IJOEEL
International Journal of English Education and Linguistics

VOL. 07 NO. 02, DEC 2025

Artificial Intelligence and Well-Being: Voices from Academic Writing Lecturers

Durratul Hikmah[1], Roviatul Hasanah[2]
Universitas Nurul Jadid
durrohhikmah@unuja.ac.id[1],

First Received: October 13, 2025 Final Proof Received: December 31, 2025

Abstract

This study aims to explore the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) integration on the professional identity and well-being of lecturers teaching Academic Writing in higher education. Employing a qualitative phenomenological approach, the study involved three lecturers from different institutions in East Java. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews and analyzed using thematic analysis. The findings reveal that lecturers respond to AI integration adaptively and reflectively. Rather than rejecting the use of AI tools such as ChatGPT or Grammarly, they selectively incorporate them into their teaching practices to support idea generation and increase task efficiency. However, they also express concerns regarding the authenticity of student writing and the shifting nature of their pedagogical roles. Second, the study also finds that lecturers undergo an ongoing negotiation of their professional identities. They reconceptualize their roles not merely as technical instructors but as facilitators of digital literacy and academic ethics. In doing so, they strive to uphold professional values, despite facing institutional and collegial pressures. Moreover, exposure to AI has an ambivalent effect on lecturers' well-being. While it generates anxiety and social disconnection, it also stimulates renewed motivation and creativity in teaching. This study highlights the importance of institutional support and reflective spaces that enable educators to.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Academic Writing, Professional Identity, Well-being

INTRODUCTION

The development of artificial intelligence (AI) technology over the past decade has had a significant impact on various aspect of life, including higher education (Kamalov et al., 2023). Generative AI tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, and Quillbot are now widely used in academic activities, both by students and lecturers. AI not only automates the technical aspects of writing but also begins to influence how people think, write, and even assess student learning outcomes (Li et al., 2024; Marzuki et al., 2023).

One course directly affected by this shift is Academic Writing, which traditionally emphasizes critical thinking, originality of ideas, logical structure of writing, and academic discipline. These values are rooted in process, not merely the outcome. However, with the presence of AI, the writing process can be bypassed. Students are now able to produce nearly flawless essays in a matter of minutes without truly understanding the underlying structure or thinking processes (Marzuki et al., 2023; Octaberlina et al., 2024).

This phenomenon not only affects the quality of learning outcomes but also creates an identity tension among lecturers who teach academic writing. They are confronted with a new reality in which their role as facilitators of critical thinking is gradually being displaced by advanced yet impersonal technologies. AI indirectly challenges the pedagogical authority of lecturers and creates uncertainty about the relevance of their role in the learning process (Nelson, 2024).

Initial observations in several language education programs in East Java reveal that many lecturers struggle to assess student assignment that appear too perfect, suspecting AI

involvement, yet they lack clear tools or policies to address it. In internal communications, statements such as, “I no longer know whether my students can actually write or they just know how to craft the right prompt for ChatGPT,” have emerged.

This dilemma becomes more complex because higher education institutions are not fully prepared to respond to this transformation. Many institutions do not have explicit policies regarding the use of AI in academic contexts. On the other hand, lecturers are expected to continuously innovate and keep up with technological developments, often without adequate training or policy support (Kasneci et al., 2023). Increasing workloads, ever-changing expectations, and limited space for professional reflection exacerbate the issue. In such circumstances, emotional and psychological pressures become inevitable (Buda & Kovács, 2024; Mah & Groß, 2024).

In this context, the professional identity of lecturers deserves to be re-examined. Identity is not a static entity but is continuously reconstructed through experience, reflection, and social interaction (Aljuaid, 2024; Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009). When new technologies enter and alter long-standing work structures, lecturers must negotiate who they are within this new system. This process can be reflective and productive, but it may also lead to uncertainty, confusion, and even a loss of meaning in their profession (Jackson et al., 2019).

To understand how lecturers navigate these changes, this study adopts the lens of educator agency (Biesta et al., 2015), which conceptualizes teachers as active agents who make professional judgments within particular cultural, structural, and material contexts. Through this framework, lecturers’ responses to AI are not seen as mere adaptations to technological demands but as expressions of their professional agency, how they exercise autonomy, make ethical decisions, and reconstruct their professional identity amid systemic and technological pressures.

Lecturer well-being, emotionally, socially, and professionally, also becomes a critical issue in this transformation. The pressure to constantly learn, adapt teaching methods, and maintain professional credibility amidst uncertainty can lead to stress, burnout, and job dissatisfaction (Honicke & Broadbent, 2016; Laconi et al., 2018). Lecturers who feel incompetent in using AI technology tend to experience professional identity crisis and lose confidence as educators (Mah & Groß, 2024). This pressure does not occur in a vacuum. It takes place within an institutional framework that is often still oriented toward administrative targets rather than their well-being. In a study by (Dwivedi et al., 2021), it was noted that the transition to digital education requires strong structural support to avoid causing emotional harm to lecturers. Unfortunately, many institutions have yet to provide such a supportive environment.

Meanwhile, studies focusing on the impact of AI on lecturers’ experiences, especially in the context of academic writing, remain very limited. Most research emphasizes the efficiency of technology (Rabbianty et al., 2023; Shah, 2024), changes in student behavior and perceptions (Ateeq et al., 2024), and the pedagogical or curricular potential of AI (Aljuaid, 2024; Hossain, 2025; Li et al., 2024; Parker et al., 2024). Few studies explicitly explore the affective experiences of lecturers, such as confusion, emotional pressure, or the renegotiation of professional identity in facing AI disruptions(Mohale et al., 2024; Shofiah & Putera, 2024). In Indonesia, discourse on the impact of AI in teaching is still dominated by topics concerning the effectiveness of technology in improving student performance (Suwendi et al., 2025).

Therefore, this study is important to deeply understand how Academic Writing lecturers make sense of AI's presence in their teaching practices. It also aims to explore how they renegotiate their personal identity and how these changes affect their emotional and social well-being as educators. The results of this study are expected to provide theoretical and practical contributions for higher education institutions in designing policies, training, and learning, and learning strategies that are more humane and responsive to the needs of lecturers in the digital era.

METHOD

Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative paradigm with a phenomenological approach, aiming to understand the meanings constructed by Academic Writing lecturers regarding their experiences in navigating the advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies. The phenomenological approach was chosen because it enables an in-depth explorations of AI use in teaching practices (Moustakas, 1994; Neubauer et al., 2019). The focus of this research lies in how instructors reconstruct their understanding of professional roles and identities, as well as the impact of these changes on the psychological dimensions of their well-being. This approach aligns with the objective of uncovering subjective reflections, emotional responses, and perspectives that cannot be captured through quantitative measures (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

Subject

This study focuses on lecturers teaching academic writing in English education programs at higher education institutions located in "tapal kuda" region of East Java. Participants were selected purposively, based on their direct and relevant experience with the phenomenon under investigation, exposure to artificial intelligence (AI) technologies in the context of teaching academic writing. This region was chosen for its representation of regional institutions that are undergoing digital transformation but often lack the attention given to urban universities. Inclusion criteria required participants to have taught Academic Writing for at least two years, have experience integrating or responding to AI tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, or Quillbot, either explicitly or implicitly, and be willing to reflect openly in in-depth interviews. A total of three participants were involved, aligning with the phenomenological approach that values the depth and richness of individual experience over large sample sizes. In this process, lecturers re viewed not only as informants but as co-constructors of meaning alongside the researcher through narrative exploration.

Instruments

The primary instrument in this study was a semi-structured interview guide developed by the researcher to deeply explore the experiences of academic writing lecturer in responding to the emergence of artificial intelligence technologies in teaching practices. The guide included open-ended questions focusing on perception of AI, shifts in teaching strategies, professional value conflicts, and the impact of AI on lecturers' identity and emotional well-being. Prior to the main data collection, a pilot interview was conducted with one participant from a similar institution, which led to refinements of the instrument, particularly in terms of question clarity and sensitivity. All interviews were conducted by the researcher. The

IJOEEL
International Journal of English Education and Linguistics
VOL. 07 NO. 02, DEC 2025

interview guide was used flexibility to maintain an open conversation and to allow in-depth narrative exploration aligned with the dynamics of each participant's experience.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using thematic analysis following the procedures established by (Braun & Clarke, 2006), which offer a flexible yet rigorous approach for identifying, analyzing, and interpreting patterns of meaning within qualitative data. This process involved six systematic stages: (1) familiarization with data through repeated reading and immersion in the interview transcripts, (2) generating initial codes to label relevant features across the dataset, (3) searching for themes by grouping related codes that reflect significant patterns, (4) reviewing themes to ensure coherence within themes and distinctiveness between them, (5) defining and naming themes to capture the essence of each thematic cluster, and (6) producing the final report that weaves together analytic insights with supporting excerpts from participants' narratives. The analysis was conducted inductively, allowing themes to emerge organically from the data without being constrained by a pre-existing theoretical framework. This inductive orientation is especially suitable for phenomenological research, as it prioritizes the lived experiences and meaning-making processes of participants, enabling the researcher to remain grounded in the data and to honor the subjective voices of instructors as they navigate the pedagogical and emotional implications of AI integration.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

Based on in-depth interviews with three lecturers who teach Academic Writing at three different universities located in "Tapal Kuda" region of East Java, a variety responses, reflections, and strategies were identified, highlighting the dynamic nature of their experiences in dealing with the integration of AI technologies into their teaching practices. The findings of this study are categorized into three main themes: lecturers' experiences in navigating AI integration in Academic Writing instruction, the negotiation of professional identity amid technological change, and the impact of Ai exposure of lecturers' emotional, social, and professional well-being.

1. Lecturers' Experiences in Facing AI Integration

A summary of the interview findings related to lecturers' experiences in dealing with AI integration is presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Summary of the data analysis from the first theme

Theme	Category	Sub-category	Sample Excerpt
Experience using AI in teaching	Initial use of AI	Introduction within the last 1-2 years	"I started to become familiar with and use ChatGPT and Grammarly intensively over the past year." (Lecturer 1)
			"About two years ago, I began to explore those AI tools..." (Lecturer 2)
			"In the past year." (Lecturer 3)
	Response to AI in	Using AI as a teaching aid	"I usually use ChatGPT or Gemini to look for ideas..." (Lecturer 2)

	teaching	Feeling supported but also burdened	"I feel helped in terms of efficiency and material variety, but sometimes also overwhelmed..." (Lecturer 1)
			"I once felt burdened seeing students' work fully generated by AI..." (Lecturer 3)
		AI plagiarism detection strategy	"I re-check by testing their understanding of their own writing..." (Lecturer 2)
	Perception of AI in professional practice	Ambivalent attitude toward AI	"I see it as a double-edged sword..." (Lecturer 1)
		AI does not replace the thinking process	"I feel that AI is just a tool and cannot make my students truly smart." (Lecturer 2)
		Good writing ≠ understanding	"Student writing may look better... but they don't understand what they've written." (Lecturer 3)

The integration of artificial intelligence technology in higher education has transformed the learning landscape, including the teaching of Academic Writing courses. The three lecturers in this study demonstrated varied yet patterned experiences in responding to the presence of AI, responses to AI in the learning process, and perception of AI in the lecturers' professional practice.

a. Initial encounter and use of AI

The three lecturers reported becoming familiar with and using AI technologies within the past one to two years. Their introduction to tolls such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, and Gemini did not occur simultaneously or through formal institutional channels. Rather, it emerged organically alongside growing discussions about technology in academic communities and social media. Lecturers who were more engaged with technological developments tended to adopt these tools more quickly. For instance, Lecturer 1 stated:

> "I began using ChatGPT and Grammarly intensively over the past year, especially as discussions or generative AI in education became more widespread." (Lecturer 1)

Meanwhile, Lecturer 2 acknowledged having known about AI earlier, but only began using it in the classroom after recognizing a need to update her teaching approach:

> "I became aware of AI tools about two years ago, but I only started using ChatGPT and Grammarly about a year ago." (Lecturer 2)

These accounts indicate that the adoption of AI among lecturers is neither linear nor uniform, but rather shaped by personal, institutional, and professional contexts. Despite their different starting points, all three lecturers acknowledged that AI has become increasingly unavoidable in contemporary teaching practices.

b. Responses to AI in Teaching

In response to the presence of AI in the classroom, the lecturers adopted flexible and adaptive attitudes. Rather than taking extreme positions of full acceptance or outright rejection, they exercised selective integration based on instructional needs. AI was

positioned as a supplementary tool rather than a replacement for reflective and critical learning process.

Lecturer 2, for example, described using tools like ChatGPT and Gemini as sources of inspiration for designing creative learning activities:

> "I usually use ChatGPT or similar apps like Gemini to generate ideas so that the learning process doesn't become monotonous." (Lecturer 2)

Lecturer 1 highlighted AI's benefits in terms of efficiency but also noted the added burden of assessing student work that may have been produced by AI:

> "AI helps me in terms of efficiency and content variety, but sometimes it becomes burdensome because I have to evaluate whether a piece of writing is genuinely done by the student or fully AI-generated." (Lecturer 1)

This shift in workload affects not only teaching design but also assessment and validation processes. Lecturers are required to be more discerning, particularly in distinguishing between authentic student work and AI-generated content. Lecturer 2 shared her experience of having to verify students' understanding of their submitted texts:

> "I tested their understanding of their own writing... and I found that they didn't understand it." (Lecturer 2)

Most respondents acknowledged that the main challenge posed by AI lies in the blurred boundaries between students' actual competencies and the technological capabilities of the tools they use. AI enables students to produce grammatically and structurally sound texts, but often lacking in understanding and originality.

> "I felt overwhelmed when I saw a student's essay that was fully AI-generated without any revision at all." (Lecturer 3)

These responses suggest that the presence of AI has pushed lecturers not only to innovate in their teaching practices but also to develop new evaluation methods that emphasize process over product.

c. Perception of AI in Professional Practice

Furthermore, the lecturers expressed complex and varied views on the presence of AI in their professional practice. On one hand, AI was seen as an opportunity to enhance teaching effectiveness and access to resources. On the other hand, it was also viewed as a threat to the principles of originality, intellectual autonomy, and meaningful learning processes. Lecturer 1 reflected on the dual nature of AI:

> "I see it as a double-edged sword. On one side, AI can help students explore ideas and improve their language. But on the other, if not properly guided, it can foster dependency and obscure their critical thinking process." (Lecturer 1)

Lecturer 2 emphasized that AI lacks the capacity to build holistic intelligence:

"I believe AI is just a tool and it can't make my students truly intelligent." (Lecturer 2)

Another concern raised was the growing disconnect between the improved surface quality of students' writing and their actual comprehension of the content. As Lecturer 3 noted:

"Students' writing may appear better nowadays… but they don't understand what they've written." (Lecturer 3)

The three lecturers appeared to agree that AI should not replace the learning process but rather be integrated into pedagogical practices that are ethically framed and carefully supervised. They showed a tendency to reinforce the reflective and evaluative roles of instructors by emphasizing the importance of dialogue, transparency, and technological literacy in academic writing classrooms.

2. Negotiating Professional Identity

A summary of the interview findings related to the negotiation of professional identity in the context of AI-driven technological change is presented in Table 2.

Table 2.
Summary of the data analysis from the second theme

Theme	Category	Sub-category	Sample excerpt
Negotiation of prefessional Identity in the Age of AI	Shifting prefessional roles	Redefining the lecturer's role	"I feel the need to re-examine my role... I have to broaden it to include digital literacy, academic ethics, and critical awareness of technology." (Lecturer 1)
		Shifting focus from product to process	"I emphasize the process more than just the final product." (Lecturer 1)
	Adaptive strategies	Redesigning tasks and promoting reflective intervention	"I ask the students to show revision notes and explain the rationale behind their changes..." (Lecturer 1)
		Ethical control and reminders	"I often have to remind and monitor students so they use AI wisely..." (Lecturer 2)
	Value conflicts in the workplace	Personal values vs. Peer responses	"I hold on to my personal values, like integrity... but sometimes I feel isolated for being too comitted to them." (Lecturer 3)

The presence of AI technology in the context of Academic Writing instruction not only affects the technical aspects of teaching practice but also disrupts the foundations of lecturers' professional identity as facilitators of critical thinking and academic integrity. The findings of this study indicate that lecturers undergo shifts in roles, adjustments in teaching strategies, and reflection on professional values, all of which represent forms of negotiation in their evolving professional identities.

a. Shifting Professional Roles and Redefining Identity

Lecturers expressed that the emergence of AI has altered the scope and focus of their academic responsibilities. Their professional identity, once rooted in the ability to teach

technical writing skills, has now expanded to encompass roles as digital literacy facilitators and ethical guides in academic conduct. This transformation is not only practical but also conceptual, as it challenges how they define themselves as educators in the digital age. Lecturer 1 articulated this process explicitly in:

> "I feel the need to re-examine my role. I used to focus more on the technical aspect of writing. Now, I have to broaden it to include digital literacy, academic ethics, and critical awareness of technology." (Lecturer 1)

This redefinition requires lecturers to strengthen competencies in areas that may not have previously been central to their expertise, such as AI tool utilization, process-based assessment, and digital ethics. While this shift can present a burden, it also offers opportunities for professional growth.

b. Adaptive strategies in Response to the Accessibility of AI

As students increasingly rely on AI in completing academic writing tasks, lecturers are left with little choice but to adapt their pedagogical approaches. These adaptations include process-oriented assignment design, the use of reflective discussions, and emphasis on transparency in AI usage. Lecturer 1 explained this strategy:

> "I emphasize the process rather than just the final product. I encourage students to show revision notes, explain their changes, and critically discuss the output generated by AI." (Lecturer 1)

Meanwhile, lecturer 2 stressed the importance of moral supervision and guidance:

> "I often have to remind and monitor students to ensure they use AI wisely so that they don't fall into harmful practices." (Lecturer 2)

Lecturer acknowledged that they now carry new responsibilities, not only assessing the students' work but also maintaining the integrity of learning process.

c. Value Conflicts and Social Tensions

Throughout this process of identity negotiation, value conflicts also emerged between lecturers' personal professional principles and the increasingly digitalized academic landscape. Lectures 3 reported tensions between her commitment to the values of "obedience" and the more permissive attitudes of her peers regarding AI use:

> "I hold on to my personal value of obedience, and I emphasize it with my students…. But I often feel isolated because I hold that value so strongly, and it's not fully accepted by my colleagues." (Lecturer 3)

This conflict indicates that the negotiation of professional identity is not only a dialogue between lecturers and technology but also between lecturers and their socio-professional environment. The lack of open dialogue and ethical consensus in the workplace further complicates this process on negotiation.

3. The Impact of AI Exposure on Lecturers' Emotional, Social, and Professional Well-being

IJOEEL
International Journal of English Education and Linguistics
VOL. 07 NO. 02, DEC 2025

The integration of AI into teaching practices has implications that extend beyond pedagogy and professional duties, it also significantly affects lecturers' personal well-being. The lecturers in this study expressed a range of emotional responses, from anxiety and social alienation to renewed motivation in fulfilling their professional roles. These findings highlight the interconnectedness of emotional, social, and professional well-being in lecturers' adaptation to AI technologies. A summary of their interview results is presented in Table 3.

Table 3.
Summary of the data analysis from the third theme

Theme	**Category**	**Sub-category**	**Sample Excerpt**
Impact of AI on lecturers' emotional, social, and professional well-being	Emotional	Anxiety about plagiarism and the lecturer's role	"There was some anxiety at first, particularly about the possibility of plagiarism or diminishing of my roles." (Lecturer 1)
		Concern over students' dependency on AI	"I'm afraid my students will become too independent on AI, which might make them lazy to learn." (Lecturer 2)
		Transformation of anxiety into new motivation	"But over time, I found new enthusiasm to learn and to develop new teaching strategies." (Lecturer 1)
	Social	Feeling of alienation due to differing values	"I feel isolated because I strongly adhere to the value of 'obedience', which is not fully accepted by my colleagues." (Lecturer 3)
	Professional	Increased creativity and teaching engagement	"AI has challenged me to be more creative in my teaching." (Lecturer 1)
		Closer relationships with students	"I also feel closer to my students because we're learning something new together." (Lecturer 1)

a. Emotional Well-being

Two of three lecturers explicitly stated that the use of AI in the classroom triggered anxiety and stress, particularly during the initial stages of exposure. Concerns over potential plagiarism, the diminishing role of lecturers, and the inability to assess the authenticity of students work emerged as significant sources of emotional pressure. Lecturer 1 stated:

> "There was some anxiety at first, particularly about the possibility of plagiarism or the diminishing of my role. But over time, I found renewed enthusiasm to learn and develop new strategies for teaching." (Lecturer 1)

A similar concern was expressed by Lecturer 2, who felt anxious about students' growing dependency on AI.

> "Yes, the anxiety is there. I'm afraid my students will become too dependent on AI and end up being lazy to learn." (Lecturer 2)

Interestingly, despite the presence of anxiety, the lecturers did not succumb to the pressure. Instead, they used it as a trigger for reflection and innovation, demonstrating signs of resilience in responding to technological disruption.

b. Social Well-being

In the context of social relationships, some lecturers experienced a sense of isolation when their personal values such as discipline, integrity, and caution in using AI were not fully appreciated within their professional environment. Lecturer 3 stated:

> "I feel isolated because I strongly adhere to the value of 'obedience', which is not fully accepted by my colleagues." (Lecturer 3)

In indicates that technological change affects not only lecturers' relationship with students but also with colleagues, particularly regarding attitudes toward the ethical use of AI. The absence of open forums or explicit collective policies on AI use has intensified the social isolation felt by some lecturers.

c. Professional Well-being

Despite facing pressure and isolation, the lecturers also reported a renewed enthusiasm for teaching particularly in exploring innovative ways to bridge AI use with ethical pedagogical principles. In fact, AI has encouraged them to foster closer connections with students through more reflective and collaborative learning approaches. Lecturer 1 stated:

> "AI has actually made me feel more challenged and creative in my teaching. I also feel closer to my students, because we are learning something new together, and I position myself as a learning partner, not just an instructor." (Lecturer 1)

Thus, although emotional and social burdens are present, AI has also opened up new opportunities for professional growth and the strengthening or more equitable and dynamic pedagogical relationships.

Discussion

1. Lecturers' Experiences in Facing AI Integration

The finding of this study indicate that lecturers do not take a passive stance in response to the emergence of AI; instead, they actively adapt their teaching practices. They demonstrate reflective capacity in discerning how AI ne used, integrating it into learning activities, and guiding students to use the technology responsibly.

This attitude aligns with the theory of educator agency proposed by (Biesta et al., 2015), which emphasizes that teachers possess the capacity to act consciously and reflectively, rather than merely following the flow of technological change. The lecturers in this study chose not to prohibit the use of AI but instead to position it within a framework of critical pedagogy.

Actions such as guiding students to use AI for the exploration of ideas rather than simply for final products reflect a form of professional agency, an effort to ensure that the direction of education remains meaningful, even as tools and media evolve. This confirms that the presence of AI is not merely a technical matter, but also a domain of moral and pedagogical decision-making for lecturers.

2. Negotiating Professional Identity

The lecturers' professional identities in this study appear to undergo an intense renegotiation process. In responding to AI, they no longer perceive themselves merely as evaluators of students' final work, but rather as facilitators of digital literacy, ethics, and critical thinking process. This shift reflects an understanding that professional identity is dynamic and context-dependent, as explained by (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009).

Some lecturers strive to uphold their core values such as honesty, discipline, and intellectual responsibility, even when these are not fully aligned with the collegial culture within their institutions. This indicates a tension between personal values and dominant professional discourse, In (Sachs, 2001) terms, this tension reflects a struggle between democratic professionalism which emphasizes reflection (agency, and social responsibility), and managerial professionalism, which prioritizes efficiency and adherence to institutional systems.

Lecturers who remain steadfast in their ethical principles demonstrates that professional identity is not merely an institutional label, but the result of reflective choices made in the face of external pressures.

3. The Impact of AI Exposure on Lecturers' Emotional, Social, and Professional Well-being

Findings on well-being reveal that the impact of AI on lecturers is varied. AI my trigger anxiety, social pressure, and even a sense of loss of meaning in one's work, particularly when lecturers feel their roles are being replaced by machines. However, on the other hand, AI also opens opportunities for creative engagement, more dialogic relationship with students, and increased professional motivation.

This situation can be interpreted using (Seligman, 2011) PERMA model, which outlines five components of well-being: positive emotion, engagement, relationships, meaning, and accomplishment. When lecturers feel challenged and motivated by AI, and are able to foster collaborative learning interactions, the dimensions of engagement and relationships are sustained. Yet, when they feel distrusted or isolated from colleagues, their positive emotion and sense of meaning may be compromised.

This is supported by (Iswati & Hastuti, 2024), who argue that digital disruption in higher education has caused psychological stress among lecturers, including anxiety, role ambiguity, and decreased job satisfaction. These findings confirm that lecturers' well-being is not solely shaped by technology, but by the extent to which they are afforded space for reflection, social support, and professional autonomy.

Based on the three main focal points, teaching experience, professional identity, and well-being, it can be concluded that AI has pushed lecturers out of their pedagogical comfort

zones. Yet rather than surrendering to the disruption, the lecturers in this study demonstrated the capacity to manage these changes in reflective and ethical ways, albeit within the limitations of suboptimal institution support. The presence of AI in higher education is not merely a change of tools; it represents a shift in roles, values, and the meaning of academic profession. Therefore, a response is needed that emphasizes not only digital competence, but also the reinforcement of professional identity and well-being, grounded in agency, ethics, and healthy social relationships.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This study explored how lecturers of Academic Writing perceive and respond to the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in their teaching practices, focusing on professional experience, identity, and well-being. The finding highlight that lecturers navigate AI integration with adaptive and critical strategies, selectively leveraging technology to enhance teaching effectiveness while maintaining student agency in academic writing. The presence of Ai also triggers a reconfiguration of professional identity, wherein lecturers shift from being technical instructors to ethical facilitators and critical thinking guides. Moreover, the impact of AI on lecturers' well-being is ambivalent, offering both challenges such as anxiety and professional alienation, as well as opportunities for renewed motivation and dialogic engagement with students. These findings underscore the need for reflective pedagogical agency and institutional support that goes beyond technical training, emphasizing ethical literacy, social support, and identity affirmation amidst educational disruption.

REFERENCES

Aljuaid, H. (2024). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence Tools on Academic Writing Instruction in Higher Education: A Systematic Review. *Arab World English Journal*, *1*(1), 26–55. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/ChatGPT.2

Ateeq, A., Alaghbari, M. A., Alzoraiki, M., Milhem, M., & Hasan Beshr, B. A. (2024). Empowering Academic Success: Integrating AI Tools in University Teaching for Enhanced Assignment and Thesis Guidance. *2024 ASU International Conference in Emerging Technologies for Sustainability and Intelligent Systems (ICETSIS)*, 297–301. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICETSIS61505.2024.10459686

Beauchamp, C., & Thomas, L. (2009). Understanding teacher identity: An overview of issues in the literature and implications for teacher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *39*(2), 175–189. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057640902902252

Biesta, G., Priestley, M., & Robinson, S. (2015). The role of beliefs in teacher agency. *Teachers and Teaching*, *21*(6), 624–640. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2015.1044325

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Buda, A., & Kovács, K. (2024). The digital aspects of the wellbeing of university teachers. *Frontiers in Education*, *9*, 1406141. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1406141

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (Fourth edition, international student edition). SAGE.

Dwivedi, Y. K., Ismagilova, E., Hughes, D. L., Carlson, J., Filieri, R., Jacobson, J., Jain, V., Karjaluoto, H., Kefi, H., Krishen, A. S., Kumar, V., Rahman, M. M., Raman, R., Rauschnabel, P. A., Rowley, J., Salo, J., Tran, G. A., & Wang, Y. (2021). Setting the future of digital and social media marketing research: Perspectives and research propositions. *International Journal of Information Management*, *59*, 102168. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102168

Honicke, T., & Broadbent, J. (2016). The influence of academic self-efficacy on academic performance: A systematic review. *Educational Research Review*, *17*, 63–84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.11.002

Hossain, M. K. (2025). Teachers' Perspectives on Integrating ChatGPT into EFL Writing Instruction. *TESOL Communications*. https://doi.org/10.58304/tc.20250103

Iswati, L., & Hastuti, S. D. S. (2024). Technology and Well-Being: Voices from ESP Teachers. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal Of English Education)*, *11*(2), Article 2.

Jackson, A., Mentzer, N., & Kramer-Bottiglio, R. (2019). Pilot analysis of the impacts of soft robotics design on high-school student engineering perceptions. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, *29*(5), 1083–1104. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10798-018-9478-8

Kamalov, F., Santandreu Calonge, D., & Gurrib, I. (2023). New Era of Artificial Intelligence in Education: Towards a Sustainable Multifaceted Revolution. *Sustainability*, *15*(16), 12451. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151612451

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., … Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *103*, 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Laconi, S., Kaliszewska-Czeremska, K., Gnisci, A., Sergi, I., Barke, A., Jeromin, F., Groth, J., Gamez-Guadix, M., Ozcan, N. K., Demetrovics, Z., Király, O., Siomos, K., Floros, G., & Kuss, D. J. (2018). Cross-cultural study of Problematic Internet Use in nine European

countries. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *84*, 430–440. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.03.020

Li, L., Ma, Z., Fan, L., Lee, S., Yu, H., & Hemphill, L. (2024). ChatGPT in education: A discourse analysis of worries and concerns on social media. *Education and Information Technologies*, *29*(9), 10729–10762. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12256-9

Mah, D.-K., & Groß, N. (2024). Artificial intelligence in higher education: Exploring faculty use, self-efficacy, distinct profiles, and professional development needs. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *21*(1), 58. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00490-1

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

Mohale, N. E., Suliman, Z., Maphoto, K., Sevnarayan, K., Mokoena, D., & Nstopi, T. J. (2024). Artificial intelligence or augmented intelligence? Experiences of lecturers and students in an ODeL university. *Acitya: Journal of Teaching and Education*, *6*(2), 317–353. https://doi.org/10.30650/ajte.v6i2.3974

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412995658

Nelson, R. (2024). The Impact of AI on Academic Roles. In *Academic Identity in the Age of AI: Higher Education and the Digital Revolution* (pp. 29–38). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83549-866-820241004

Neubauer, B. E., Witkop, C. T., & Varpio, L. (2019). How phenomenology can help us learn from the experiences of others. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, *8*(2), 90–97. https://doi.org/10.1007/S40037-019-0509-2

Octaberlina, L. R., Muslimin, A. I., Chamidah, D., Surur, M., & Mustikawan, A. (2024). Exploring the impact of AI threats on originality and critical thinking in academic writing. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, *8*(6), 8805–8814. https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v8i6.3878

Parker, J. L., Richard, V. M., Acabá, A., Escoffier, S., Flaherty, S., Jablonka, S., & Becker, K. P. (2024). Negotiating Meaning with Machines: AI's Role in Doctoral Writing Pedagogy. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-024-00425-x

Rabbianty, E. N., Azizah, S., & Virdyna, N. K. (2023). AI in academic writing: Assessing current usage and future implications. *INSANIA : Jurnal Pemikiran Alternatif Kependidikan*, *28*(1a), 14–35. https://doi.org/10.24090/insania.v28i1a.9278

Sachs, J. (2001). Teacher professional identity: Competing discourses, competing outcomes. *Journal of Education Policy*, *16*(2), 149–161. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930116819

Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A Visionary New Understanding of Happiness and Well-Being*. Atria Books.

Shah, S. (2024). The Role of Artificial Intelligence In Research Writing: A Critical Analysis. *Journal of Universal College of Medical Sciences*, *12*(03), 1–2. https://doi.org/10.3126/jucms.v12i03.73724

Shofiah, N., & Putera, Z. F. (2024). *Examining the user experience of artificial intelligence tools in academic writing: The perceptions lecturers practices*. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3871916/v1

Suwendi, S., Mesraini, Gama, C. B., Rahman, H., Luhuringbudi, T., & Masrom, M. (2025). Adoption of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Resources among Academicians of Islamic Higher Education Institutions in Indonesia. *Jurnal Online Informatika*, *10*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.15575/join.v10i1.1549