6th CELTI
Conference in English Language Teaching
AN INTERNATIONAL VIRTUAL CONFERENCE
Decolonize English at the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Rethinking Language, Literature, and Pedagogy

Blending Gen AI-Generated and Textbook-Based Materials in ELT Grammar Instruction: A Case Study

Author:
Muhammad Zanuar Irsyad

Affiliation:
Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, *Indonesia*

Corresponding email:
2536082041@webmail.uad.ac.id

DOI:
https://doi.org/10.24090/ggfs9k13

Pages:
129-138

Abstract: This study investigates the implementation of Gen AI-assisted grammar instruction through the integration of Gen AI-generated learning materials and textbook-based instruction in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context. The instructional design combined a Gen AI tool for generating grammar exercises and speaking prompts, Quizizz as a formative assessment platform, and English for Nusantara Grade VIII as the core textbook. The study employed a qualitative case study approach involving a single Grade 8 junior high school student, referred to as Student 1, observed across five instructional meetings. Each session focused on progressive grammar topics: Simple Present Tense, Simple Past Tense, Past Continuous Tense, and Past Perfect Tense. Data were collected through pre-test and post-test assessments administered via Quizizz, classroom observation notes, and teacher reflective journals. The findings indicate a consistent improvement in grammar accuracy, increasing from 60% in the baseline assessment to 100% in the final stage. The results also show a shift in learner engagement from low participation during evening sessions to high responsiveness during morning sessions. In addition, error analysis reveals a gradual reduction in grammatical inaccuracies, particularly in subject-verb agreement, auxiliary verb usage, and tense-form selection. The study concludes that Gen AI-assisted instruction, when integrated with textbook-based learning and guided by teacher mediation and scaffolding, can substantially enhance grammar learning outcomes in EFL private tutoring contexts.

Keywords: Gen AI-assisted learning; grammar instruction; EFL; textbook integration; case study

Introduction

The rapid advancement of Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI) technologies has opened new pedagogical possibilities in English Language Teaching (ELT), particularly in grammar instruction within English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. As digital tools become increasingly accessible, educators and researchers are exploring how AI-generated content can supplement or enhance traditional instructional materials. Grammar remains one of the most foundational yet challenging aspects of EFL learning, and identifying effective instructional approaches that can address individual learner needs is a persistent concern in applied linguistics (Muftah, 2023).

Over the past decade, technology-mediated language instruction has grown substantially, with platforms such as Quizizz emerging as formative assessment tools that promote engagement and immediate feedback (Aulia & Warni, 2024; Bindiya & Fediyanto, 2023). Simultaneously, the emergence

of Gen AI tools capable of generating contextually relevant grammar exercises, sentence transformation tasks, and interactive prompts has introduced a novel layer of instructional support (Song & Song, 2023; Wei, 2023). However, most available research has focused on higher education settings or group-based instruction, leaving a gap in the literature regarding individual, private tutoring contexts at the secondary school level.

In Indonesia, English is taught as a compulsory foreign language at all levels of basic education, and the English for Nusantara textbook series represents the official curriculum-aligned material for junior high school learners under the Merdeka Belajar (Freedom to Learn) curriculum. While this textbook provides structured, culturally contextualised content, its grammar exercises are relatively limited in scope. Teachers and tutors working with individual students often seek supplementary materials to reinforce specific grammar points and address personalised learning needs. Gen AI tools offer a promising avenue for generating such supplementary content on demand.

Previous studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of AI-assisted instruction in improving grammar accuracy and learner motivation (Deng & Jamaludin, 2026; Jiang, 2022; Wei, 2023). However, research examining the integration of Gen AI-generated materials with textbook-based instruction through a qualitative, longitudinal case study design remains scarce, particularly in Indonesian EFL contexts. This gap warrants closer investigation, as the dynamics of single-learner instruction differ substantially from those of classroom-based group learning.

The present study addresses this gap by examining how Gen AI-generated materials and textbook-based instruction were blended in a five-session private tutoring programme for a Grade 8 EFL learner. The study traces the learner's progression across four grammar topics (Simple Present Tense, Simple Past Tense, Past Continuous Tense, and Past Perfect Tense) using Quizizz assessments, classroom observations, and teacher reflective journals as data sources. Specifically, this study asks: (1) How does grammar accuracy develop across the five instructional sessions? (2) What patterns of learner engagement and error reduction are observable across the sessions? (3) In what ways does the blending of Gen AI-generated materials and textbook-based instruction support grammar learning outcomes?

Literature Review

Gen AI in EFL Instruction

Generative AI has emerged as a transformative force in EFL education, offering versatile applications ranging from writing assistance and automated feedback to the generation of grammar exercises and speaking prompts (Deng & Jamaludin, 2026). Jiang (2022) conducted a comprehensive review of AI in the EFL context and concluded that AI tools significantly support diverse language skills, including grammar, vocabulary, and writing, through adaptive, personalised input. Building on this, Wei (2023) demonstrated through a mixed-methods study that AI-mediated language instruction positively influenced English learning achievement, L2 motivation, and self-regulated learning among EFL learners. These findings highlight the potential of Gen AI tools to serve not merely as content generators but as instructional scaffolds that support learner autonomy and metacognitive engagement.

In grammar instruction specifically, Gen AI tools can generate varied exercise types, fill-in-the-blank, sentence transformation, and error correction tasks, that align with specific learning objectives. Song and Song (2023) found that AI-assisted writing instruction enhanced grammatical accuracy by providing real-time feedback and contextualised grammar models. Similarly, Lu (2025) demonstrated that AI-generated corpus learning improved EFL learners' acquisition of grammatical structures compared to traditional textbook instruction alone. These studies collectively suggest that Gen AI-generated content can serve as a productive complement to existing curriculum materials, particularly in contexts where individual learner needs exceed what standard textbooks can address.

Nevertheless, researchers caution that the effectiveness of Gen AI tools in language education depends significantly on teacher mediation and instructional design. Xiao, Zhu, and Xin (2026) found that most ChatGPT-integrated writing studies relied on off-the-shelf AI use without tailoring to learners' cultural and linguistic backgrounds, which limited pedagogical impact. This underscores the importance of teacher-guided integration, in which AI-generated materials are purposefully contextualised within broader instructional frameworks.

Formative Assessment and Technology-Enhanced Learning

Formative assessment plays a critical role in monitoring learner progress and providing timely feedback in EFL settings. Digital platforms such as Quizizz have gained considerable attention for their capacity to deliver gamified, low-stakes quizzes that enhance learner engagement and motivation (Bindiya & Fediyanto, 2023). Aulia and Warni (2024) explored learner perceptions of Quizizz as an assessment tool in EFL classrooms and reported positive attitudes towards its interactive and immediate feedback features. These findings align with broader research on game-based formative assessment, which consistently demonstrates benefits for learner attention, participation, and academic achievement (Andresta & Anwar, 2022).

In combination with AI-assisted instruction, formative assessment tools like Quizizz can provide a structured mechanism for tracking grammar accuracy at regular intervals. This is particularly valuable in single-learner private tutoring contexts, where the teacher can monitor progress closely and adjust instructional input accordingly. The integration of Quizizz into grammar instruction sessions thus serves a dual function: assessing current proficiency and generating data for teacher reflection and pedagogical decision-making.

Scaffolding and Teacher Mediation in Grammar Learning

Vygotsky's concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and the related pedagogical principle of scaffolding are central to understanding how learners acquire new grammatical knowledge with guided support (Vygotsky, 1978). In EFL grammar instruction, scaffolding encompasses a range of teacher-directed support strategies, including explicit explanation, modelling, guided practice, and corrective feedback, which are gradually withdrawn as learner competence increases (Mahan, 2022). This principle is particularly relevant in one-on-one tutoring contexts, where the tutor can tailor scaffolding dynamically to the individual learner's emerging needs.

Error analysis provides a systematic framework for identifying recurrent grammatical difficulties, which informs scaffolding decisions. Muftah (2023) demonstrated that Arab EFL learners consistently produced errors in present and past tense usage, particularly in subject-verb agreement and irregular verb forms. These findings resonate with Indonesian EFL learners' known difficulties in tense acquisition, where the absence of morphological tense marking in Bahasa Indonesia contributes to interlingual errors (Corder, 1967). By analysing error patterns across sessions, teachers can identify persistent challenges and target scaffolding more precisely, a process that Gen AI-generated practice materials can support by providing high-volume, varied exposure to the target structure.

Textbook-Based Instruction and Material Integration

Textbooks remain the predominant instructional resource in Indonesian EFL classrooms, and the government-issued *English for Nusantara* series represents the official material framework for junior high school learners under the Merdeka Belajar curriculum. Mustofa and Wirza (2023) noted that EFL textbooks in Indonesia play a dual role of delivering linguistic content and fostering learner autonomy, though they may require supplementation to address individual learning trajectories. The integration of supplementary AI-generated materials with textbook-based instruction thus responds to a well-documented pedagogical need, bridging the gap between standardised curricular content and personalised learning demands.

Adapting and supplementing EFL materials is a recognised practice in secondary school contexts, as textbooks alone may not provide sufficient practice for diverse learner profiles (Hanifa, as cited in Mustofa & Wirza, 2023). The present study contributes to this literature by demonstrating how Gen AI tools can function as on-demand material generators that complement textbook content without replacing its structural and cultural functions.

Research Method

Research Design

This study adopted a qualitative single-case study design following the framework proposed by Yin (2018), which is appropriate when a phenomenon is examined in its real-life context and the boundaries between the phenomenon and context are not clearly defined. The case study approach is particularly suited to this investigation because it allows for detailed, contextualised exploration of the instructional process, including the interplay between learner behaviour, teacher response, and assessment outcomes across time. The bounded unit of analysis is one Grade 8 EFL learner, observed across five instructional meetings in a private tutoring setting.

Participant

The participant is a single Grade 8 junior high school student (referred to as Student 1, a pseudonym assigned for privacy protection) enrolled in private English tutoring. Student 1 is an EFL learner receiving instruction in a one-on-one setting, with sessions alternating between evening (20:00–21:10) and morning (09:00–10:10) time slots across the study period from January to March 2026. No prior baseline beyond the first Quizizz quiz was available; the first session served simultaneously as an introductory and diagnostic meeting.

Instructional Tools and Materials

Three instructional tools were employed across the five sessions. First, a Gen AI tool was used by the teacher-researcher to generate grammar exercises, sentence transformation tasks, and speaking prompts tailored to each session's grammatical focus. Second, Quizizz was used as the formative assessment platform, with one ten-item quiz administered at the end of each session. Third, *English for Nusantara Grade VIII* served as the core textbook, providing the curriculum-aligned content framework within which Gen AI-generated materials were integrated.

Data Collection

Data were collected through three instruments. First, Quizizz quiz results provided quantitative accuracy data (percentage of correct responses per session). Second, classroom observation notes recorded by the teacher-researcher documented learner engagement, response patterns, and environmental conditions during each session. Third, teacher reflective journals were maintained throughout the study, capturing qualitative observations regarding learner performance, scaffolding strategies employed, and observed shifts in comprehension and participation.

Data Analysis

Data were analysed through descriptive content analysis and error analysis. Quizizz performance data were tabulated and compared across sessions to trace accuracy development. Observation and journal data were analysed thematically, with attention to engagement patterns, scaffolding episodes, and error recurrence. Error analysis followed the framework informed by Corder (1967) and Muftah (2023), categorising errors by type (e.g., subject-verb agreement, auxiliary verb omission, tense-form selection) and tracking their frequency across sessions to identify patterns of acquisition and persistent difficulty.

Findings

The findings are organised around three intersecting dimensions: grammar accuracy development, learner engagement and time-of-day effects, and error reduction patterns across the five instructional sessions.

Grammar Accuracy Development Across Sessions

Table 1 presents Student 1's Quizizz performance across the five instructional meetings, spanning four grammar topics from January to March 2026.

Table 1. Student 1's Quizizz Performance Across Five Instructional Sessions

Meeting	Date	Grammar Focus	Time	Score (%)	Correct / Total	Errors
1	21 Jan 2026	Simple Present Tense	Evening	60%	6 / 10	4
2	09 Feb 2026	Simple Past Tense	Evening	80%	8 / 10	2
3	11 Feb 2026	Past Continuous Tense (Set 1)	Evening	70%	7 / 10	3
4	22 Feb 2026	Past Continuous Tense (Set 2)	Morning	100%	10 / 10	0
5	01 Mar 2026	Past Perfect Tense	Morning	100%	10 / 10	0

Note. All quizzes were administered via Quizizz; each quiz comprised 10 items.

As illustrated in Table 1, Student 1's grammar accuracy followed a generally ascending trajectory across the five sessions, improving from 60% at the baseline (Session 1, Simple Present Tense) to 80% in Session 2 (Simple Past Tense), declining slightly to 70% in Session 3 (Past Continuous Tense, Set 1), before reaching 100% in Sessions 4 and 5. The temporary decline in Session 3 is discussed in the context of engagement and environmental conditions below. The overall trajectory represents an improvement of 40 percentage points across the study period, culminating in perfect accuracy in both the reinforcement session on Past Continuous Tense and the final session on Past Perfect Tense.

Learner Engagement and Time-of-Day Effects

Table 2 summarises the engagement levels, observed behaviours, and environmental conditions across the five sessions.

Table 2. Learner Engagement, Observed Behaviour, and Session Conditions

Meeting	Time	Engagement	Observed Behaviour	Environmental Conditions	Scaffolding Level
1	Evening	Low	Confused, slow response, drowsy	Rainy season; low alertness	High (continuous)
2	Evening	Medium	Slight improvement, still slow	Drowsy but less distracted	Moderate
3	Evening	Low	Fatigue, inconsistent response	Raining; tired after school day	High (assisted throughout)
4	Morning	High	Focused, active, excited	Morning alertness; no distractions	Low (mostly independent)
5	Morning	High	Fast response, confident	Morning; motivated	Minimal

A clear pattern emerges from Table 2: the three evening sessions (Meetings 1–3) were consistently associated with lower engagement, fatigue-related behaviours, and environmental disruptions such as rainy weather. In contrast, the two morning sessions (Meetings 4–5) were characterised by high engagement, fast responsiveness, and confident participation. Teacher reflective journal entries corroborate these observations; for instance, the entry for Session 1 noted that Student 1 experienced

difficulty constructing sentences even with continuous scaffolding, while the entry for Session 4 recorded that the student demonstrated independent sentence formation without needing prompting.

These findings suggest that time-of-day and environmental conditions function as contextual moderators of learner performance. The shift to morning sessions appears to have been a catalyst for increased learner responsiveness, which in turn facilitated more efficient acquisition of the target grammar structures. This finding aligns with research on cognitive performance and fatigue in adolescent learners, which indicates that late-evening study sessions may impair memory consolidation and attention (Wei, 2023).

Error Reduction and Pattern Analysis

Analysis of error patterns across the five sessions reveals a systematic reduction in grammatical inaccuracies, particularly across three error categories: subject-verb agreement, auxiliary verb usage, and tense-form selection.

In Session 1 (Simple Present Tense), Student 1 committed four errors, all related to subject-verb agreement. Specifically, incorrect verb forms were selected for third-person singular subjects (e.g., *plays, studies, watches* applied to plural subjects) and auxiliary verbs were omitted or misapplied (e.g., using *do* incorrectly). Teacher journal notes indicate that Student 1 struggled to convert between affirmative, negative, and interrogative sentence forms, requiring continuous scaffolding to produce correct transformations.

Session 2 (Simple Past Tense) showed improvement to 80% accuracy, with two remaining errors attributable to irregular verb confusion (e.g., *putted* in place of *put*) and auxiliary confusion (*was* used in a context requiring *were*). These error types are consistent with Muftah's (2023) findings regarding the difficulty of irregular verb forms and plural auxiliary selection for EFL learners at intermediate proficiency levels.

Session 3 (Past Continuous Tense, Set 1) yielded 70% accuracy with three errors, all involving incorrect auxiliary selection. Student 1 selected present-tense auxiliaries (e.g., *is studying* instead of *was studying*) and applied incorrect subject-auxiliary agreement in negative constructions (e.g., *was not listening* instead of *were not listening*). The teacher's reflective journal noted that tense confusion, specifically the interference of present continuous form knowledge on past continuous production, was the primary difficulty at this stage.

Sessions 4 and 5 showed complete error elimination, with Student 1 achieving 100% accuracy on the reinforcement quiz for Past Continuous Tense and the new quiz for Past Perfect Tense. Teacher journal entries for these sessions described Student 1 as independently constructing and transforming sentences without scaffolding prompts, a qualitative shift indicative of internalised grammatical knowledge (Vygotsky, 1978). The progression from high-scaffolding, error-prone performance in evening sessions to independent, error-free performance in morning sessions represents the core narrative of the case study.

Discussion

The findings of this study converge around three central themes: the role of Gen AI-generated materials in individualising grammar practice, the mediating effect of time-of-day and learning conditions on performance, and the facilitating function of teacher scaffolding and reflective practice in grammar acquisition.

The Role of Gen AI-Generated Materials in Grammar Practice

The integration of Gen AI-generated exercises into the instructional design provided Student 1 with a richer and more varied set of grammar practice tasks than the *English for Nusantara* textbook alone could supply. Each session featured Gen AI-generated sentence transformation tasks, fill-in-the-blank items, and speaking prompts that directly targeted the grammatical structure under study,

creating high-density practice opportunities aligned with the session's learning objectives. This aligns with Lu's (2025) finding that AI-generated corpus-based practice improves acquisition of grammatical structures compared to textbook instruction alone, and with Song and Song (2023) demonstration that AI-assisted instruction enhances grammatical accuracy through contextualised, repetitive exposure.

The on-demand nature of Gen AI content generation is particularly salient in private tutoring contexts. Unlike classroom settings where pre-prepared worksheets must serve multiple learners simultaneously, the one-on-one tutoring context permits the teacher-researcher to generate exercises tailored to Student 1's specific error patterns identified from the preceding Quizizz results. For instance, following Session 3, in which Student 1 consistently misapplied present-tense auxiliaries to past continuous contexts, the teacher used a Gen AI tool to generate a targeted set of auxiliary discrimination tasks that contrasted present and past progressive forms in contextualised sentences. This responsive material generation exemplifies what Deng and Jamaludin (2026) describe as the "implementation" function of Gen AI in EFL instruction, wherein AI tools serve as intelligent tutoring systems capable of adapting to individual learner needs.

Importantly, Gen AI-generated materials were not used in isolation but were contextualised within the broader textbook-based instructional framework. The *English for Nusantara* textbook provided the cultural and communicative grounding for each grammar topic, while Gen AI-generated tasks offered additional structural practice. This blended approach reflects the recommendation by Xiao et al. (2026) that Gen AI tools be embedded within existing pedagogical frameworks rather than deployed as standalone resources, ensuring that the cultural and linguistic context of the learner is not bypassed. In this study, the textbook served as the anchor for meaning-making and communicative purpose, while Gen AI-generated exercises served as the engine for repeated structural practice, a complementary rather than competitive relationship that proved effective for this learner.

This finding has implications for instructional material design in Indonesian EFL contexts more broadly. As Mustofa and Wirza,(2023) observed, government-issued EFL textbooks such as *English for Nusantara* may not provide sufficient individualised practice for learners at different proficiency levels. Gen AI tools offer teachers a practical mechanism for supplementing textbook content without requiring the extensive time and expertise associated with manual worksheet design. The present case study provides an initial illustration of how this supplementation process might operate in practice, though larger-scale studies are needed to evaluate its effectiveness systematically across diverse learner populations and instructional settings.

Time-of-Day as a Moderating Variable

One of the most distinctive findings of this study is the relationship between session time and learner performance. The three evening sessions were uniformly associated with lower engagement, higher error frequency, and greater reliance on scaffolding, while the two morning sessions produced markedly better outcomes. This pattern has practical implications for instructional scheduling in private tutoring contexts, suggesting that when flexibility exists, morning sessions may be more productive for grammar acquisition with adolescent EFL learners.

This finding is consistent with broader literature on cognitive load and learning readiness, which indicates that adolescent learners may experience diminished attentional resources and working memory capacity in evening hours following a full school day (Wei, 2023). The transition to morning sessions in this study appeared to function as a turning point in the case, after which Student 1's engagement and accuracy improved dramatically. Future case studies may wish to investigate this variable more explicitly, controlling for time-of-day as an independent factor in grammar instruction research.

Scaffolding, Teacher Mediation, and Reflective Practice

The teacher's scaffolding intensity closely tracked Student 1's proficiency development. Sessions 1–3 required continuous, high-level scaffolding to support sentence construction and transformation, while Sessions 4–5 required minimal intervention. This trajectory aligns with Vygotsky's (1978) notion of the ZPD, wherein learners progressively internalise supported knowledge and eventually perform independently. The teacher reflective journals were instrumental in capturing this dynamic and informing session-by-session instructional adjustments, a process consistent with the role of reflective practice in EFL teacher professional development.

Error analysis guided the scaffolding decisions across sessions. Recognising Student 1's persistent difficulty with auxiliary verb selection in Past Continuous Tense (Session 3), the teacher designed Session 4 as a targeted reinforcement session using additional Gen AI-generated practice items that specifically addressed auxiliary agreement errors. This responsive instructional adjustment directly contributed to Student 1's error-free performance in Session 4, demonstrating the value of data-driven scaffolding supported by diagnostic assessment tools such as Quizizz.

Teacher reflective journals also captured qualitative dimensions of learning that quantitative quiz data alone could not reveal. For example, Journal Entry 3 noted that Student 1 demonstrated growing confidence in positive-to-interrogative sentence transformations but continued to hesitate when reversing the transformation direction (interrogative-to-negative). This nuanced observation, which fell below the threshold of a wrong quiz answer, guided the specific prompting strategies employed in Session 4, illustrating how reflective practice enables teachers to respond to learning edges that lie just within the learner's ZPD. These observations found that reflective teaching practices improve teachers' understanding of learner progress and enhance instructional quality in EFL settings.

The interaction between formative assessment data and teacher reflection created a feedback loop that structured the entire instructional sequence. Quizizz results identified error categories; teacher journals contextualised those errors within behavioural and environmental observations; and Gen AI tools generated additional practice to target identified difficulties. This tripartite system, digital assessment, reflective journalling, and AI-generated materials, constitutes a replicable instructional model for private EFL grammar tutoring that future practitioners may adapt to their own contexts.

These findings are also consistent with the broader literature on AI-assisted EFL instruction, which emphasises that the effectiveness of Gen AI tools is substantially mediated by teacher judgement and instructional design (Deng & Jamaludin, 2026; Jiang, 2022). Gen AI tools generate practice content; it is teacher mediation that contextualises that content within the learner's developmental trajectory. Without the teacher's diagnostic reading of quiz results and reflective interpretation of engagement patterns, the Gen AI-generated exercises would constitute undifferentiated practice rather than targeted developmental input. This observation is a caution against viewing Gen AI tools as autonomous instructional agents; they function most effectively as responsive tools in the hands of reflective, data-literate teachers.

Conclusion

This study examined the integration of Gen AI-generated materials and textbook-based instruction in a five-session private EFL grammar tutoring programme for a single Grade 8 learner. The findings demonstrate that this blended instructional approach, supported by Quizizz formative assessments and teacher scaffolding, was associated with substantial improvements in grammar accuracy, from 60% at the baseline to 100% in the final two sessions, alongside a progressive reduction in grammatical errors and an increase in independent learner performance.

Three conclusions emerge from the study. First, Gen AI-generated materials can effectively supplement textbook-based grammar instruction by providing high-density, targeted practice opportunities that address individual learner needs. Second, contextual factors, particularly session time and environmental conditions, exert significant influence on learner engagement and performance, and

instructional scheduling decisions should account for these variables in private tutoring contexts. Third, teacher scaffolding and reflective practice are indispensable mediating factors in AI-assisted grammar instruction, ensuring that generated content is deployed responsively in relation to the learner's evolving proficiency.

This study has several limitations. The single-participant design, while appropriate for an in-depth case study, limits the generalisability of the findings. The study period of five sessions across approximately six weeks may not capture long-term retention effects. Additionally, the absence of a control condition makes it impossible to attribute improvement exclusively to the Gen AI-generated materials rather than the combined effect of instruction, practice, and time.

Future research should investigate the effects of Gen AI-assisted grammar instruction with larger, more diverse learner populations, including classroom-based settings in Indonesian secondary schools. Longitudinal studies examining retention and transfer of grammatical knowledge would also contribute meaningfully to the literature. Researchers might also explore the comparative effects of different Gen AI tools and prompting strategies on grammar learning outcomes, as well as the role of learner metacognition in Gen AI-assisted instruction contexts.

References

Andresta, N. B., & Anwar, C. (2022). Quizizz as an assessment medium in EFL teaching: Students' voices. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture, 7*(2), 386–401. https://doi.org/10.30659/e.7.2.386-401

Apoko, T. W. (2025). Generative artificial intelligence in English instruction: Indonesian EFL vocational high school teachers' perspectives. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 13*(3), 1432–1444. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v13i3.14190

Aulia, R., & Warni, S. (2024). Students' perceptions toward Quizizz as an assessment tool in EFL classrooms. *International Journal of Research in Education, 4*(2), 283–294. https://doi.org/10.26877/ijre.v4i2.554

Bindiya, A., & Fediyanto, N. (2023). EFL students' perceptions towards Quizizz usage in English subject formative assessment. *Journal of Research on English and Language Learning, 4*(2), 167–182. https://doi.org/10.33474/j-reall.v4i2.20309

Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learner's errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 5*(1–4), 161–170. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161

Deng, L., & Jamaludin, K. A. (2026). Roles of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in English as a foreign language (EFL) instruction: A systematic literature review. *SAGE Open, 16*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440261418315

Fan, J., & Zhang, Q. (2024). From literacy to learning: The sequential mediation of attitudes and enjoyment in AI-assisted EFL education. *Heliyon, 10*(17), e37158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e37158

Jiang, R. (2022). How does artificial intelligence empower EFL teaching and learning nowadays? A review on artificial intelligence in the EFL context. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 1049401. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1049401

Lu, C. (2025). AI-generated corpus learning and EFL learners' learning of grammatical structures, lexical bundles, and willingness to write. *PLOS ONE, 20*(7), e0321544. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0321544

Mahan, K. R. (2022). The comprehending teacher: Scaffolding in content and language integrated learning (CLIL). *Language Teaching Research, 26*(3), 467–485. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1705879

Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology. (2021). *English for Nusantara: English for Grade VIII junior secondary school*. Pusat Perbukuan.

Muftah, M. (2023). Error analysis in second language acquisition (SLA): Types and frequencies of grammatical errors of simple present and past tense in the elicited written production task of Arab EFL undergraduate learners. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal, 25*(1), 42–56. https://doi.org/10.14483/22487085.19202

Mustofa, M. I., & Wirza, Y. (2023). Promoting learner autonomy through EFL textbook: The textbook facilitation and the students' and teacher's perceptions. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language, 13*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v13i1.6056

Rafida, T., Suwandi, S., & Ananda, R. (2024). EFL students' perception in Indonesia and Taiwan on using artificial intelligence to enhance writing skills. *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun, 12*(3), 987–1016. https://doi.org/10.26811/peuradeun.v12i3.1520

Song, C., & Song, Y. (2023). Enhancing academic writing skills and motivation: Assessing the efficacy of ChatGPT in AI-assisted language learning for EFL students. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, 1260843. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1260843

Triastuti, A., Madya, S., & Chappell, P. (2022). Genre-based teaching cycle and instructional design for teaching texts and mandated curriculum contents. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 12*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i1.46563

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Wei, L. (2023). Artificial intelligence in language instruction: Impact on English learning achievement, L2 motivation, and self-regulated learning. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, 1261955. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1261955

Wulandary, N., & Amrullah, A. (2023). Teachers' practices of reflective teaching in EFL classroom. *IJORER: International Journal of Recent Educational Research, 5*(3), 441–452. https://doi.org/10.46245/ijorer.v5i3.591

Xiao, F., Zhu, S., & Xin, W. (2025). Exploring the landscape of generative AI (ChatGPT)-powered writing instruction in English as a foreign language education: A scoping review. *ECNU Review of Education, 8*(1), 103–129. https://doi.org/10.1177/20965311241310881

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). SAGE.