

The Use of Generative AI for Abstract Translation and Its Impact on Language Skills and Academic Integrity among Accounting Students

Fitrotul Maulidiyah^{1*}, Rizka Rahmawati², Ririn Pratiwi Suharto³, Adzikirani⁴, Lia Agustina⁵, Futuh Handoyo⁶

Politeknik Negeri Malang

Corresponding Author: Fitrotul Maulidiyah fitrotulmaulidiyah@polinema.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Generative AI, Assessment, Language Learning

Received : 15 June

Revised : 20 July

Accepted: 31 August

©2026 Maulidiyah, Rahmawati, Suharto, Adzikirani, Agustina, Handoyo: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Atribusi 4.0 Internasional](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

This research examines accounting students' use of generative AI, particularly ChatGPT, for translating academic abstracts and its impact on their English proficiency and academic integrity. Using a qualitative descriptive approach, data were collected through in-depth interviews with 15 students, a Likert-scale questionnaire with 25 students, and a focus group discussion with 5 students at Politeknik Negeri Malang, then analysed thematically. Findings show that AI accelerates translation and enriches vocabulary and grammatical awareness when used reflectively, but some students exhibit dependency and uncertainty about ethical boundaries. Most students are aware of the need for transparency, yet the absence of institutional guidance leaves ethical limits unclear. The study concludes that generative AI can enrich linguistic competence and ethical awareness when used responsibly

INTRODUCTION

Regarded as the next major technological revolution, artificial intelligence (AI) has developed rapidly and gained considerable attention since 2023 (Bran & Grosseck, 2024). General AI refers broadly to technologies capable of intelligent behavior, such as automatic translation, online recommendation systems, and grammar checkers, whereas generative AI is a more specific class of AI capable of producing new content, including text, images, and even code. The most well-known example is ChatGPT. Generative AI is considered a disruptive technology because it operates on the most advanced human invention, language itself (Bozkurt, 2024), and its rapid adoption across education, including language learning and academic writing, has raised both pedagogical opportunities and new challenges.

Among university students, particularly those in accounting, translating research abstracts accurately into English is essential, since academic work is increasingly expected to be communicated internationally. Generative AI tools such as ChatGPT have emerged to assist students in this task, offering translations that are often more contextually appropriate than conventional machine translation. However, this convenience is accompanied by concerns about academic integrity and plagiarism, as well as the risk that students may become overly dependent on AI rather than developing their own English proficiency.

This research aims to investigate how accounting students at Politeknik Negeri Malang use generative AI to translate academic abstracts, and to examine the impact of this practice on their language proficiency and their understanding of academic integrity. By integrating language-learning theory with the practical use of generative AI, this study seeks to inform the development of institutional guidelines that allow AI to be used as a means of enriching linguistic competence rather than undermining it (Dien, 2023).

In the Indonesian context, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology has begun to acknowledge the presence of generative AI in higher education, issuing preliminary guidance that encourages institutions to develop their own contextual policies rather than adopting a single national standard (Diktiristek, 2024). At the institutional level, however, many vocational higher education institutions, including Politeknik Negeri Malang, have not yet formulated specific regulations on generative AI use in academic writing, leaving lecturers and students to navigate its use without clear reference points. This situation is particularly relevant for accounting students, whose final projects require an English abstract as a graduation requirement, making the translation process a recurring and high-stakes academic task in which the temptation to rely on AI is considerable.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Generative AI and Academic Translation

Generative AI refers to artificial intelligence capable of creating new content, including text, images, and audio. Notable examples include OpenAI's GPT-3 and GPT-4 models, trained using deep learning techniques on massive datasets of diverse texts; GPT-3 alone has 175 billion parameters, enabling it to understand and generate human language with remarkable accuracy (Draxler et al., 2023). In education, generative AI has been shown to enhance students' motivation and learning outcomes by supporting the design of more engaging and interactive materials (Roe & Perkins, 2024). In translation specifically, tools such as ChatGPT do not merely translate word-for-word; they capture contextual meaning, producing translations that are more natural and academically appropriate than those generated by conventional machine-translation tools (Rizal, 2024). Nevertheless, questions remain about the accuracy and reliability of AI-generated translations, and about the risk that students may become overly dependent on these tools rather than developing their own mastery of English.

Beyond translation accuracy, several studies have examined how learners interact with AI output at the cognitive level. Roe & Perkins (2024) argue that generative AI functions as a form of distributed cognition, in which part of the linguistic decision-making process is offloaded to the machine; the educational value of this interaction depends heavily on whether learners critically evaluate the suggestions provided or accept them uncritically. In the context of abstract translation specifically, this distinction becomes crucial because an abstract functions as the most visible summary of a whole research project, meaning that translation errors or a lack of genuine engagement with the English version may misrepresent the depth of the underlying research.

Academic Integrity and Ethical Use of AI

One of the major issues arising from the use of generative AI in academic writing is academic integrity. Students may submit AI-generated work as their own without proper attribution, which undermines academic credibility (Diktiristek, 2024). Current guidance for generative AI use in higher education emphasizes that although AI can serve as a useful tool, its output must still be reviewed and edited manually by the user. However, in the absence of explicit institutional frameworks, students' moral reasoning about what constitutes acceptable AI use tends to be individual and inconsistent (Diktiristek, 2024), creating ambiguity about the boundary between legitimate assistance and academic dishonesty.

The consequences of this ambiguity extend beyond individual assignments. Dien (2023) contends that when generative AI is used to produce substantial portions of academic text without disclosure, it constitutes a distinct category of plagiarism that differs from traditional copy-and-paste practices because the output is original in form yet not the product of the student's own reasoning. This raises difficult questions for assessment: unlike conventional plagiarism, AI-generated text cannot always be traced to a specific source document, making detection tools an incomplete solution. Consequently, cultivating students' internal ethical compass, rather than relying solely on detection technology, has

been proposed as a more sustainable long-term strategy for safeguarding academic integrity.

English Proficiency and Research Gaps in AI-Assisted Language Learning

English proficiency is one of the key competencies required of accounting students, as the ability to produce financial reports, business presentations, and academic research in English is increasingly necessary in the global workplace (Karafil & Uyar, 2025). The integration of generative AI into English learning may offer an effective way to improve these skills through interactive translation and writing practice, provided that students still receive adequate guidance from instructors. Generative AI is therefore viewed not only as a tool for accelerating technical learning, but also as an innovation that can promote more interactive, creative, and relevant learning experiences (Gleneagles et al., 2024; Munawwaroh & Adeoye, 2024). Even so, several research gaps remain, particularly regarding the long-term effects of generative AI on language acquisition, unequal access to technology in resource-limited institutions, and the lack of transparency in AI models that makes it difficult for users to interpret their outputs (Rizal, 2024).

Furthermore, English proficiency for accounting students cannot be separated from discipline-specific literacy. Accurate translation of an abstract requires not only general grammatical competence but also familiarity with specialised terminology, such as distinguishing between “revenue recognition” and “income realisation,” which general-purpose AI models may render imprecisely without contextual correction from the user. This suggests that generative AI is most beneficial when paired with discipline-specific vocabulary instruction, reinforcing the argument that AI should complement, rather than substitute, targeted language teaching within professional and vocational curricula such as those offered at Politeknik Negeri Malang.

Institutional Governance and Policy Gaps in AI-Assisted Academic Writing

Globally, universities have responded to generative AI in varying ways, ranging from outright bans to structured integration into curricula, reflecting an unsettled consensus on best practice (Bozkurt, 2024). Institutions that have adopted proactive governance frameworks typically combine three elements: explicit disclosure requirements, in which students state where and how AI was used; instructor training on evaluating AI-assisted work; and revised assessment design that emphasises process documentation, such as drafts and reflection logs, over the final product alone. In the Indonesian vocational higher education sector, such frameworks remain largely absent, and the responsibility for defining acceptable AI use currently falls on individual lecturers rather than institutional policy. This gap between global governance discourse and local implementation forms part of the rationale for the present study, which seeks to generate contextually grounded evidence to inform future policy development at Politeknik Negeri Malang.

METHODOLOGY

This research employed a qualitative descriptive approach to explore the use of generative AI in abstract translation and its impact on the language proficiency and academic integrity of accounting students. The qualitative method was chosen because it enables an in-depth exploration of students' experiences, perceptions, and attitudes toward generative AI in academic contexts (Cresswell, 2013). The research was conducted at the Accounting Department of Politeknik Negeri Malang.

Participants were selected through purposive sampling (Palinkas et al., 2015), based on the following criteria: active enrolment as accounting students, experience in writing abstracts in English for final reports or theses, and prior use of generative AI during the translation process.

Data were collected using three techniques. First, semi-structured in-depth interviews lasting twenty to thirty minutes were conducted with fifteen students to explore their motivations, perceived advantages and limitations, editing behaviours, and ethical awareness. Second, a questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale, consisting of ten statements on the frequency of AI use, its perceived effect on language proficiency, and students' understanding of academic integrity, was distributed to twenty-five students to provide quantitative support. Third, a one-hour focus group discussion (FGD) was conducted with five students representing frequent, moderate, and limited levels of AI use, to obtain shared perspectives on the challenges, learning outcomes, and institutional guidance expected by students.

Qualitative data from the interviews and FGD were analysed thematically using the six-step framework of Braun & Clarke (2006), comprising familiarisation, initial coding, theme development, theme refinement, definition, and synthesis. Validity was enhanced through member checking during the FGD and source triangulation across the three data sources. Quantitative data from the questionnaire were analysed using descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, and mean) to identify general trends, which were then used to support and reinforce the thematic interpretation of the qualitative data.

Ethical considerations were addressed throughout the research process. Prior to data collection, all participants were informed of the purpose of the study and provided written consent, with assurance that their identities would remain confidential and that participation would not affect their academic evaluation. Interview and FGD recordings were anonymised during transcription, and participants were assigned numerical codes (e.g., Student 1, Student 2) rather than real names in all reporting. Participants were also informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any point without consequence.

To strengthen the trustworthiness of the findings, the study applied several strategies commonly used in qualitative research. Credibility was supported through triangulation across interviews, the questionnaire, and the FGD, allowing convergent patterns to be identified across data sources. Dependability was addressed through an audit trail documenting coding decisions during thematic analysis, while confirmability was strengthened by involving a second coder to review a sample of transcripts and compare emerging themes, with

disagreements resolved through discussion. Transferability, given the qualitative and context-specific nature of the study, is left to the reader's judgement, supported by a detailed description of the research setting and participant characteristics.

RESEARCH RESULT

Patterns of Generative AI Use in Abstract Translation

The data indicate that students typically rely on tools such as ChatGPT or Google Gemini to translate their abstracts from Indonesian into English, most of them having begun using these tools after observing their effectiveness in producing accurate and natural-sounding translations. Students frequently described AI as a “quick assistant” that helps them understand complex sentence structures and appropriate academic vocabulary. Engagement with the AI-generated text varied: some students submitted the AI-produced version with minimal revision, while others refined sentence structures, replaced repetitive vocabulary, or adjusted tone and cohesion, indicating that generative AI functions primarily as a linguistic scaffold that assists but does not entirely replace human effort. Table 1 summarises the interview results.

A closer look at the interview data suggests that the degree of engagement with AI output was closely related to students' prior English proficiency. Students who described themselves as having stronger English backgrounds tended to treat the AI translation as a first draft to be critically reworked, whereas students with weaker self-reported proficiency were more likely to submit the AI output with little modification, citing limited confidence in their own ability to judge whether a revision would improve or worsen the translation. This pattern indicates that generative AI does not affect all students uniformly; rather, its pedagogical value appears to be mediated by the learner's existing language competence, a nuance that has implications for how lecturers scaffold AI use across students with different proficiency levels.

Table 1. Interview Results

No.	Questions	Summary of Interview Analysis
1.	Initial experience using AI	Most students first learned about ChatGPT from friends or lecturers and tried it while preparing their thesis abstracts. “At first, I just wanted to try it out, and it turned out better than Google Translate.” (Student 7)
2.	Main benefits of using AI	Twelve of fifteen students stated that AI accelerated the translation process, and nine felt that their academic vocabulary became richer. “I realized that using the word 'implication' is more accurate than 'impact.'” (Student 3)
3.	Challenges in using AI	Ten students mentioned that AI-generated results were sometimes too wordy or unnatural, and six said that while the grammar was usually correct, the context was sometimes inaccurate. “The sentences sound good, but they often don't express what I actually mean.” (Student 11)
4.	Academic integrity	Eight students believed AI should only be used as a supporting tool, not a full replacement for manual translation. Four students admitted they were still unsure whether AI use constitutes plagiarism. “If someone just copies and pastes the AI output, I think that's the same as being dishonest.” (Student 1)

5.	Impact on language skills	Seven students felt their language skills improved because they learned editing techniques, while five admitted to becoming too dependent on AI. "I can work faster now, but if I had to write on my own, I'd probably struggle." (Student 12)
----	---------------------------	--

The second finding relates to the perceived benefits and challenges of using generative AI for abstract translation. Most participants agreed that AI improves efficiency, reduces anxiety, and accelerates the translation process, while exposing them to formal sentence structures, transitional expressions, and discipline-specific vocabulary essential to academic writing. However, some students admitted that reliance on AI made them less confident in writing independently, and several were unsure whether AI-generated content should be acknowledged in their theses; errors also occasionally occurred in accounting-specific terminology such as "asset impairment" or "liability recognition," showing that AI-generated translations still require human evaluation. Quantitative data reinforce these observations: 84% of respondents agreed that AI tools helped them improve their translation results, 76% believed their grammar improved, but 68% admitted to overreliance on AI, and 61% were unsure about ethical use, figures that highlight a dual effect in which AI enhances linguistic ability yet fosters dependency and ethical ambiguity. Table 2 presents the questionnaire results in detail.

Table 2. Questionnaire Results

No.	Statement	SD	D	N	A	SA
1.	I often use AI to translate abstracts.	1	1	3	10	10
2.	AI-generated translations are fairly accurate and easy to understand.	1	1	5	9	9
3.	AI helps enrich my English vocabulary.	1	1	4	10	9
4.	AI helps me understand academic sentence structures.	1	1	6	9	8
5.	My English proficiency has improved after using AI.	2	4	7	6	6
6.	I still need to edit AI outputs to meet academic standards.	0	1	1	7	16
7.	I am worried about becoming too dependent on AI.	1	3	5	7	9
8.	I understand the importance of maintaining academic honesty when using AI.	0	1	3	9	12
9.	AI should only be a supporting tool, not a replacement.	0	1	2	8	14
10.	I agree that the university should create ethical guidelines for AI use.	0	1	1	9	14

Note. SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; N = Neutral; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree.

The third finding concerns the influence of AI use on students' understanding of academic integrity. Most students recognised that submitting unedited AI-generated work constitutes unethical behaviour, but many remained unsure about the appropriate way to acknowledge AI assistance. The focus group discussion revealed that students viewed AI both as a supportive learning tool and as a potential threat to academic honesty, and they emphasised the need for institutional guidelines that clearly define the boundaries of acceptable AI use and outline editing responsibilities.

Interestingly, students' concern about academic integrity did not always translate into concrete behavioural change. Several participants in the FGD acknowledged that although they were aware AI-generated text should be reviewed and partially rewritten, time pressure before submission deadlines sometimes led them to submit translations with only superficial edits, such as changing a few word choices, rather than substantive revision. This gap between ethical awareness and practice suggests that raising awareness alone may be insufficient; students also need practical support, such as checklists or guided editing exercises, to translate their ethical understanding into consistent academic behaviour.

Overall, the findings reveal that accounting students at Politeknik Negeri Malang have adopted generative AI as a learning and translation aid that significantly influences their writing practices, linguistic awareness, and ethical reasoning. While AI offers clear pedagogical advantages, the absence of explicit institutional policy leaves students uncertain about how to integrate it responsibly into their academic work.

Taken together, the three sets of findings suggest a layered picture: generative AI offers clear linguistic benefits at the level of vocabulary and sentence construction, but its ethical and pedagogical implications are shaped by factors such as students' prior proficiency, time constraints, and the absence of institutional structures that translate awareness into consistent practice. This layered pattern reinforces the argument that responses to generative AI in academic writing cannot rely on a single intervention, such as banning its use or simply raising awareness, but instead require a combination of curriculum design, assessment adjustment, and institutional policy working together.

DISCUSSION

The findings align with recent literature emphasizing the transformative yet controversial role of generative AI in education. From a pedagogical standpoint, AI tools function as mediators of cognitive development, facilitating access to authentic linguistic input and fostering learner autonomy. By revising AI-generated translations, students practice linguistic accuracy while also developing critical thinking and self-regulation skills, supporting the argument of Bran & Grosbeck (2024) that AI can enhance metacognitive awareness when learners are guided to analyze and refine its outputs rather than accept them passively.

At the same time, the findings highlight the “pedagogical paradox” described by Bozkurt (2024), in which AI serves as both a facilitator and a potential barrier to authentic learning. When used responsibly, generative AI stimulates students' curiosity, reduces language anxiety, and provides immediate linguistic feedback; however, when overused or uncritically adopted, it may weaken learners' ability to produce independent and original writing. This tension underscores the importance of digital literacy, students must learn not only how to use AI, but also when and why to use it, treating it as a tool for exploration and reflection rather than a replacement for human creativity and judgment.

Ethically, the research exposes a gap between students' awareness of integrity principles and their practical understanding of AI's implications. Although most participants acknowledged that unedited AI use constitutes plagiarism, they struggled to articulate how to ethically disclose or credit AI contributions. This ambiguity arises largely from the absence of institutional frameworks regulating AI use in academic settings; as Diktiristek (2024) noted, without explicit guidelines, students' moral reasoning about AI tends to be individual and inconsistent.

The findings also confirm that generative AI can be an effective pedagogical ally when integrated with reflective learning practices. Students who engaged in post-editing AI outputs demonstrated stronger awareness of linguistic nuances and ethical considerations, reflecting active learning in which the learner assumes responsibility for evaluating and refining input rather than consuming it passively. This supports Karafil & Uyar (2025), who assert that digital transformation in education must go hand in hand with ethical and critical literacy to maintain academic authenticity.

These findings resonate with international research on generative AI in second-language writing, which similarly reports a dual effect of efficiency gains alongside diminished engagement in independent composition (Roe & Perkins, 2024). However, the present study extends this literature by situating the discussion within a vocational, discipline-specific context, showing that the tension between efficiency and authentic learning is not limited to general English or literature courses but also applies to professional and technical writing such as accounting abstracts, where domain-specific accuracy carries additional weight beyond general linguistic correctness.

From a curriculum design perspective, the findings imply that writing instruction for accounting students may benefit from explicitly incorporating AI-literacy components, such as guided exercises in comparing AI-generated and self-produced translations, structured reflection tasks on the differences observed, and rubrics that reward evidence of critical engagement with AI output rather than penalising its use outright. Such an approach would position generative AI as an object of study within the writing curriculum itself, rather than an external tool whose use is left unaddressed.

Overall, the discussion reinforces that integrating generative AI into higher education, particularly in language and writing contexts, requires a dual emphasis on technological proficiency and ethical awareness. Universities should therefore develop clear policies that define acceptable AI use, establish acknowledgment protocols, and train both lecturers and students to apply AI tools responsibly.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Generative AI has become an influential tool in the academic translation process, significantly transforming the way students approach English abstract writing. Its ability to generate accurate, contextually appropriate, and stylistically consistent translations has given students greater access to authentic linguistic input and improved their awareness of academic writing conventions, while also risking dependence and reduced initiative to engage deeply in the language-learning process if not properly guided.

The findings also show that although students generally recognise that submitting AI-generated work without acknowledgment constitutes plagiarism, many remain uncertain about the boundary between legitimate assistance and academic dishonesty. This uncertainty stems primarily from the absence of institutional regulations defining acceptable AI practices, underscoring the urgent need for higher education institutions to establish clear policies that promote transparency, accountability, and responsible AI use.

From a pedagogical perspective, generative AI can act as a cognitive scaffold that supports active learning when used reflectively, allowing students to compare, revise, and internalise linguistic patterns; used passively, however, it may diminish cognitive engagement and hinder genuine language acquisition. Lecturers therefore play a crucial role in guiding students to engage with AI constructively by encouraging post-editing, reflection, and ethical awareness.

Based on these conclusions, several recommendations are proposed. First, institutions should formulate comprehensive policies governing generative AI use in academic settings, including guidelines on disclosure, acknowledgment, and permissible levels of AI assistance. Second, lecturers are encouraged to integrate AI literacy into their teaching, emphasising reflective use rather than reliance, with assignments that include critical analysis and revision. Third, students should be encouraged to view AI as a learning partner rather than a replacement for their own linguistic effort, developing habits of post-editing, verifying terminology accuracy, and reflecting on the ethical implications of their use of technology.

For institutional leaders, these recommendations translate into concrete steps: convening a working group involving lecturers, language centre staff, and academic quality assurance units to draft an AI-use policy within one to two academic semesters, and piloting a disclosure statement that students attach to AI-assisted assignments. For lecturers, practical steps include allocating a portion of writing classes to compare AI-generated and student-produced translations, and providing feedback that explicitly addresses both linguistic accuracy and critical engagement with AI tools. For students, developing a habit of comparing AI suggestions against a dictionary or terminology glossary before finalising a translation offers a low-cost way to strengthen both language learning and translation accuracy.

ADVANCED RESEARCH

This research is limited to accounting students at a single institution, Politeknik Negeri Malang, and relies primarily on self-reported data from interviews, a questionnaire, and a focus group discussion; the findings may therefore not be generalisable to other disciplines or institutional contexts. Future research is recommended to examine the long-term effects of AI-assisted translation on students' language development and ethical reasoning across different disciplines and levels of study, and to evaluate the effectiveness of institutional guidelines once such policies are implemented.

Future studies could also employ a mixed-methods experimental design, comparing writing outcomes between students who receive structured AI-literacy training and those who do not, to provide stronger causal evidence on the pedagogical value of guided AI use. Comparative studies across institutions with differing levels of AI policy maturity would further help identify which specific governance mechanisms most effectively translate students' ethical awareness into consistent academic practice.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank the accounting students of Politeknik Negeri Malang who participated in the interviews, questionnaire, and focus group discussion, as well as colleagues at Accounting Department, Politeknik Negeri Malang for their valuable support during this research.

REFERENCES

- Bozkurt, A. (2024). Tell me your prompts and I will make them true: The alchemy of prompt engineering and generative AI. In *Open Praxis* (Vol. 16, Number 2, pp. 111–118). International Council for Open and Distance Education Oslo, Norway.
- Bran, R., & Grosseck, G. (2024). Addressing the challenges of generative AI in English language teaching. *Scientific Bulletin of the Politehnica University of Timisoara: Transactions on Modern Languages/Buletinul Științific al Universității Politehnica Din Timișoara: Seria Limbi Moderne*, 23(1).
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Cresswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*.
- Dien, J. (2023). Generative artificial intelligence as a plagiarism problem. In *Biological Psychology* (Vol. 181, p. 108621). Elsevier.
- Diktiristek, D. (2024). *Panduan Penggunaan Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) pada Pembelajaran di Perguruan Tinggi*.

- Draxler, F., Schmidt, A., & Chuang, L. L. (2023). Relevance, Effort, and Perceived Quality: Language Learners' Experiences with AI-Generated Contextually Personalized Learning Material. *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference*, 2249–2262.
- Gleneagles, D. B., Larasyifa, F., & Fawaiz, R. (2024). Peran teknologi kecerdasan buatan (AI) dalam meningkatkan efisiensi proses belajar dan pembelajaran. *Madani: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, 2(5), 107–116.
- Karafil, B., & Uyar, A. (2025). Exploring knowledge, attitudes, and practices of academics in the field of educational sciences towards using ChatGPT. *Education and Information Technologies*, 1–44.
- Munawwaroh, I., & Adeoye, M. A. (2024). AI-Enhanced Learning Experiences: Moving Beyond Traditional Textbook Approaches in Global Education. *Educative: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*, 2(3), 169–177.
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42, 533–544.
- Rizal, M. A. S. (2024). Eksplorasi Penggunaan AI Generatif untuk Menciptakan Materi Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia yang Menarik dan Efektif. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 4(3), 7080–7095.
- Roe, J., & Perkins, M. (2024). Generative AI and Agency in Education: A Critical Scoping Review and Thematic Analysis. *ArXiv Preprint ArXiv:2411.00631*.