students did not agree with the ease-of-use items. Such data might indicate that contemporary AI writing tools, and especially those used in English studies, have achieved a sufficient level of usability to serve as barriers for adoption.

These findings suggest that perceived ease of use is an important factor influencing the acceptance of AI tools for graduate students' thesis writing practices. The strong favorable reactions suggest that students will proactively use AI tools to enhance their workflow, leading to efficiencies and sparing them the drudgery of additional manual labour. High means and low variability indicate acceptance, as well as consistency of percept across individuals, pointing to the importance of easy-to-use design and intuition of interface for behavior on attractiveness. What is more, the findings suggest that strategies for promoting AI in thesis-writing need to focus on interface simplicity and features that save time as this determines perceived usefulness, and by extension satisfaction with and intention to use by students.

Conclusion

This study discovered that English Studies graduate students are generally favorable towards the adoption of AI thesis writing tools. Most of those who responded said that AI technologies make writing, productivity and research better. Means for the information retrieval, user-friendliness and Grammar/ vocabulary development items were all relatively high ($M = 4.03$). These results imply that students believe in the usefulness of AI technologies to help with brainstorming ideas, organizing them, improving them and generating well-structured academic documents. But the study has highlighted some cautious optimism too. Students thought AI would be useful but weren't really convinced that AI technologies make writing a thesis quicker or better (lowest mean = 3.69). This means that students still have problems when it comes to AI-tools, such as making sure the context is fitting, becoming too dependent on them and needing human assessment for critical thinking and understanding information. The fact that most medians are 4 and the standard deviations are relatively low demonstrates that A.I. tools should perhaps be used as helpers rather than stand-in writers. The study concludes that AI tools improve academic writing in a number of ways, making language better, organizing it better and helping writers to find material more easily. These tools are crucial to the work of graduate students in English Studies, who know that there they have limitations. In this way, students can use AI but under the academic integrity rules of honesty, respect and responsibility. To evaluate the utilization of AI technologies in writing among students from other academic areas, subsequent research may investigate additional fields. Future studies could assess the ethical and enduring impacts of AI-assisted writing on academic integrity, originality, and critical thinking. Finally, universities and institutions should offer training programs and rules to help students use AI tools securely in their academic studies.

REFERENCES

- Abdelhalim, S. M., & Alsahil, A. A. (2025). Supervisory written feedback in ELT practicum: exploring content, linguistic features, and perceptions of preservice teachers. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12(1), 1-12.
- Alam, A. (2021). Possibilities and apprehensions in the landscape of artificial intelligence in education. 2021 International Conference on Computational Intelligence and Computing Applications (ICCICA), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCICA52458.2021.9697272>
- Aljuaid, H. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence tools on academic writing instruction in higher education: A systematic review. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on ChatGPT*.
- Anders, B. A. (2023). Is using ChatGPT cheating, plagiarism, both, neither, or forward thinking? *Patterns*, 4(3), 100694. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2023.100694>
- Atkinson-Toal, A., & Guo, C. (2024). Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Education Policies of UK Universities. *Enhancing Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 2.
- Chaurasia, M. S. A. (2025). Ethical Concerns and Challenges in AI-Generated Content. *MultidisciplinaryX Research for Sustainable Solutions*, 58.

- Chen, C., & Gong, Y. (2025). The role of AI-assisted learning in academic writing: A mixed-methods study on Chinese as a second language students. *Education Sciences*, 15(2), 141.
- Crawford, J., Cowling, M., & Allen, K.-A. (2023). Leadership is needed for ethical ChatGPT: Character, assessment, and learning using artificial intelligence (AI). *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 20(3), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.3.02>
- Črček, N., & Patekar, J. (2023). Writing with AI: University students' use of ChatGPT. *Journal of Language and Education*, 9(4), 128–138. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2023.17379>
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Foster, C. (2023). Methodological pragmatism in educational research: From qualitative-quantitative to exploratory-confirmatory distinctions. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 47(1), 4–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727x.2023.2210063>
- Goh, P. S. (2024). Pedagogical perspective on ChatGPT's effectiveness as a learning tool for ESL writing. *UTAR*,
- Holmes, W., & Tuomi, I. (2022). State of the art and practice in AI in education. *European Journal of Education*, 57(4), 542–570. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12533>
- Hosseini, M., Resnik, D. B., & Holmes, K. (2023). The ethics of disclosing the use of artificial intelligence tools in writing scholarly manuscripts. *Research Ethics*, 19(4), 449-465.
- Ibrahim, A., & Shiring, E. (2022). The Relationship between Educators' Attitudes, Perceived Usefulness, and Perceived Ease of Use of Instructional and Web-Based Technologies: Implications from Technology Acceptance Model (TAM). *International Journal of Technology in Education*, 5(4), 535-551.
- Imran, A. A., & Lashari, A. A. (2023). Exploring the World of Artificial Intelligence: The perception of the university students about chatgpt for academic purpose. *Global Social Sciences Review*, VIII(I), 375–384. [https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2023\(viii-i\).34](https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2023(viii-i).34)
- Kacena, M. A., Plotkin, L. I., & Fehrenbacher, J. C. (2024). The use of artificial intelligence in writing scientific review articles. *Current osteoporosis reports*, 22(1), 115-121.
- Khalifa, M., & Albadawy, M. (2024). Using artificial intelligence in academic writing and research: An essential productivity tool. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine Update*, 5, 100145.
- Khalid, M. S., El-Haj Moussa, A. M., Wu, J., & Ekstrøm, J. (2025). Generative AI Tools for Systematic Approaches to Literature Review: Insights from Danish Librarians. Paper presented at the International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction.
- Khalifa, M., & Albadawy, M. (2024). Using artificial intelligence in academic writing and research: An essential productivity tool. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine Update*, 5, 100145.

- 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.
- Krajka, J., & Olszak, I. (2024). Artificial intelligence tools in academic writing instruction: Exploring the potential of on-demand AI assistance in the writing process. *Roczniki Humanistyczne*, 72(6), 123-140.
- Lin, H., & Chen, Q. (2024). Artificial intelligence (AI)-integrated educational applications and college students' creativity and academic emotions: students and teachers' perceptions and attitudes. *BMC psychology*, 12(1), 487.
- 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>
- Lockey, S., Gillespie, N., Holm, D., & Someh, I. A. (2021). A review of trust in artificial intelligence: Challenges, vulnerabilities and future directions. *Proceedings of the Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, 5463–5472. <https://doi.org/10.24251/hicss.2021.664>
- Malik, A. R., Pratiwi, Y., Andajani, K., Numertayasa, I. W., Suharti, S., & Darwis, A. (2023). Exploring artificial intelligence in academic essay: higher education student's perspective. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 5, 100296.
- Manan, S. A. (2019). Myth of English teaching and learning: A study of practices in the low-cost schools in Pakistan. *Asian Englishes*, 21(2), 172-189.
- Mines, R. (2024). Student Experiences in Technology-Infused Learning Contexts: An Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis Exploration. Open Access Te Herenga Waka-Victoria University of Wellington,
- Mehdaoui, A. (2024). Unveiling Barriers and Challenges of AI Technology Integration in Education: Assessing Teachers' Perceptions, Readiness and Anticipated Resistance. *Futurity Education*, 4(4), 95-108.
- Mustafa, G., Khoso, A. R., & Raza, M. A. (2025). EVALUATING THE ROLE OF AI TOOLS IN ENHANCING CRITICAL THINKING AND ARGUMENTATION IN HIGH-STAKES WRITING AMONG GRADUATE STUDENTS AT MUET HYDERABAD. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT)*, 8(2), 1521-1536.
- Nguyen Bich Dieu, P. H. N. (2024). An Investigation into Third-Year Elt Students' Perceptions of Using Chatgpt as an AI Writing Assistant Tool: A Case Study in Vietnam. *International Journal of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences Studies*, 9(5), 41–55. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/http://www.ijahss.com/Paper/09052024/1179451928.pdf>
- Potasheva, O. V., Kuzmenko, M. V., & Plutova, M. I. (2019). The effective use of digital technologies in education: Positive experience of regional innovation platforms. *Modern Management Trends and the Digital Economy (MTDE 2019)*, 81, 688–693. <https://doi.org/10.2991/mtde-19.2019.140>
- Schwenke, N., Söbke, H., & Kraft, E. (2023b). Potentials and challenges of chatbot-

Online ISSN

3007-3197

Print ISSN

3007-3189

<http://amresearchreview.com/index.php/Journal/about>

- supported thesis writing: An autoethnography. *Trends in Higher Education*, 2(4), 611–635. <https://doi.org/10.3390/higheredu2040037>
- Sharshova, R., Salkhanova, Z., Yelubayeva, P., Maral, A., Sholakhova, A., & Kaliaskarova, A. (2025). The Use of AI Writing Tools in Second Language Learning to Enhance Kazakh IT Students' Academic Writing Skills. Paper presented at the Forum for Linguistic Studies.
- Silva, J. C., Gouveia, R. P., Zielinski, K. M., Oliveira, M. C. F., Amancio, D. R., Bruno, O. M., & Oliveira Jr, O. N. (2025). AI-Assisted Tools for Scientific Review Writing: Opportunities and Cautions. *ACS applied materials & interfaces*, 17(34), 47795-47805.
- Syahnaz, M., & Fithriani, R. (2023). Utilizing artificial intelligence-based paraphrasing tool in EFL writing class: a focus on Indonesian university students' perceptions. *Scope: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 210-218.
- Thompson, J., & Harris, O. (2025). A Narrative Review of Educational Technology in Higher Education. *Social Science Chronicle*, 5, 1-27
- Yusuf, A., Bello, S., Pervin, N., & Tukur, A. K. (2024). Implementing a proposed framework for enhancing critical thinking skills in synthesizing AI-generated texts. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 53, 101619.
- Zheng, W. (2024). AI vs. Human: A Comparative Study of Cohesion and Coherence in Academic Texts between Human-Written and ChatGPT-Generated Texts.
- Zhao, D. (2025). The impact of AI-enhanced natural language processing tools on writing proficiency: An analysis of language precision, content summarization, and creative writing facilitation. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(6), 8055-8086.
- Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education—where are the educators? *International journal of educational technology in higher education*, 16(1), 1-27.