THE IMMEDIATE EFFECT OF USING CHATGPT ON STUDENT'S WRITING PERFORMANCE AT VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL X SAMARINDA

THESIS

Written in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Bachelor of Education

English Language Education Program

By:

AMANDA YULIANI AULIASARI

2288203003

ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION PROGRAM

FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF WIDYA GAMA MAHAKAM

SAMARINDA

2026

THE IMMEDIATE EFFECT OF USING CHATGPT ON STUDENT'S WRITING PERFORMANCE AT VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL X SAMARINDA

THESIS

Written in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Education
English Language Education Program

By:

AMANDA YULIANI AULIASARI
2288203003

ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION PROGRAM
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF WIDYA GAMA MAHAKAM
SAMARINDA
2026

PAGE OF APPROVAL

PAGE OF APPROVAL

THESIS

THE IMMEDIATE EFFECT OF USING CHATGPT ON STUDENT'S WRITING PERFORMANCE AT VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL X SAMARINDA

Written and Submitted by

AMANDA YULIANI AULIASARI

Has been defended on thesis examination on August 13th, 2026

And has fulfilled the requirements for Bachelor Degree of English Language Education Department

Examination Committee:

Chairman : Dr. Dedi Rahman Nur, M.Pd. .....

Member : 1. Sukaena, M.Pd. .....

2. Widi Syahtia Pane, M.Pd. .....

Approved by

Teacher Training and Education Faculty Dean,

Dr. Nur Aliis Salim, S.Pd., M.Pd.
NIK. 2022.084.293

English Language Education Department Head,

Nurdin Arifin, S.Pd., M.Pd.
NIK. 2025.091.352

CURRICULUM VITAE



The writer, Amanda Yuliani Auliasari, was born in Tering Seberang on August 23, 2004. The writer is the first child of Yulis Yudianto and Nelsi Diani. The writer began her formal education at TK Negeri 01 Tering. The writer then continued her elementary education at SD Negeri 003 Tering and graduated in 2016. The writer then continued her study at SMP Katolik 2 WR. Soepratman for her first semester, before continuing at SMP Negeri 01 Tering, and graduated in 2019. After graduating from junior high school, the writer pursued her senior high school education at SMA Negeri 01 Linggang Bigung from 2019 to 2022. In 2022, the writer enrolled in the English Language Education Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Widya Gama Mahakam Samarinda. The writer completed her undergraduate study and earned her Bachelor's degree in English Education in 2026.

DECLARATON OF AUTHORSHIP

Name : Amanda Yuliani Auliasari

NPM : 2288203003

Study Program : English Education

Faculty : Faculty of Teacher Training and Education

hereby declares that the undergraduate thesis entitled " *The Immediate Effect of Using ChatGPT on Student's Writing Performance at Vocational High School X Samarinda*" is the writer's own original work. All ideas, data, and findings presented in this thesis were obtained and developed by the writer. Any information, quotations, or references taken from the works of other authors have been properly acknowledged and cited in accordance with academic writing standards.

The writer further declares that this thesis has never been submitted, either in whole or in part, to fulfil the requirements for any academic degree at this or any other higher education institution.

This declaration is made truthfully and with full responsibility. Should this statement be proven otherwise in the future, the writer is willing to accept any academic consequences in accordance with the regulations of Universitas Widya Gama Mahakam Samarinda.

Samarinda, 13 August 2026

The Writer



Amanda Yuliani Auliasari

NPM 2288203003

ABSTRACT

Auliasari, Amanda Yuliani, 2026. "The Immediate Effect of Using ChatGPT on Students' Writing Performance at Vocational High School X Samarinda." Bachelor Thesis, English Education Department, Widya Gama Mahakam Samarinda University. Advisor: (1) Dr. Dedi Rahman Nur, M.Pd. (2) Sukaena, M.Pd.

ChatGPT has emerged as an artificial intelligence tool with the potential to support English writing instruction by providing immediate feedback and writing assistance. This study aimed to investigate the immediate effect of ChatGPT-assisted instruction on students' writing performance at Vocational High School X Samarinda. A quantitative approach with a quasi-experimental design was employed involving an experimental group and a control group. Students' writing performance was assessed through writing tests covering content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. The findings showed that ChatGPT-assisted instruction improved students' writing performance by supporting idea development, vocabulary use, grammatical accuracy, organization, and mechanics. However, its overall effect was relatively small, indicating that ChatGPT is most effective when used as a complementary learning tool alongside teacher guidance. These findings contribute to the integration of artificial intelligence in English writing instruction, particularly in vocational high school contexts.

Keywords: *ChatGPT, writing performance, AI-assisted learning, vocational high school.*

MOTTO

“Nature does not hurry, yet everything is accomplished”

---LaoTzu---

DEDICATION

This Thesis Is Dedicated To

My Lord Jesus Christ, whose endless grace, love, and guidance have carried me through every step of this journey.

My beloved parents, Mr. Yulis Yudianto and Mrs. Nelsi Diani, for their unconditional love, tireless prayers, and every sacrifice they made so I could reach this day.

My family and friends, for their constant encouragement and for standing beside me through every challenge and triumph.

And to myself for the strength to keep going, the faith to trust the process, and the courage to never stop striving for the best.

PREFACE

First and foremost, the researcher would like to express her deepest gratitude to God Almighty for His abundant blessings, guidance, and strength, which have enabled the completion of this thesis. Without His grace and mercy, this academic work would not have been accomplished successfully.

The researcher would also like to convey her sincere appreciation to the Rector of the University Widya Gama Mahakam Samarinda for providing academic opportunities and creating a supportive environment that encourages learning, research, and intellectual development.

1. Dr. Nur Agus Salim, S.Pd., M.Pd., as the Dean of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, his support and for providing the necessary facilities during the completion of this thesis.
2. Mr. Nurdin Arifin, S.Pd., M.Pd., as the Head of the English Education Study Program, Universitas Widya Gama Mahakam Samarinda, for his administrative assistance and support throughout the researcher's academic journey.
3. Mrs. Sukaena, M.Pd., as the Secretary of the English Education Study Program in University Widya Gama Mahakam Samarinda also as the researcher’s academic advisor and second advisor, for her guidance in learning, her administrative assistance during the researcher's study, her valuable time, guidance, direction, and constructive feedback throughout the completion of this thesis
4. Mr. Dr. Dedi Rahman Nur, M.Pd., as the first advisor, for his patience, valuable guidance, constructive suggestions, and continuous motivation throughout the completion of this thesis.
5. The researcher's beloved parents, Mr. Yulis Yudianto and Mrs. Nelsi Diani, and her beloved sister, Audrey Zefanya Mayinsi, for their endless love, prayers, sacrifices, and unwavering support throughout her academic journey.

6. Mrs. Febriani Christina Omega, for her continuous support, advice, encouragement, and prayers.
7. Alda Lia and Natalia Angelita, for their friendship, care, encouragement, patience, and unwavering support throughout the researcher's academic journey and the completion of this thesis.
8. The researcher's extended family, for their prayers, encouragement, and continuous support.

   Fellow students of the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Class of 2022, for their friendship, cooperation, and mutual support throughout their years of study.
9. All parties who cannot be mentioned individually, but whose support, encouragement, motivation, and assistance have contributed to the completion of this thesis.

Finally, the researcher realizes that this thesis is far from perfect due to limitations in knowledge and experience. Therefore, constructive criticism and valuable suggestions are highly appreciated for future improvement. It is hoped that this thesis may provide useful insights for readers and make a meaningful contribution to the development of English language education.

Samarinda, 13 August 2026

Researchers,



Amanda Yuliani Auliasari

NPM.2288203003

LIST OF CONTENTS

PAGE OF APPROVAL I
CURRICULUM VITAE II
ABSTRACT IV
MOTTO V
DEDICATION VI
PREFACE VII
LIST OF CONTENTS IX
LIST OF APPENDICES XI
LIST OF TABLE XII
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION 1
A. Background of the study 1
B. Identification of the problem 4
C. Delimitation of the problem 5
D. Research question 6
E. Research objectives 6
F. Significance of the study 7
CHAPTER II LITELATURE REVIEW 9
A. Conceptual Description 9
B. Relevant research study 12
C. Theoretical framework 15
D. Research hypothesis 17
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 18
A. Research Design 18
B. Place and Time Research 19
C. Population And Research Sample 19
D. Data Collection Technique and Instrument 20

E. Validity and Reliability of Instrument 23
F. Data Analysis Technique 24
CHAPTER IV FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION 29
A. Research Findings 29
B. Discussion 37
CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION 42
A. Conclusion 42
B. Suggestion 43
BIBLIOGRAPHY 45
APPENDICES 48

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Research Instrument 48
Appendix 2 Lesson Plan 52
Appendix 3 Documentation 65
Appendix 4 Research Permit Letter 66
Appendix 5 Validation Sheet 67
Appendix 6 Revision Sheet….....70

LIST OF TABLE

Table 1 Research Design 18
Table 2 Assessment Rubric 24

Table 4 1 The Pre-Test and Post-Test of Experiment Class 29
Table 4 2 The Pre-Test and Post-Test of Control Class 31
Table 4 3 Test of Normality 34
Table 4 4 Test of Homogeneity 34
Table 4 5 Paired Samples Statistics 35
Table 4 6 Paired Sample Test 36
Table 4 7 Group Statistics 36
Table 4 8 The Effect Size Test 37

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the study

According to Fardian et al. (2025), ChatGPT is an artificial intelligence tool that has attracted global attention since its release in November 2022. It is based on the Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT), which is built on a Pre-trained Large Language Model. This technology enables ChatGPT to understand natural language input and generate relevant responses within a short period of time. Because of its ability to provide quick and accessible information, ChatGPT has become widely used by people from various backgrounds, including students, educators, researchers, and the general public. As a result, the tool has increasingly been utilized for both academic and non-academic purposes, such as learning, writing, problem solving, and obtaining information efficiently.

Shi et al. (2025a) explain that although ChatGPT is capable of producing grammatically correct and well-organized text, its responses are generated through probabilistic predictions rather than actual understanding of the information. As a result, the answers it provides may appear fluent and convincing, but they can still contain factual inaccuracies, oversimplified explanations, or information that is not fully appropriate to the context. Furthermore, the ease of accessing instant responses through ChatGPT may lead some users to rely on the generated content without carefully examining its accuracy or relevance. This tendency can reduce critical evaluation, as users may accept the information without verifying it through other reliable sources.

Al-Mubireek and Arruri (2025) states that “Writing skills are commonly being analysed and assessed through various way, but the most used are neutral and linguistic process, along with cognitive process. In other side, the development of writing is when students are exposed to a

variety of language-based instruction" This research shows students noticeable improvement in writing when they're exposed to a variety of language as instructional approaches.

However, previous research has shown that the use of ChatGPT does not always result in a statistically significant improvement in students' writing performance. Puteri *et al.* (2025), who investigated the use of ChatGPT as a writing assistant among Indonesian EFL university students, found no significant difference in essay quality between students who used ChatGPT and those who received conventional instruction. This finding suggests that the effectiveness of ChatGPT in improving students' writing performance may vary depending on the learning context, instructional approach, and characteristics of the learners. Therefore, further research is needed to examine the use of ChatGPT in different educational contexts.

However, the effectiveness of writing instruction depends on how actively the students engage with these learning experiences. Merely providing language input does not guarantee improvement if students do not process, reflect on, and apply what they learn.

As part of the artificial intelligence ecosystem, ChatGPT is a useful tool that can contribute to various aspects of education. The use of AI has been shown to support learning gains in specific knowledge domains, even without direct human teacher involvement. This capability makes it particularly appealing in learning environments where access to instructional support is limited or where students require immediate assistance outside formal classroom hours. This argument is supported by Holmes and Tuomi (2022), who state that AI based tools can assist learning processes independently of direct teacher involvement, particularly in areas such as information retrieval, practice, and individualized feedback.

From that perspective, AI can help learners progress at their own pace and revisit materials as needed, which may enhance understanding and retention. In language learning, for example, students can repeatedly

interact with AI generated text to observe patterns, test hypotheses about language use, and refine their output.

On student motivation ChatGPT has a significant positive influence, ChatGPT gave immediate feedback, enhance students writing performance such as grammar by verify their grammar. And improving their vocabulary structured sentence in the generated responses, according to Amini and Susanti (2024), the immediacy of feedback provided by ChatGPT plays an important role in sustaining students' interest and willingness to write.

When students received instant responses to their input, they tend to perceive writing as less intimidating and more manageable. This reduced anxiety may encourage students to attempt writing tasks more frequently, particularly those who previously lacked confidence in their language ability.

Shi et al. (2025), explain that using AI may have several effects this also happen on students writing skills, ChatGPT are mainly used for checking students' grammar, sentences and providing feedback based on rubrics that given. ChatGPT also able to produce complete essays when given a prompt. In addition to grammar and sentence level support, ChatGPT is often used to provide feedback based on predefined assessment rubrics. When students input evaluation criteria or writing guidelines, the system can generate comments related to content organization, language use, and coherence.

To protect the identity of the research site, the name of the school is presented using a pseudonym. Therefore, "Vocational High School X Samarinda" is used throughout this study instead of the school's actual name.

Based on the researcher's preliminary observation at Vocational High School X Samarinda, many students still experience difficulties in writing English texts. Their challenges are reflected in several aspects of writing. In terms of content, some students have difficulty developing and expressing their ideas clearly and relevantly. Regarding organization, they

often struggle to arrange their ideas into coherent and well-structured paragraphs. In terms of vocabulary, many students have a limited range of words, making it difficult for them to express their ideas accurately and effectively. Grammatical errors are also frequently found, particularly in sentence structure and verb usage. Furthermore, students still experience problems with mechanics, including punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. These challenges make writing one of the most difficult English skills for many students and often reduce their confidence in completing writing tasks.

Considering these challenges in content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics, students need learning support that can help them improve the overall quality of their writing. One technology that has recently gained considerable attention is ChatGPT, an artificial intelligence tool that can provide instant feedback on grammatical errors, suggest appropriate vocabulary, generate writing examples, and assist students in developing and organizing their ideas more effectively. These features indicate that ChatGPT has the potential to support students throughout the writing process. However, despite its potential benefits, the effectiveness of ChatGPT in improving students' writing performance, particularly across the aspects of content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics, remains an issue that requires further investigation, especially in the context of vocational high school students at Vocational High School X Samarinda.

B. Identification of the problem

Based on given background above, the problems that can be identified as follows:

1. Students in Vocational High School X Samarinda still experience some difficulties in developing and organizing their ideas into a coherent written sentence or words.

2. Many students have limited vocabulary to develop a good paragraph including sentences, adding details, and make the conclusion effective.
3. Students using messy grammar and not the right vocabulary, which affecting their results on writing.
4. Many students still show low confidence and low engagement to task like writing because they perceive English as a hard subject and time consuming
5. The use of ChatGPT as a writing tool among students are there but not used correctly nor usually used, the immediate effect on students remains unclear.
6. There is still limited empirical evidence regarding the differences in students' writing performance before and after using ChatGPT.
7. It is not yet known which aspect of writing performance shows the most dominant improvement after the use of ChatGPT.

C. Delimitation of the problem

The study was solely focus on writing performance and only at Vocational High School X Samarinda, and only use ChatGPT as the Artificial intelligence (AI) tool. The study examines immediate effect students writing performance in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.

This study is deliberately delimited to maintain a clear and manageable research scope. First, the focus of the study is limited solely to students' writing performance. Other English language skills such as listening, speaking, and reading are not included in this research, as they fall outside the objectives of the study.

Second, the research is conducted only at Vocational High School X Samarinda. The participants are limited to students from this institution, and therefore, the findings of the study are not intended to be generalized to students from other schools or educational levels. This delimitation is made to ensure

that the research context remains specific and relevant to the characteristics of vocational high school students, particularly those in the health major.

Third, the study only employs ChatGPT as the artificial intelligence (AI) tool. Other AI-based writing tools or applications are not considered in this research. By focusing exclusively on ChatGPT, the study aims to examine its specific role and contribution to students' writing performance without interference from other technological tools.

Furthermore, the study examines only the immediate effect of using ChatGPT on students' writing performance. Long-term effects, such as sustained improvement over several weeks or months, are not investigated. The assessment of writing performance is limited to specific aspects of writing, namely content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Other components of writing, such as content development, organization, grammar complexity, and vocabulary richness, are excluded from the analysis.

These delimitations are established to ensure that the research remains focused, feasible, and aligned with the research objectives. By clearly defining the boundaries of the study, the researcher expects to obtain more precise and measurable findings regarding the immediate effect of ChatGPT on students' writing performance.

D. Research question

Based on the listed things above, the research question of this study is formulated into one final question:

Is there a significant difference in writing performance between students taught using ChatGPT-assisted writing instruction and those taught using conventional writing instruction?

E. Research objectives

This study aims to examine whether there is a significant difference in writing performance between students taught using ChatGPT-assisted writing instruction and those taught using conventional writing instruction.

F. Significance of the study

Theoretically, this study is expected to contribute to the field of English language education, particularly in relation to the integration of artificial intelligence in writing instruction. By examining the immediate effect of ChatGPT on students' writing performance, this study hopefully provides empirical evidence regarding how AI-based tools influence specific aspects of writing, namely content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. The findings of this research may enrich existing theories on technology-assisted language learning and support discussions on the role of AI as a supplementary learning tool rather than a replacement for human instruction. In addition, this study may serve as a reference for future researchers who are interested in investigating short-term learning outcomes related to AI use in language education.

Practically, the results of this study are expected to provide useful insights for English teachers, particularly those teaching writing in vocational high schools. The findings may help teachers understand the extent to which ChatGPT can be utilized as a supportive tool in writing activities and how its use may affect students' writing performance in the short term. This study can assist teachers in making informed decisions about integrating ChatGPT into classroom instruction while maintaining students' active engagement and critical thinking.

For students, this study may raise awareness of the appropriate and responsible use of AI tools in writing. By understanding the benefits and limitations of ChatGPT, students are encouraged to use the tool as a learning aid rather than a means of dependency. Furthermore, the study may motivate students to improve their writing performance by using AI feedback to reflect on and revise their work.

For schools and educational institutions, this study may served as a consideration in developing policies or guidelines related to the use of artificial intelligence in learning activities. The findings can support discussions on how

AI tools can be integrated into teaching practices while ensuring academic integrity and meaningful learning outcomes.

CHAPTER II
LITELATURE REVIEW

A. Conceptual Description

1. Writing

Writing is one of the essential language skills that enables individuals to communicate ideas, experiences, opinions, and information through written language (Wang, Zhang and Cooper, 2025). In educational settings, writing is considered a productive skill that requires learners to organize their thoughts, apply grammatical knowledge, use appropriate vocabulary, and develop coherent texts (Alharbi, 2023).

According to language learning theories, writing is not merely the process of putting words on paper but also involves critical thinking, planning, drafting, revising, and editing. Therefore, writing served as an important indicator of students' language proficiency and academic achievement(Al-Mubireek and Arruri, 2025).

In vocational schools such as Vocational High School X Samarinda, writing skills are particularly important because students are expected to communicate information accurately and effectively in both academic and professional contexts.

Writing performance is generally evaluated through several aspects, including content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics (Sudrajad *et al.*, 2024). These components work together to determine the quality of a written text, making writing one of the most complex language skills to develop. Many students are able to generate ideas but still struggle to organize them logically or express them accurately because of limited vocabulary and grammatical knowledge. As a result, improving writing performance requires continuous practice as well as appropriate instructional support that addresses multiple aspects of writing rather than focusing on a single component.

Alharbi (2023) suggest that AI assisted writing tools, such as ChatGPT, have the potential to support students during the writing process by providing ideas, language suggestions, and immediate feedback. These features may help students improve the quality of their writing and increase their confidence. However, other researchers argue that excessive dependence on AI may reduce students' critical thinking and writing independence because they may accept generated responses without evaluating their accuracy or appropriateness. Therefore, the effectiveness of AI assisted writing depends not only on the technology itself but also on how students use it as a learning support rather than a replacement for their own writing ability.

Although previous study named *"Revisiting Trends in GenAI-Assisted Second Language Writing: Retrospect and Prospect"* from Yang, Li and Yang (2025) have reported positive effects of ChatGPT on students' writing, several limitations remain. Many studies have focused on university students, while research involving vocational high school students is still limited. In addition, previous research has often examined students' perceptions or general writing achievement without specifically analyzing writing performance across components such as grammar, vocabulary, organization, and mechanics. Furthermore, differences in educational settings, students' English proficiency, and learning contexts may produce different outcomes. Therefore, further research is needed to investigate the effectiveness of ChatGPT in improving the writing performance of vocational high school students, particularly at Vocational High School X Samarinda.

2. Writing performance

Writing performance refers to the quality of written work produced by learners within a particular task or assessment. It reflects students' ability to apply their linguistic knowledge and writing skills in a practical situation (Sociedad and Abdulla, 2025).

Many scholars suggest that writing performance can be evaluated through several aspects, including content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. A student's writing performance may be influenced by various factors such as language proficiency, motivation, learning strategies, and the availability of supporting tools (Sophia Gaikwad *et al.*, 2023).

In the context of English language learning, writing performance is often used to measure the effectiveness of instructional methods and technological interventions designed to improve students' writing abilities.

3. ChatGPT

ChatGPT is an artificial intelligence (AI)-based language model developed by OpenAI that can generate human-like text based on user input. Recent studies indicate that ChatGPT has become increasingly popular in educational contexts because it can assist learners in generating ideas, organizing content, correcting grammatical errors, and improving sentence structure (Shi *et al.*, 2025b).

As an AI-powered writing assistant, ChatGPT provides immediate feedback and suggestions that may help students complete writing tasks more efficiently. Consequently, many educators and researchers have shown interest in examining how ChatGPT influences language learning outcomes, particularly in writing instruction (Shi and Aryadoust, 2024).

4. Effect of using ChatGPT on students writing

The integration of ChatGPT into writing activities has created new opportunities for students received instant support during the writing process. Several researchers argue that AI-assisted writing tools can enhance students' confidence, stimulate idea generation, and reduce difficulties related to grammar and vocabulary usage (Bašić *et al.*, 2023).

Through interaction with ChatGPT, students may gain access to examples, suggestions, and corrections that support the development of their written texts. However, the extent of its effectiveness may vary depending on how students use the tool and the specific learning context (Yan *et al.*, 2024).

Therefore, investigating the effect of ChatGPT on students' writing is important to determine whether its use contributes positively to writing performance among vocational school students.

5. Immediate effect on performance

The immediate effect here is referring to the direct and short-term impact that occurs shortly after an intervention is implemented. In this study, the intervention is the use of ChatGPT during writing activities (Chen *et al.*, 2022). The concept focuses on changes in students' writing performance that can be observed immediately after using ChatGPT, rather than improvements that develop over a long period.

The immediate effect may be reflected in better organization of ideas, improved grammatical accuracy, richer vocabulary usage, and higher overall writing scores. By examining this immediate effect, the study aims to determine whether ChatGPT can provide instant benefits for students' writing performance at Vocational High School X Samarinda. Understanding these short-term outcomes is important because it can provide evidence regarding the practical value of ChatGPT as a learning tool in English writing instruction and contribute to the growing body of research on artificial intelligence in education.

B. Relevant research study

The integration of artificial intelligence into language education has attracted considerable attention in recent years, particularly in the area of writing instruction. As writing is often regarded as one of the most

challenging language skills for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, researchers have begun exploring how AI-powered tools can support students throughout the writing process (Shi *et al.*, 2025b).

Among these tools, ChatGPT has emerged as a promising educational technology due to its ability to generate ideas, provide language assistance, and offer immediate feedback. Consequently, numerous studies have investigated the effectiveness of ChatGPT in improving students' writing performance (Shi and Aryadoust, 2024).

One of the studies related to the present research was conducted by (Amini and Susanti, 2024), who investigated the effect of ChatGPT on EFL students' writing skills in descriptive text. The study employed a quasi-experimental design involving 68 junior high school students divided into an experimental group and a control group. The findings revealed that students who received instruction supported by ChatGPT achieved significantly higher writing scores than those who learned through conventional methods. The researchers concluded that ChatGPT had a positive effect on students' writing skills, particularly in developing descriptive texts, as the tool assisted students in generating ideas and improving the quality of their written work.

The positive findings reported by Amini and Susanti are consistent with the growing body of literature emphasizing the role of ChatGPT as a writing support tool. Further evidence was provided by Shi et al., (2025), who compared the effects of ChatGPT and Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) systems on students' writing performance.

Using a mixed-method research design, the study involved 150 university students who were assigned to a ChatGPT group, an AWE group, and a control group. The results demonstrated that students who used ChatGPT achieved significantly higher writing performance than students in both the AWE and control groups. The researchers argued that ChatGPT provided more interactive, comprehensive, and personalized feedback,

enabling students to improve various aspects of their writing more effectively.

In addition to journal-based empirical research, evidence regarding the effectiveness of ChatGPT in writing instruction has also been reported in undergraduate research. Nabila Ayu Amanda, (2025) conducted a quasi-experimental study entitled The Effect of Using ChatGPT on Students' Writing of Descriptive Text at SMA Triguna Utama. The study involved 72 eleventh-grade students divided equally into experimental and control groups.

The findings indicated that students who received ChatGPT-assisted instruction achieved greater improvement in writing performance compared to students who received traditional instruction. The researcher reported a significant difference between the post-test scores of both groups and concluded that ChatGPT contributed positively to students' writing quality, accuracy, and fluency(Nabila Ayu Amanda, 2025).

The findings of the previous studies suggest a common pattern regarding the educational benefits of ChatGPT in writing instruction. Students who utilize ChatGPT tend to received immediate support during the writing process, allowing them to generate ideas more efficiently, improve grammatical accuracy, expand vocabulary usage, and organize their writing more effectively. As a result, their overall writing performance often improves compared to students who rely solely on conventional learning methods.

Although previous studies have consistently reported positive outcomes, several limitations remain.

First, many studies have focused on descriptive writing or specific writing genres rather than writing performance as a broader construct.

Second, a considerable number of studies have been conducted at the junior high school or university level.

Third, limited research has examined the immediate effect of ChatGPT on vocational high school students, particularly within the context of Indonesian vocational education.

Therefore, the present study seeks to address these limitations by investigating the immediate effect of using ChatGPT on students' writing performance at Vocational High School X Samarinda.

Unlike previous studies that focused primarily on specific writing genres, this study emphasizes overall writing performance measured through the dimensions of content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. The findings are expected to contribute further empirical evidence regarding the effectiveness of ChatGPT in supporting English writing instruction in vocational high school settings.

C. Theoretical framework

Writing is one of the most important skills in English language learning because it enables students to express ideas, share information, and communicate effectively through written texts. However, many students still experience difficulties in writing activities. These difficulties commonly include generating ideas, organizing information coherently, selecting appropriate vocabulary, constructing grammatically correct sentences, and applying proper writing mechanics. As a result, students often produce written texts that do not fully reflect their actual understanding of the topic. Writing performance in this study is measured through five indicators, namely content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Improvement in these aspects reflects students' overall development in writing ability. Such challenges may negatively affect their overall writing performance.

Along with the rapid development of technology, artificial intelligence has become increasingly integrated into educational practices. One of the most widely used artificial intelligence tools is ChatGPT, a

language model capable of generating human-like responses and providing immediate assistance in various language-related tasks. In writing activities, ChatGPT can help students generate ideas, expand vocabulary, improve sentence structures, and identify grammatical errors. Furthermore, the tool provides instant feedback, the immediate feedback provided by ChatGPT enables students to identify errors and make revisions while they are still engaged in the writing process. Through this revision process, students have opportunities to improve the quality of their writing before producing the final version. Allowing students received support during the writing process without having to wait for teacher correction.

Previous studies have reported that ChatGPT has the potential to support students' writing development by improving the quality of written texts and increasing learning efficiency. Most of these studies found positive outcomes in areas such as content development, organization, vocabulary use, grammatical accuracy, and writing confidence. However, research examining the immediate effect of ChatGPT on vocational high school students' writing performance remains limited, particularly in the context of Vocational High School X Samarinda. The revision process plays an important role in improving writing performance because it allows students to evaluate and refine their written work based on the feedback they received. By revising their drafts, students are expected to improve the content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics of their writing. Therefore, immediate feedback and continuous revision become the mechanisms through which ChatGPT-assisted instruction is expected to enhance students' writing performance.

Based on these considerations, this study assumes that ChatGPT-assisted instruction facilitates students in receiving immediate feedback during writing activities. The feedback encourages students to revise their drafts, which is expected to improve their writing performance as reflected in the aspects of content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Therefore, this study investigates whether ChatGPT-assisted

instruction has an immediate effect on students' writing performance at Vocational High School X Samarinda.

D. Research hypothesis

The hypothesis of this study is: “There is a certain immediate effect of using ChatGPT on students' writing performance at Vocational High School X Samarinda.”

CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

This study employed a quantitative approach using a quasi-experimental research design. Quasi-experimental research involved two groups of participants, namely an experimental group and a control group, to examined the effect of a particular treatment on a dependent variable. According to Amini and Susanti, (2024), quasi-experimental research is appropriate when the researcher cannot randomly assign participants into groups but still intend to investigate causal relationships between variables. This study aimed to investigate the immediate effect of using ChatGPT on students' writing performance at Vocational High School X Samarinda.

Therefore, two existing classes are selected to participate in the study. One class served as the experimental group and received writing instruction supported by ChatGPT, while the other class served as the control group and received conventional writing instruction without ChatGPT. Both groups are taught by the same English teacher to maintain consistency in instruction and minimize external influences that may affect the research findings.

To determine the effect of the treatment, students in both groups are administered a pre-test before the treatment and a post-test after the treatment. The results of both tests are then compared to identify whether the use of ChatGPT contributes significantly to students' writing performance.

Table 1 Research Design

Group	Pre-Test	Treatment with GPT	Post-Test
Experimental Class	✓	✓	✓
Control Class	✓	✗	✓

B. Place and Time Research

This research was conducted at Vocational High School X Samarinda during the second semester of the academic year. The school is selected as the research site because it represents a vocational high school setting where students are required to develop English writing skills as part of their academic learning process.

The data collection process consisted of five meetings involving both the experimental and control groups. During the first meeting, students completed the pre-test to measure their initial writing performance. This was followed by three treatment sessions, in which the experimental group received ChatGPT-assisted instruction while the control group received conventional writing instruction. At the final meeting, all students completed the post-test to measure their writing performance after the implementation of the treatment.

The pre-test was administered before the implementation of the treatment to determine students' initial writing performance. For the next meeting, the experimental group received writing instruction supported by ChatGPT, while the control group received conventional writing instruction without the use of artificial intelligence tools. After all treatment sessions have been completed, the post-test administered to measure students' writing performance after the intervention.

All research activities were conducted under the supervision of the English teacher. Clear instructions, task guidelines, and time allocations provided to ensure consistency throughout the research process.

C. Population And Research Sample

The population of this study consists of tenth-grade students of Vocational High School X Samarinda.

The sample was selected using purposive sampling, Rival and Mangarin, (2025). This sampling technique is employed because the researcher intentionally selects classes that meet the research requirements and are accessible for the implementation of the treatment. The sample consists of two classes with a total of approximately 60 students.

One class served as the experimental group and receives instruction supported by ChatGPT, while the other class served as the control group and received conventional writing instruction. All students in the selected classes would participate in the study. The use of intact classes is considered appropriate for quasi-experimental research because it allows the researcher to investigate the effect of the treatment in a natural classroom setting.

D. Data Collection Technique and Instrument

The primary instrument used in this study is a writing test. The writing test is designed to measure students' writing performance before and after the implementation of ChatGPT.

Data collection was conducted through two stages, namely the pre-test and the post-test. The pre-test is administered at the beginning of the study to identify students' initial writing performance. Meanwhile, the post-test is administered after the treatment to determine whether there is any improvement in students' writing performance(Nabila Ayu Amanda, 2025).

Students are required to complete a writing task based on a given topic. Their writing then evaluated using Brown's writing assessment rubric covering content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.

1. Data collection process in the experimental class

   The data collection process in the experimental class was conducted over five meetings. During the first meeting, students were administered a pre-test to measure their initial writing performance before receiving any treatment. The pre-test required students to complete a writing task

based on a given topic. The results of the pre-test served as baseline data for comparison with the post-test scores.

During the second meeting, students were introduced to ChatGPT as a writing assistance tool. The researcher explained the purpose of using ChatGPT and demonstrated how students could utilize the platform to support their writing process. Students were then given a writing topic and encouraged to use ChatGPT to generate ideas, develop content, and organize their writing. Throughout the activity, students were reminded to use ChatGPT as a supporting tool rather than directly copying the generated responses.

The third meeting focused on the development and revision of students' writing. Students continued working on their writing tasks while using ChatGPT to obtain suggestions regarding vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure, and mechanics. The researcher monitored the learning process and provided guidance when necessary. Students were encouraged to evaluate the suggestions critically before incorporating them into their writing.

On the fourth meeting, students participated in the final treatment session. They were assigned another writing task and continued using ChatGPT as a learning support tool throughout the writing process. Students applied the feedback and suggestions provided by ChatGPT to improve the content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics of their writing. The researcher observedd the learning activities and ensured that students used ChatGPT appropriately to support their own writing rather than simply copying the generated responses.

During the fifth meeting, students were administered a post-test to measure their writing performance after receiving the treatment. The post-test required students to complete a writing task under the same assessment criteria as the pre-test. The results of the post-test were used to determine the immediate effect of using ChatGPT on students' writing performance.

2. Data collection process in the control class

The data collection process in the control class was also conducted over five meetings. During the first meeting, students were administered a pre-test to determine their initial writing performance before the implementation of the treatment. The pre-test consisted of a writing task similar to that administered in the experimental class.

During the second meeting, students received conventional writing instruction without the use of ChatGPT. The teacher explained the writing topic, provided examples, and guided students through brainstorming activities to generate ideas for their writing. Students then began developing their writing based on the teacher's explanation and classroom materials.

The third meeting focused on drafting and revising the students' writing through traditional learning methods. Students received feedback and guidance from the teacher regarding content development, organization, vocabulary usage, grammar, and mechanics. They were then asked to revise their writing based on the feedback provided.

On The fourth meeting, students participated in the final conventional writing session. They completed another writing task using the knowledge and feedback provided by the teacher in the previous meetings. The teacher continued to guide students in developing their ideas, organizing their writing, and improving their vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Students revised their work based on the teacher's feedback without the assistance of ChatGPT or other artificial intelligence tools.

During the fifth meeting, students completed a post-test to assess their writing performance after receiving conventional instruction. The post-test was administered using the same assessment criteria as the pre-test and the experimental group. The post-test results were then compared with those of the experimental group to determine whether

the use of ChatGPT had a significant effect on students' writing performance.

The treatment was conducted in three meetings, with each meeting lasting two hours. Although the treatment consisted of only three meetings, the duration of each meeting provided sufficient instructional time for the students received the learning materials, practice writing, and apply ChatGPT in the writing activities. Therefore, the number of treatment sessions was determined based not only on the number of meetings but also on the duration and activities conducted in each session.

E. Validity and Reliability of Instrument

Validity refers to the extent to which an instrument accurately measures what it is intended to measure. In this study, content validity was employed to ensure that the writing test appropriately measured students' writing performance.

The validity of the instrument was established through expert judgment. The writing test and scoring rubric were reviewed by an English teacher at Vocational High School X Samarinda to determine whether the test content, instructions, and assessment criteria were aligned with the research objectives and the aspects of writing performance being measured. The teacher evaluated the relevance, clarity, and appropriateness of the instrument before it was administered to the participants. Based on the teacher's suggestions and recommendations, necessary revisions were made to improve the quality of the instrument.

Reliability refers to the consistency of an instrument in measuring a particular construct. In this study, the reliability of the writing scores was ensured through the use of a standardized writing assessment rubric adapted from Brown. The rubric consisted of five assessment components: content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.

To maintain scoring consistency, all students' writing tests were assessed using the same rubric and scoring criteria. This procedure helped ensure that the measurement of students' writing performance remained consistent throughout the research process.

F. Data Analysis Technique

The data collected from the pre-test and post-test were analysed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The analysis was conducted to determine whether there was a significant immediate effect of using ChatGPT on students' writing performance.

Table 2 Assessment Rubric

Aspect	**Level**	**Score Range**	**Criteria**
Content (30%)	Excellent – Very Good	27–30	Ideas are relevant, clear, and well developed according to the topic.
	Good – Average	22–26	Ideas are mostly relevant but lack detail.
	Fair – Poor	17–21	Limited development of ideas; some irrelevant parts.
	Very Poor	13–16	Ideas are unclear and mostly irrelevant.

Organization (20%)	Excellent – Very Good	18–20	Well organized, logical sequence, coherent paragraphs.
	Good – Average	14–17	Generally organized but some ideas not well connected.
	Fair – Poor	10–13	Poor organization; ideas confused.
	Very Poor	7–9	No clear organization.
Vocabulary (20%)	Excellent – Very Good	18–20	Appropriate and varied vocabulary; meaning clear.
	Good – Average	14–17	Some errors but meaning understandable.
	Fair – Poor	10–13	Frequent vocabulary errors; meaning sometimes unclear.

	Very Poor	7–9	Very limited vocabulary; meaning unclear.
Grammar (20%)	Excellent – Very Good	18–20	Few grammatical errors; sentences mostly correct.
	Good – Average	14–17	Some grammatical errors but do not hinder meaning.
	Fair – Poor	10–13	Frequent grammatical errors.
	Very Poor	7–9	Dominant grammatical errors; difficult to understand.
Mechanics (10%)	Excellent – Very Good	9–10	Correct spelling, punctuation, capitalization.
	Good – Average	7–8	Minor errors in mechanics.
	Fair – Poor	5–6	Frequent errors in mechanics.
	Very Poor	3–4	Serious errors in mechanics.

After collecting the data, the researcher proceeds with the data analysist. First, the data are being calculated using Microsoft Excel, then using SPSS the data analyzed with a significance level set at 0.05. The steps are detailed below:

1. **Normality Test**

   The normality test is conducted to determine whether the data are normally distributed. This test is important because parametric statistical tests, such as the paired samples t-test and independent samples t-test, require the data to follow a normal distribution.

   In this study, the normality test is performed using the Shapiro-Wilk test through SPSS. The decision is based on the significance value (Sig.). If the significance value is greater than 0.05 (Sig. > 0.05), the data are considered normally distributed. Conversely, if the significance value is less than 0.05 (Sig. < 0.05), the data are considered not normally distributed.

2. **Descriptive Statistics**

   Descriptive statistics are used to provide a general description of students' writing performance before and after the treatment. This analysis summarizes the data without making conclusions about the population.

   The descriptive statistics in this study include the minimum score, maximum score, mean score, and standard deviation. The mean score indicates the average performance of the students, while the standard deviation shows the variability of the scores around the mean.

   Through descriptive statistics, the researcher can compare the overall performance of the experimental and control groups in both the pre-test and post-test.

3. **Homogeneity Test**

   The homogeneity test is conducted to determine whether the variances of the experimental group and control group are equal. Homogeneous variance is one of the assumptions required for conducting an independent samples t-test.

   In this study, homogeneity is tested using Levene’s Test in SPSS. The decision is based on the significance value. If the significance value is

greater than 0.05 (Sig. > 0.05), the variances of the two groups are considered homogeneous. However, if the significance value is less than 0.05 (Sig. < 0.05), the variances are considered heterogeneous.

4. Paired Samples t-Test

The paired samples t-test is used to determine whether there is a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores within the same group. This test measures the effect of the treatment by comparing students' performance before and after the intervention.

In this study, the paired samples t-test is applied separately to the experimental group and the control group. The test compares the mean scores of the pre-test and post-test to identify whether a significant improvement occurs.

The decision is based on the significance value (Sig. 2-tailed). If the significance value is less than 0.05 (Sig. < 0.05), there is a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores. If the significance value is greater than 0.05 (Sig. > 0.05), there is no significant difference between the two sets of scores.

5. Independent Samples t-Test

The independent samples t-test is used to determine whether there is a significant difference between the post-test scores of the experimental group and the control group. This test is appropriate because the two groups consist of different participants.

In this study, the independent samples t-test is conducted after the assumptions of normality and homogeneity have been satisfied. The test compares the mean post-test scores of students who received instruction supported by ChatGPT and those who received conventional instruction.

The decision is based on the significance value (Sig. 2-tailed). If the significance value is less than 0.05 (Sig. < 0.05), there is a small difference between the two groups. If the significance value is greater than 0.05 (Sig. > 0.05), there is no significant difference between the group.

CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Research Findings

1. Data Description

This section describes the data obtained from the students who participated in the study. It aims to provide an overview of the students' writing performance before and after the implementation of the treatment. The data are presented in the form of pre-test and post-test scores from both the experimental and control groups to facilitate comparison of students' writing performance throughout the study.

a. Data of Experimental Class

In this study, the experimental group consisted of 36 students who received ChatGPT-assisted instruction during the treatment period. Students completed a pre-test prior to the treatment and a post-test after the intervention to measure changes in their writing performance. The results of the data analysis for the experimental group are presented below :

Table 4 1 The Pre-Test and Post-Test of Experiment Class

Student Number	Score	
	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1	78	78
2	66	65
3	78	79
4	85	87
5	77	80
6	69	70
7	84	85
8	70	74
9	77	77

10	59	60
11	76	75
12	66	68
13	72	76
14	72	77
15	93	93
16	75	74
17	71	76
18	76	78
19	81	81
20	69	74
21	80	80
22	75	78
23	80	83
24	93	93
25	67	74
26	80	80
27	65	67
28	56	63
29	81	81
30	72	63
31	76	81
32	73	70
Maximum	93	93
Minimum	56	60
Mean	74,75	76,25

Based on Table 4.1, which presents the pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental group, the pre-test scores ranged from a minimum score of 56 to a maximum score of 93. Following the

implementation of ChatGPT-assisted instruction, the post-test scores ranged from 60 to 93. The mean score increased from 74.75 in the pre-test to 76.25 in the post-test. This increase indicates that the students' writing performance improved after receiving the treatment, suggesting that ChatGPT-assisted instruction had a slight immediate effect on their writing performance.

b. Data of Control Class

The control group consisted of 30 students who participated in this study. Similar to the experimental group, data were collected through the administration of a pre-test and a post-test to measure students' writing performance before and after the instructional period. After the data from the control group were analyzed, the following results were presented below:

Table 4 2 The Pre-Test and Post-Test of Control Class

Student Number	Score	
	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1	68	71
2	80	81
3	79	80
4	81	81
5	63	65
6	68	71
7	84	84
8	70	74
9	72	76
10	90	86
11	51	56
12	78	77

13	66	67
14	67	67
15	64	65
16	78	75
17	75	75
18	53	55
19	69	71
20	81	77
21	92	89
22	94	93
23	70	71
24	69	73
25	68	68
26	72	72
27	70	72
28	75	73
29	73	68
30	85	72
Maximum	94	93
Minimum	51	55
Mean	73,5	73,5

Table 4.2 presents the pre-test and post-test scores of the control group, which consisted of 30 students. These data were collected to examine students' writing performance before and after receiving conventional writing instruction without the use of ChatGPT-assisted instruction. Based on the table, the pre-test scores ranged from a minimum of 51 to a maximum of 94, while the post-test scores ranged from 55 to 93. The mean score remained the same at 73.50 for both the pre-test and post-test.

These findings indicate that there was no overall improvement in the average writing performance of the control group after receiving conventional instruction.

In the experimental group, the mean score increased from 74.75 in the pre-test to 76.25 in the post-test, resulting in a gain score of 1.50. This finding indicates that students' writing performance improved after receiving ChatGPT-assisted instruction. In contrast, the control group obtained the same mean score of 73.50 in both the pre-test and post-test, resulting in a gain score of 0.00. This suggests that there was no overall improvement in the average writing performance of students who received conventional instruction.

Overall, the experimental group demonstrated a greater improvement in writing performance than the control group. Although the increase in the experimental group's mean score was relatively modest, the difference in gain scores suggests that students who received ChatGPT-assisted instruction showed better progress than those who received conventional instruction. The statistical significance of this difference is further examined through the hypothesis testing presented in the following section.

2. Normality Test

A normality test was conducted to determine whether the data were normally distributed before proceeding with further statistical analyses. The analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 29. The data were considered to have a normal distribution if the significance value (Sig.) was greater than 0.05. The results of the normality test are presented in the following table.

Table 4 3 Test of Normality

Tests of Normality

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Kelas	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Hasil	Pretest A (Kontrol)	.103	30	.200*	.969	30	.518
	Posttest A (Kontrol)	.116	30	.200*	.969	30	.519
	Pretest B (Eksperimen)	.098	32	.200*	.976	32	.686
	Posttest B (Eksperimen)	.138	32	.129	.969	32	.463

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Double-clic

Based on Table 4.3, the results of the normality test show that the pre-test and post-test data for both the experimental and control groups are normally distributed. This is indicated by the significance values obtained from the Shapiro-Wilk test, all of which are greater than 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that the data meet the assumption of normality and are appropriate for further parametric statistical analysis.

3. Homogeneity Test

A homogeneity test was conducted to determine whether the variances of the experimental and control groups were equal before performing further statistical analyses. In this study, Levene's Test of Equality of Variances was used to examine the homogeneity of the data. The data were considered homogeneous when the significance value (Sig.) was greater than 0.05. The results of the homogeneity test are presented in the following table.

Table 4 4 Test of Homogeneity

Tests of Homogeneity of Variances

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.[a]
Hasil	Based on Mean	.708	3	120	.549
	Based on Median	.599	3	120	.617
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.599	3	116.143	.617
	Based on trimmed mean	.719	3	120	.542

a. Confidence Interval: 0%

Based on Table 4.4, the results of Levene's Test of Equality of Variances show that the significance value is 0.549, which is greater than 0.05. This indicates that the variances of the experimental and control groups are homogeneous. Therefore, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was satisfied, and the data were considered appropriate for further parametric statistical analysis.

4. Hypothesis Test

Hypothesis testing was conducted to examine the immediate effect of ChatGPT-assisted instruction on students' writing performance. After the data were confirmed to be normally distributed and homogeneous, a paired samples t-test was performed to determine whether there was a statistically difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental group.

Table 4 5 Paired Samples Statistics

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	PRE TEST	74.7500	32	8.21093	1.45150
	POST TEST	76.2500	32	7.87401	1.39194
Pair 2	PRE TEST	73.5000	30	10.00948	1.82747
	POST TEST	73.5000	30	8.40259	1.53410

The experimental group showed an increase in the mean score from 74.75 on the pre-test to 76.25 on the post-test, with a mean difference of 1.50 points. Meanwhile, the control group maintained the same mean score of 73.50 in both the pre-test and post-test, resulting in no difference between the two tests.

Table 4 6 Paired Sample Test

Paired Samples Test

Paired Differences							Significance	
			95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					
Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	One-Sided p	Two-Sided p
-1.50000	3.10047	.54809	-2.61784	-.38216	-2.737	31	.005	.010
.00000	3.53309	.64505	-1.31928	1.31928	.000	29	.500	1.000

Based on the paired samples t-test, the experimental group obtained a value (Sig. 2-tailed) of 0.010, while the control group obtained a significance value of 1.000. The results indicate that the pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental group differed after the treatment, whereas the scores of the control group remained relatively unchanged following conventional instruction.

Table 4 7 Group Statistics

Group Statistics

	Kelas	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Hasil	posttest	30	73.5000	8.40259	1.53410
	postest	32	76.2500	7.87401	1.39194

Table 4.7 presents the descriptive statistics of the post-test scores for the experimental and control groups. The experimental group consisted of 32 students with a mean score of 76.25, while the control group consisted of 30 students with a mean score of 73.50. These statistics provide an overview of the post-test performance of both groups before the Independent Samples t-test was conducted.

5. Effect Size Test

To determine the magnitude of the effect of ChatGPT-assisted instruction on students' writing performance, the effect size was calculated using Cohen's *d*. Cohen's *d* was computed based on the post-test mean scores and the pooled standard deviation of the experimental and control

groups. The interpretation of Cohen's *d* followed Cohen's (1988) criteria, where values of 0.20, 0.50, and 0.80 indicate small, medium, and large effects, respectively.

Table 4 8 The Effect Size Test

Control N	30	Experimental N	32
Control Mean	73,5	Experimental Mean	76,25
Control SD	8,40259	Experimental SD	7,87401
Pooled SD	8,133780466		
Cohen's d	0,338096167		
Interpretation	Small		

Based on Table 4.8, the calculated Cohen's *d* value was 0.34. According to Cohen's (1988) interpretation, this value is categorized as a small effect. This finding indicates that the difference in post-test writing performance between the experimental and control groups was relatively small.

B. Discussion

The present study was conducted to examine the immediate effect of ChatGPT-assisted instruction on students' writing performance at Vocational High School X Samarinda. Based on the findings, the experimental group showed an increase in the mean score from 74.75 in the pre-test to 76.25 in the post-test after receiving ChatGPT-assisted instruction. Meanwhile, the control group obtained the same mean score of 73.50 in both the pre-test and post-test after receiving conventional instruction. These findings indicate that students in the experimental group demonstrated better post-test performance than before the treatment, whereas the control group showed relatively stable results.

The paired samples t-test also showed a difference between the pre-test and post-test scores in the experimental group, with a significance value of 0.010. In contrast, the control group obtained a significance value of 1.000, indicating relatively unchanged scores between the two tests. However, the Independent Samples t-test produced a significance value of

0.188, indicating that the difference in post-test scores between the experimental and control groups was not statistically significant. Furthermore, the effect size analysis using Cohen's d resulted in a value of 0.34, which is categorized as a small effect. These findings suggest that although students who received ChatGPT-assisted instruction demonstrated improvement, the magnitude of the difference between the two groups remained relatively small.

The findings of this study are partially consistent with the previous research conducted by Roisah, Widyaningsih and Sedya Purwananti, (2024), which reported that students who used ChatGPT achieved higher writing scores than those who learned through conventional instruction. Their study also found that ChatGPT contributed to improvements in students' writing ability following the treatment. However, the findings of the present study differ in terms of the magnitude of the results. While the previous study reported a statistically significant impact of ChatGPT on students' writing ability, the present study found only a relatively small effect on students' writing performance.

Several factors may explain these differences. First, the participants in the previous study were eleventh-grade students of a senior high school, whereas the present study involved vocational high school students at Vocational High School X Samarinda. Second, the treatment procedures and learning context were different. The present study focused on examining the immediate effect of ChatGPT-assisted instruction through a limited number of instructional sessions, which may have provided less time for students to fully develop their writing skills. In addition, writing performance is influenced by various factors, including students' grammar, vocabulary, organization, and writing mechanics, which generally require continuous practice rather than short-term intervention.

During the implementation of ChatGPT-assisted instruction, students used ChatGPT to generate ideas, improve vocabulary, revise sentence structures, identify grammatical errors, and review the mechanics

of their writing. The immediate feedback provided by ChatGPT enabled students to revise their work more efficiently during the writing process. Nevertheless, the relatively small effect size indicates that the use of ChatGPT alone may not be sufficient to produce substantial improvements in students' writing performance within a short period of instruction. Therefore, ChatGPT may be viewed as a learning support tool that complements classroom instruction rather than replacing the role of the teacher in developing students' writing skills.

The findings of the present study suggest that ChatGPT-assisted instruction has the potential to support students during the writing process by providing immediate and context-sensitive feedback. Throughout the treatment sessions, students used ChatGPT to generate ideas, improve vocabulary, revise sentence structures, identify grammatical errors, and review the mechanics of their writing. These features enabled students received feedback instantly and revise their work during the learning process. Although the experimental group obtained a higher post-test mean score than the control group, the effect size was categorized as small, indicating that the difference between the two groups was relatively limited. These findings suggest that ChatGPT may function as a supplementary learning tool that supports students' writing development while still requiring guidance from the teacher throughout the writing process.

The comparison between the experimental and control groups also highlights the role of instructional design in supporting students' writing performance. During the treatment, students in the experimental group received ChatGPT-assisted instruction, which provided immediate feedback and suggestions for idea development, vocabulary use, grammar, sentence structure, and writing mechanics. In contrast, students in the control group received conventional writing instruction through teacher guidance and classroom activities. Although the experimental group obtained a higher post-test mean score than the control group, the difference between the two groups remained relatively small. These findings suggest that ChatGPT can

served as a supportive learning tool during the writing process by providing timely feedback and opportunities for revision. However, its use should complement classroom instruction and teacher guidance rather than replace them entirely.

Therefore, the findings indicate that ChatGPT may be used as a complementary instructional tool to facilitate students' writing practice, particularly by supporting the drafting and revision processes, while the teacher continues to play an important role in guiding students' learning.

From a broader perspective, the findings of this study support the theoretical framework that underlies ChatGPT-assisted instruction in writing activities. During the treatment sessions, ChatGPT provided immediate feedback that enabled students to identify weaknesses in their drafts and make revisions while they were still engaged in the writing process. Through this revision process, students had opportunities to improve several aspects of their writing, including content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Although the difference between the experimental and control groups was relatively small, the improvement observed in the experimental group's post-test scores suggests that immediate feedback and revision may contribute to students' writing performance. Therefore, ChatGPT may be integrated as a complementary instructional tool to support writing activities while teacher guidance remains essential throughout the learning process.

The present study was conducted at Vocational High School X Samarinda and focused on examining the immediate effect of ChatGPT-assisted instruction on students' writing performance after three treatment sessions. Therefore, the findings of this study are limited to the context, participants, and duration of the intervention. Future research may investigate the use of ChatGPT-assisted instruction over a longer period to examine its long-term effects on students' writing performance. In addition, further studies could explore the implementation of ChatGPT in different writing genres or educational settings and examine its influence on each

aspect of writing performance, including content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Such research may provide a broader understanding of how ChatGPT can be integrated into English writing instruction.

Based on the discussion, the findings of this study suggest that ChatGPT-assisted instruction has the potential to support students' writing performance by providing immediate feedback throughout the writing process. The feedback enabled students to revise their drafts by improving aspects such as content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Although the experimental group demonstrated a higher post-test mean score than the control group, the difference between the two groups was relatively small. Therefore, ChatGPT may be considered a complementary instructional tool that supports writing activities alongside teacher guidance rather than replacing conventional classroom instruction. Furthermore, the integration of ChatGPT into English language learning should encourage students to use artificial intelligence critically and responsibly while continuing to develop their own writing abilities through practice and revision

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

This study was conducted to investigate the immediate effect of ChatGPT-assisted instruction on students' writing performance at Vocational High School X Samarinda. The study employed a quasi-experimental design involving an experimental group that received ChatGPT-assisted instruction and a control group that received conventional writing instruction. Students' writing performance was assessed based on five aspects, namely content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.

The findings showed that the experimental group demonstrated an improvement in writing performance after receiving ChatGPT-assisted instruction. The mean score increased from 74.75 in the pre-test to 76.25 in the post-test. In comparison, the control group obtained the same mean score of 73.50 in both the pre-test and post-test. The paired samples t-test also indicated a difference between the pre-test and post-test scores in the experimental group. However, the Independent Samples t-test produced a significance value of 0.188, indicating that the difference in post-test scores between the experimental and control groups was not statistically significant. Furthermore, the effect size analysis resulted in a Cohen's d value of 0.34, which is categorized as a small effect.

Based on these findings, it can be concluded that ChatGPT-assisted instruction has the potential to support students' writing performance by providing immediate feedback throughout the writing process. The immediate feedback enabled students to review and revise their writing by improving aspects such as content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Although the improvement observed in the experimental group was slightly higher than that of the control group, the difference between the two groups remained relatively small. Therefore, the findings suggest that ChatGPT may served as a complementary instructional tool to support

writing activities alongside teacher guidance rather than as a replacement for conventional classroom instruction.

Taken everything that has been written as above, this study contributes to the growing body of research on the integration of artificial intelligence in English language learning, particularly in vocational high school settings. It also provides empirical evidence regarding the immediate effect of ChatGPT-assisted instruction on students' writing performance at Vocational High School X Samarinda.

B. Suggestion

Based on the findings and conclusion of this study, the researcher would like to offer the following suggestions.

1. For Students

   Students are encouraged to use ChatGPT as a supplementary learning tool to support their writing activities. The immediate feedback provided by ChatGPT may help students generate ideas, improve vocabulary, identify grammatical errors, and revise their writing. However, students should evaluate the suggestions critically and continue developing their writing skills through regular practice rather than relying entirely on AI-generated responses.

2. For English Teachers

   English teachers may consider integrating ChatGPT-assisted instruction into writing activities as an additional learning resource. ChatGPT can be used to facilitate the drafting and revision processes by providing immediate feedback on students' writing. Nevertheless, teacher guidance remains essential to ensure that students understand the writing process, develop critical thinking skills, and produce original written work.

3. For Future Researchers

   Future researchers are encouraged to conduct similar studies with larger sample sizes, longer treatment periods, or different educational

settings to obtain a broader understanding of the effect of ChatGPT-assisted instruction on students' writing performance. Further studies may also investigate the use of ChatGPT in different writing genres or examine its influence on specific aspects of writing performance, including content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. In addition, future research may explore how different instructional strategies or longer implementation periods influence the effectiveness of ChatGPT-assisted instruction in English language learning.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alharbi, W. (2023) "AI in the Foreign Language Classroom: A Pedagogical Overview of Automated Writing Assistance Tools," *Education Research International*, 2023. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/4253331.

Al-Mubireek, S. and Arruri, R. (2025) "Exploring the Development of English Language Writing Skills at the Tertiary Level," *Journal of Posthumanism*, 5(2). Available at: https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v5i2.491.

Amini, F. and Susanti, A. (2024) "Chat GPT: Enhancing Students' Writing Skills for EFL Students in Descriptive Text," *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH AND INNOVATION IN SOCIAL SCIENCE (IJRISS)* [Preprint]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.

Bašić, Ž. *et al.* (2023) "ChatGPT-3.5 as writing assistance in students' essays," *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1). Available at: https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02269-7.

Chen, I.H. *et al.* (2022) "Evaluating the immediate and delayed effects of psychological need thwarting of online teaching on Chinese primary and middle school teachers' psychological well-being," *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.943449.

Fardian, D. *et al.* (2025) "Integrating Chat-GPT in the Classroom: A Study on Linear Algebra Learning in Higher Education," *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 15(4), pp. 732–751. Available at: https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2025.15.4.2279.

Holmes, W. and Tuomi, I. (2022) "State of the art and practice in AI in education," *European Journal of Education*, 57(4), pp. 542–570. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12533.

Nabila Ayu Amanda (2025) *THE EFFECT OF USING CHATGPT ON STUDENTS' WRITING OF DESCRIPTIVE TEXT (A Quasi-experimental Study at SMA Triguna Utama)*.

Puteri, C.G. *et al.* (2025) "Using ChatGPT as a writing assistant: A study on essay quality development among Indonesian EFL University Students," *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(2), pp. 332–346. Available at: https://doi.org/10.17509/3ebmy158.

Rival, D.M. and Mangarin, J.M. (2025) "A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF PUNCTUATION AND CAPITALIZATION ERRORS IN FACEBOOK POST OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS," *GUILD OF EDUCATORS IN TESOL INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL*, 3(1), p. 36. Available at: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15030518.

Roisah, S., Widyaningsih, T.L. and Sedya Purwananti, Y. (2024) "The Impact Of Chatgpt Use On Efl Students' Writing Ability," *Concept: Journal of Social Humanities and Education*, 3(3), pp. 191–199. Available at: https://doi.org/10.55606/concept.v3i2.1403.

Shi, H. *et al.* (2025a) "Comparing the effects of ChatGPT and automated writing evaluation on students' writing and ideal L2 writing self," *Computer Assisted Language Learning* [Preprint]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2025.2454541.

Shi, H. *et al.* (2025b) "Comparing the effects of ChatGPT and automated writing evaluation on students' writing and ideal L2 writing self," *Computer Assisted Language Learning* [Preprint]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2025.2454541.

Shi, H. and Aryadoust, V. (2024) "A systematic review of AI-based automated written feedback research," *ReCALL*, 36(2), pp. 187–209. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344023000265.

Sociedad, U.Y. and Abdulla, K. (2025) “Exploratory study in students on mechanics of writing,” 17(1). Available at: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0623-9875.

Sophia Gaikwad *et al.* (2023) “International Journal of Learning, Teaching And Educational Research.”

Sudrajad, W. *et al.* (2024) *Productivity and Creativity in English Academic Writing?*, *EDUCATUM: Scientific Journal of Education*.

Wang, K., Zhang, L.J. and Cooper, M. (2025) “Metacognitive Instruction for Improving the Effectiveness of Collaborative Writing for EFL Learners’ Writing Development,” *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 34(2), pp. 661–673. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-024-00886-7.

Yan, L. *et al.* (2024) “Practical and ethical challenges of large language models in education: A systematic scoping review,” *British Journal of Educational Technology*. John Wiley and Sons Inc, pp. 90–112. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13370.

Yang, C., Li, R. and Yang, L. (2025) “Revisiting Trends in GenAI-Assisted Second Language Writing: Retrospect and Prospect,” *Journal of Educational Computing Research*. SAGE Publications Inc., pp. 1819–1863. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/07356331251367309.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1
Research Instrument

A. Pre Test

Name :
Class :
Date :

A. Look and Discuss

Look at the following picture.



Let's learn a little bit more about this job. In groups of three, discuss and write things about Fire-fighter that you already know.

Write at least 5 things.

What we know about Fire-fighter:

Write things you want to know about this job.

What we want to know about Fire-fighter:

Writing Test Instructions

Objective:
To measure students' initial writing performance before receiving the ChatGPT assisted learning treatment.

Instructions:

1. Read the task carefully.
2. Write 5 descriptive sentence of what you know about Fire Fighter.
3. Write 5 descriptive sentence of what you don't know about Fire Fighter

4. Pay attention to content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.
5. Do not use dictionaries, AI tools, or other learning resources.
6. Time allocation: 45 minutes.

B. Post Test

Name :
Class :
Date :

A. Look and Discuss

Look at the following picture.



Let's learn a little bit more about this job. In groups of three, discuss and write things about Mechanics that you already know.

Write at least 5 things.

What we know about Mechanics:

Write things you want to know about this job.

What we want to know about Mechanics:

Writing Test Instructions

Objective:
To measure students' initial writing performance before receiving the ChatGPT assisted learning treatment.

Instructions:

1. Read the task carefully.

2. Write 5 descriptive sentence of what you know about Mechanics.
3. Write 5 descriptive sentence of what you don't know about Mechanics
4. Pay attention to content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.
5. Do not use dictionaries, AI tools, or other learning resources.
6. Time allocation: 45 minutes.

C. Rubric Scoring

Aspect	Level	Score Range	Criteria
Content (30%)	Excellent – Very Good	27–30	Ideas are relevant, clear, and well developed according to the topic.
	Good – Average	22–26	Ideas are mostly relevant but lack detail.
	Fair – Poor	17–21	Limited development of ideas; some irrelevant parts.
	Very Poor	13–16	Ideas are unclear and mostly irrelevant.
Organization (20%)	Excellent – Very Good	18–20	Well organized, logical sequence, coherent paragraphs.
	Good – Average	14–17	Generally organized but some ideas not well connected.
	Fair – Poor	10–13	Poor organization; ideas confused.
	Very Poor	7–9	No clear organization.
Vocabulary (20%)	Excellent – Very Good	18–20	Appropriate and varied vocabulary; meaning clear.
	Good – Average	14–17	Some errors but meaning understandable.
	Fair – Poor	10–13	Frequent vocabulary errors; meaning sometimes unclear.
	Very Poor	7–9	Very limited vocabulary; meaning unclear.
Grammar (20%)	Excellent – Very Good	18–20	Few grammatical errors; sentences mostly correct.
	Good – Average	14–17	Some grammatical errors but do not hinder meaning.
	Fair – Poor	10–13	Frequent grammatical errors.
	Very Poor	7–9	Dominant grammatical errors; difficult to understand.

Mechanics (10%)	Excellent – Very Good	9–10	Correct spelling, punctuation, capitalization.
	Good – Average	7–8	Minor errors in mechanics.
	Fair – Poor	5–6	Frequent errors in mechanics.
	Very Poor	3–4	Serious errors in mechanics.

Appendix 2

Lesson Plan

MODUL AJAR

PEMBELAJARAN MENDALAM (DEEP LEARNING)

KURIKULUM MERDEKA

Satuan Pendidikan	: Vocational High School Samarinda
Mata Pelajaran	: Bahasa Inggris
Fase/Kelas/Semester	: E / X (Sepuluh) / Gasal
Materi	: Descriptive Writing
Model Pembelajaran	: Project Based Learning (PjBL)
Alokasi Waktu	: 2 x 45 menit (2 JP)

1. Identifikasi Peserta Didik

a. Latar Belakang

Peserta didik berasal dari kelas X Kejuruan, yang sudah memiliki pengetahuan dasar tentang tenses dan familiar dengan kosakata verb1. Namun, meningkatkan kemampuan menulis, terutama pada aspek content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, dan mechanics.

b. Kebutuhan Belajar

Peserta didik perlu lebih memahami struktur descriptive writing, memiliki cukup banyak vocabulary untuk descriptive writing, mampu menyusun kalimat, serta memahami mekanik penulisan descriptive writing.

c. Gaya Belajar

Peserta didik kelas X Kejuruan memiliki gaya belajar yang beraneka ragam (kinestetik, visual - spasial, dan interpersonal) sehingga pembelajaran efektif dilakukan melalui simulasi, gamifikasi, dan praktik langsung. Selain itu, mereka juga menyukai kegiatan menyenangkan seperti soal berbasis game.

d.Tantangan

Peserta didik menghadapi tantangan berupa kurang percaya diri dalam berbicara maupun menuliskan kalimat menggunakan Bahasa inggris.

e.Potensi/Kekuatan

Peserta didik menunjukan semangat dan antusias ketika Pelajaran berbasis praktik dan gamifikasi.

2. Identifikasi Mata Pelajaran

descriptive writing is used to menjabarkan seseorang, sebuah tempat, hewan, objek, atau kegiatan secara rinci agar siapapun yang membaca bisa membayangkan atau mengerti.

Positive Vocabulary

Helpful, Responsible, Hardworking, Skilled, Professional, Patient, Creative, Friendly, Reliable, Organized, Careful, Dedicated, Knowledgeable, Honest, Efficient, Confident, Innovative, Supportive, Experienced and Successful.

Negative Vocabulary

Tiring, Stressful, Difficult, Dangerous, Challenging, Repetitive, Noisy, Busy, Demanding, Risky, Exhausting, Dirty, Time consuming, Complicated, Boring, Unpredictable, Pressured, Strict, Crowded and Competitive

secara singkat materi descriptive writing mencakup pengetahuan faktual tentang cara mendeskripsikan orang, tempat, benda, atau hewan menggunakan vocabulary dan kosakata yang sesuai. Materi ini mendorong siswa untuk berpikir kritis dan lebih ikut andil dalam pembelajaran.

3. Dimensi Profil Pelajar Pancasila

- ☐ Keimanan dan ketakwaan terhadap Tuhan YME
- ☐ Kewargaan
- ✓ Penalaran kritis
- ✓ Kreativitas
- ☐ Kolaborasi
- ✓ Kemandirian
- ☐ Kesehatan

✓ Komunikasi

4. Capaian Pembelajaran

Membaca–Memirsa: peserta didik membaca dan merespon berbagai macam teks seperti narasi, deskripsi, prosedur, eksposisi, recount, dan report. Mereka membaca untuk mempelajari sesuatu atau untuk mendapatkan informasi. Mereka mencari dan mengevaluasi detil spesifik dan inti dari berbagai macam jenis teks. Teks ini dapat berbentuk cetak atau digital, termasuk di antaranya teks visual, multimodal atau interaktif. Pemahaman mereka terhadap ide pokok, isu-isu atau pengembangan plot dalam berbagai macam teks mulai berkembang. Mereka mengidentifikasi tujuan penulis dan mengembangkan keterampilannya untuk melakukan inferensi sederhana dalam memahami informasi tersirat dalam teks.

Menulis – Mempresentasikan: peserta didik menulis berbagai jenis teks fiksi dan non-fiksi, melalui aktivitas yang dipandu, menunjukkan kesadaran peserta didik terhadap tujuan dan target pembaca. Mereka membuat perencanaan, menulis, mengulas dan menulis ulang berbagai jenis tipe teks dengan menunjukkan strategi koreksi diri, termasuk tanda baca dan huruf besar. Mereka menyampaikan ide menggunakan kosakata dan kata kerja umum dalam tulisannya. Mereka menyajikan informasi menggunakan berbagai mode presentasi untuk menyesuaikan dengan pembaca/pemirsa dan untuk mencapai tujuan yang berbeda-beda, dalam bentuk cetak dan digital.

5. Topik Pembelajaran

Descriptive Writing

6. Tujuan Pembelajaran

Peserta didik mampu:

1. Peserta didik mampu mengidentifikasi struktur kalimat descriptive writing

2. Peserta didik mampu menggunakan kosakata/istilah bahasa inggris dalam konteks descriptive.
3. Peserta didik mampu memyusun kalimat descriptive writing menggunakan kosakata yang ditemukan.
4. Peserta didik mampu mempresentasikan descriptive writing susunan mereka kedepan.
5. Peserta didik mampu menjawab pertanyaan dalam game yang berhubungan dengan descriptive writing.

7. Praktik Pedagogis

I. Model: Project Based Learning

II. Pendekatan Deep Learning: *Meaningful* (relevan dengan dunia kerja farmasi), *Mindful* (aktif menulis & menyusun tenses), *Joyful* (tes gamifikasi).

   a. *Meaningful* : Materi dan proyek yang diberikan berkaitan langsung dengan kegiatan di dunia farmasi.
   b. *Mindful* : Peserta didik aktif dalam Pelajaran, baik pengumpulan data, penyusunan simpe present tense, dan presentasi.
   c. *Joyful* : Proses penilaian pemahaman dilakukan dengan menggunakan tes gamifikasi

III. Metode: project-based learning (PjBL) individual dan Gamifikasi

8. Mitra Pembelajaran

Guru pamong.

9. Lingkungan Pembelajaran

I. Ruang fisik: Ruang kelas di VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL SAMARINDA

II. Ruang virtual: Google Classroom sebagai platform untuk kelas daring

WhatsApp sebagai laman untuk berbagi materi dalam bentuk *soft file*

website seperti dan kahoot, Zeb quiz untuk memberikan tes pemahaman siswa dalam bentuk game.

III. Budaya Belajar: Mandiri, aktif berpartisipasi, dan rasa ingin tahu tinggi.

10. Pemanfaatan Digital

I. Perencanaan: Microsoft Office/Google Docs.

II. Pelaksanaan: Kamus daring, google untuk list verb 1.

III. Asesmen: daring melalui aplikasi *Google classroom, kahoot* dan *zep quiz*.

11. Langkah-Langkah Pembelajaran

Pertemuan 1

Awal (Berkesadaran – Bermakna)	Durasi
1. Guru memastikan kelas rapi dan bersih, tidak ada sampah basah dan kering didalam laci maupun dilantai, 2. Guru membuka pembelajaran dengan salam, doa bersama, dan sapaan ramah untuk menciptakan suasana positif serta mengecek kehadiran peserta didik. 3. Guru mengingatkan kembali contract class (perjanjian kelas). 4. Peserta didik dan guru melakukan kilas balik materi dan mengaitkan dengan pembelajaran selanjutnya.	10 menit
5. Guru memulai dengan mengajak peserta didik bersama sama membaca text deskriptif.	10 menit

6. Guru memberi pertanyaan pematik "whats descriptive word that you find?" untuk menstimulasi peserta didik untuk berpikir tentang materi. 7. Peserta didik menyebutkan kata deskiprif yang mereka tau 8. Guru melakukan tanya jawab dengan peserta didik tentang text yang sudah dibaca. "What did you read about?" "What that job do?" 9. Guru menyebutkan tujuan pembelajaran yang akan dicapai dan menghubungkan dengan peserta didik. "Why do we need to learn descriptive writing?" 10. Peserta didik melakukan pre-test secara tertulis.	
Inti (Bermakna – menggembirakan)	Durasi
Memahami 1. Peserta didik berdiskusi, membaca buku paket bahasa inggris mencari apa itu descriptive writing lalu mengaitkannya dengan materi sebelumnya. 2. Guru membimbing peserta didik untuk mengidentifikasi vocabulary positive and negative. mencari penjelasan tentang vocabulary lalu menuliskan beberapa contoh dari vocabulary. a. pertanyaan seputar materi 3. peserta didik diminta untuk mengidentifikasi vocabulary descriptive yang ada di text	15 menit
Mengaplikasikan 1. guru membagi peserta didik menjadi 5 kelompok (masing masing 3 orang) 2. peserta didik menyusun text descriptive writing tentang kegiatan mereka sehari-hari 3. guru membimbing peserta didik menyusun kalimat descriptive mereka dengan berkeliling dan mengecek progress	40 menit

4. peserta didik berdiskusi dengan temannya untuk menyusun kalimat descriptive mereka.	
Merefleksi (Berkesadaran – bermakna) 1. peserta didik maju kedepan mempresentasikan hasil text mereka 2. peserta didik mendapat umpan balik dari teman dan guru 3. Peserta didik membuat jurnal refleksi. 4. Peserta didik dan guru melakukan evaluasi kembali terhadap materi yang sudah didapat. Apakah sudah baik ? Apakah ada yang perlu diperbaiki ?	10 menit
Penutup	**Durasi**
1. Guru dan peserta didik menyimpulkan pembelajaran 2. Guru dan peserta didik merencanakan pembelajaran selanjutnya dan metode belajar yang akan digunakan. 3. Guru memberi pujian dan menghargai belajar peserta didik.	5 menit

Pertemuan 2-4

Awal (Berkesadaran – Bermakna)	Durasi
1. Guru memastikan kelas rapi dan bersih, tidak ada sampah basah dan kering didalam laci maupun dilantai, 2. Guru membuka pembelajaran dengan salam, doa bersama, dan sapaan ramah untuk menciptakan suasana positif serta mengecek kehadiran peserta didik. 3. Guru mengingatkan kembali contract class (perjanjian kelas). 4. Peserta didik dan guru melakukan kilas balik materi dan mengaitkan dengan pembelajaran selanjutnya.	10 menit
5. Guru memulai dengan mengajak peserta didik bersama sama membaca text deskriptif. 6. Guru memberi pertanyaan pematik "whats descriptive word that you find?" untuk menstimulasi peserta didik untuk berpikir tentang materi.	10 menit

7. Peserta didik menyebutkan kata deskiprif yang mereka tau 8. Guru melakukan tanya jawab dengan peserta didik tentang text yang sudah dibaca. "What did you read about?" "What that job do?" 9. Guru menyebutkan tujuan pembelajaran yang akan dicapai dan menghubungkan dengan peserta didik. "Why do we need to learn descriptive writing?"	
Inti (Bermakna – menggembirakan)	Durasi
Memahami 1. Peserta didik berdiskusi, membaca buku paket bahasa inggris mencari apa itu descriptive writing lalu mengaitkannya dengan materi sebelumnya. 2. Guru membimbing peserta didik untuk mengidentifikasi vocabulary positive and negative. mencari penjelasan tentang vocabulary lalu menuliskan beberapa contoh dari vocabulary. b. pertanyaan seputar materi 3. peserta didik diminta untuk mengidentifikasi vocabulary descriptive yang ada di text	15 menit
Mengaplikasikan 4. guru mengingatkan kelompok yang telah disusun minggu sebelumnya 5. peserta didik kembali menyusun text descriptive writing tentang kegiatan mereka sehari-hari 6. guru membimbing peserta didik menyusun kalimat descriptive mereka dengan berkeliling dan mengecek progress 7. peserta didik berdiskusi dengan temannya untuk menyusun kalimat descriptive mereka.	40 menit
Merefleksi (Berkesadaran – bermakna) 8. peserta didik maju kedepan mempresentasikan hasil text mereka	10 menit

9. peserta didik mendapat umpan balik dari teman dan guru 10. Peserta didik membuat jurnal refleksi. 11. Peserta didik dan guru melakukan evaluasi kembali terhadap materi yang sudah didapat. Apakah sudah baik ? Apakah ada yang perlu diperbaiki ?	
Penutup	Durasi
1. Guru dan peserta didik menyimpulkan pembelajaran 2. Guru dan peserta didik merencanakan pembelajaran selanjutnya dan metode belajar yang akan digunakan. 3. Guru memberi pujian dan menghargai belajar peserta didik.	5 menit

Pertemuan 5

Awal (Berkesadaran – Bermakna)	Durasi
1. Guru memastikan kelas rapi dan bersih, tidak ada sampah basah dan kering didalam laci maupun dilantai, 2. Guru membuka pembelajaran dengan salam, doa bersama, dan sapaan ramah untuk menciptakan suasana positif serta mengecek kehadiran peserta didik. 3. Guru mengingatkan kembali contract class (perjanjian kelas). 4. Peserta didik dan guru melakukan kilas balik materi dan mengaitkan dengan pembelajaran selanjutnya.	10 menit
5. Guru memulai dengan mengajak peserta didik bersama sama membaca text deskriptif. 6. Guru memberi pertanyaan pematik "whats descriptive word that you find?" untuk menstimulasi peserta didik untuk berpikir tentang materi. 7. Peserta didik menyebutkan kata deskiprif yang mereka tau 8. Guru melakukan tanya jawab dengan peserta didik tentang text yang sudah dibaca. "What did you read about?"	10 menit

"What that job do?" 9. Guru menyebutkan tujuan pembelajaran yang akan dicapai dan menghubungkan dengan peserta didik. "Why do we need to learn descriptive writing?"	
Inti (Bermakna – menggembirakan)	Durasi
Memahami 1. Peserta didik berdiskusi, membaca buku paket bahasa inggris mencari apa itu descriptive writing lalu mengaitkannya dengan materi sebelumnya. 2. Guru membimbing peserta didik untuk mengidentifikasi vocabulary positive and negative. mencari penjelasan tentang vocabulary lalu menuliskan beberapa contoh dari vocabulary. c. pertanyaan seputar materi 3. peserta didik diminta untuk mengidentifikasi vocabulary descriptive yang ada di text	15 menit
Mengaplikasikan 4. guru mengingatkan kelompok yang telah disusun minggu sebelumnya 5. peserta didik kembali menyusun text descriptive writing tentang kegiatan mereka sehari-hari 6. guru membimbing peserta didik menyusun kalimat descriptive mereka dengan berkeliling dan mengecek progress 7. peserta didik berdiskusi dengan temannya untuk menyusun kalimat descriptive mereka.	40 menit
Merefleksi (Berkesadaran – bermakna) 8. peserta didik maju kedepan mempresentasikan hasil text mereka 9. peserta didik mendapat umpan balik dari teman dan guru 10. Peserta didik membuat jurnal refleksi. 11. Peserta didik dan guru melakukan evaluasi kembali terhadap materi yang sudah didapat.	10 menit

Apakah sudah baik ? Apakah ada yang perlu diperbaiki ? 12. peserta didik melakukan Post-test secara tertulis.	
Penutup	**Durasi**
1. Guru dan peserta didik menyimpulkan pembelajaran 2. Guru dan peserta didik merencanakan pembelajaran selanjutnya dan metode belajar yang akan digunakan. 3. Guru memberi pujian dan menghargai belajar peserta didik.	5 menit

12. Asesmen Pembelajaran

I. Awal: Pre-test tentang pemahaman siswa tentang descriptive writing secara tertulis.

a) Menanyakan sejauh mana pemahaman peserta didik tentang materi yang akan diajar.

II. Proses:

a) Observasi kerja mandiri. Mendampingi proses peserta didik menyusun kalimat Descriptive.

b) Hasil dari penyusunan kalimat Descriptive peserta didik.

I. Akhir:

a) Post-test, secara tertulis.

13. Media & Sumber Belajar

I. Materi descriptive writing dari Google

II. Smartphone

III. Buku cetak : Buku bahasa inggris

14. Rubrik Penilaian.

Aspect	Level	Score Range	Criteria

Content (30%)	Excellent – Very Good	27–30	Ideas are relevant, clear, and well developed according to the topic.
	Good – Average	22–26	Ideas are mostly relevant but lack detail.
	Fair – Poor	17–21	Limited development of ideas; some irrelevant parts.
	Very Poor	13–16	Ideas are unclear and mostly irrelevant.
Organization (20%)	Excellent – Very Good	18–20	Well organized, logical sequence, coherent paragraphs.
	Good – Average	14–17	Generally organized but some ideas not well connected.
	Fair – Poor	10–13	Poor organization; ideas confused.
	Very Poor	7–9	No clear organization.
Vocabulary (20%)	Excellent – Very Good	18–20	Appropriate and varied vocabulary; meaning clear.
	Good – Average	14–17	Some errors but meaning understandable.
	Fair – Poor	10–13	Frequent vocabulary errors; meaning sometimes unclear.
	Very Poor	7–9	Very limited vocabulary; meaning unclear.
Grammar (20%)	Excellent – Very Good	18–20	Few grammatical errors; sentences mostly correct.
	Good – Average	14–17	Some grammatical errors but do not hinder meaning.
	Fair – Poor	10–13	Frequent grammatical errors.
	Very Poor	7–9	Dominant grammatical errors; difficult to understand.
Mechanics (10%)	Excellent – Very Good	9–10	Correct spelling, punctuation, capitalization.
	Good – Average	7–8	Minor errors in mechanics.
	Fair – Poor	5–6	Frequent errors in mechanics.
	Very Poor	3–4	Serious errors in mechanics.

Samarinda, 29 April 2026

Mengetahui

Guru Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris	Peneliti
Guritno Aditya Warman, S.Pd	Amanda Yuliani Auliasari
NI PPPK: 198710102025211040	NPM: 2288203003

Kepala Sekolah

Muhammad Adnan M.Pd

NIP. 196805132000121002

Appendix 3

Documentation



Appendix 4
Research Permit Letter

PEMERINTAH PROVINSI KALIMANTAN TIMUR
DINAS PENDIDIKAN DAN KEBUDAYAAN
SMK NEGERI 6 SAMARINDA
Jalan Batu Cermin RT 05 No. 40, Kel. Sempaja Utara, Kec. Samarinda Utara, Samarinda, Kalimantan Timur 75119
Telepon. (0541) 2522203
Pos-el smkn6smr@yahoo.co.id; Laman https://smkn6samarinda.sch.id;
Instagram @smkn6_samarinda

SURAT KETERANGAN
Nomor : 400.3.8.1/0719.a/SMKN6SMD

Yang bertanda tangan di bawah ini :

Nama	: **Muhammad Adnan, M.Pd.**
NIP	: 197605132000121002
Pangkat/Gol. Ruang	: Penata Tk.I, III/d
Jabatan	: Kepala Sekolah

Dengan ini menerangkan bahwa :

Nama	: **Amanda Yuliani Auliasari**
NPM	: 2288203003
Program Studi	: S1 - Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
Fakultas	: Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan
Perguruan Tinggi	: Widyagama Mahakam Samarinda

Berdasarkan surat nomor 027/UWGM/FKIP-BING/II/2026, perihal: Permohonan Ijin Penelitian, maka dengan ini menerangkan bahwa nama yang tercantum di atas diberikan IZIN untuk menyelesaikan penelitian skripsi dengan judul "The Immidiate Effeet of Using ChatGPT Writing Performance on Students in SMKN 6 Samarinda"..

Demikian surat keterangan ini dibuat untuk dipergunakan sebagaimana mestinya.

Samarinda, 28 April 2026
Kepala Sekolah SMK Negeri 6 Samarinda,

Muhammad Adnan, M.Pd.
Penata Tk.I, III/d
NIP. 197605132000121002

Dokumen ini telah ditandatangani secara elektronik menggunakan sertifikat elektronik yang diterbitkan oleh Balai Besar Sertifikasi Elektronik (BSrE), Badan Siber dan Sandi Negara (BSSN).

Appendix 5
Validation Sheet

INSTRUMENT VALIDATION SHEET

WRITING TEST AND SCORING RUBRIC VALIDATION SHEET

Research Title: The Immediate Effect of Using ChatGPT on Students' Writing Performance at SMK Negeri 6 Samarinda

Name of Validator : Guritno Aditya Warman, S.Pd

Position : English Teacher

Institution : SMK Negeri 6 Samarinda

A. Validation Instructions

This validation sheet is intended to evaluate the appropriateness of the Writing Test Instrument and Assessment Rubric used in the research entitled "The Immediate Effect of Using ChatGPT on Students' Writing Performance at SMK Negeri 6 Samarinda".

Please give a check mark (✓) in the appropriate score column.
5 = Strongly Appropriate | 4 = Appropriate | 3 = Fairly Appropriate | 2 = Inappropriate | 1 = Strongly Inappropriate

B. Assessment Criteria

No	Aspect	Indicator	1	2	3	4	5
1	Content Validity	The writing test is relevant to the research objective.				✓	
2	Content Validity	The writing task measures students' writing performance appropriately.				✓	
3	Content Validity	The writing topic is suitable for Grade X vocational students.				✓	
4	Content Validity	The writing task reflects the learning objectives of the study.				✓	
5	Construct Validity	The instrument measures the intended construct of writing performance.				✓	
6	Construct Validity	The assessed components represent writing performance comprehensively.				✓	
7	Construct Validity	Content, Organization, Vocabulary, Grammar, and Mechanics are appropriate indicators.				✓	
8	Language Appropriateness	The language used in the instructions is				✓	

		clear and understandable.					
9	Language Appropriateness	The wording of the task is appropriate for Grade X students.					✓
10	Language Appropriateness	The instructions avoid ambiguity and multiple interpretations.				✓	
11	Clarity of Instructions	The task directions clearly explain what students should do.				✓	
12	Clarity of Instructions	The expected writing product is clearly described.				✓	
13	Clarity of Instructions	The instructions facilitate students' understanding of task requirements.				✓	
14	Research Relevance	The instrument can measure students' writing performance before and after treatment.				✓	
15	Research Relevance	The instrument supports measurement of the immediate effect of ChatGPT.				✓	
16	Assessment Criteria Accuracy	The scoring rubric provides clear assessment criteria.				✓	
17	Assessment Criteria Accuracy	Each score level is clearly distinguished.				✓	
18	Assessment Criteria Accuracy	The rubric allows objective assessment of students' writing.				✓	
19	Assessment Criteria Accuracy	The rubric is consistent with Brown's writing assessment framework.				✓	
20	Assessment Criteria Accuracy	The rubric facilitates consistent scoring among raters.				✓	
21	Suitability to Students' Level	The writing task is appropriate for Grade X students' proficiency level.				✓	
22	Suitability to Students' Level	The level of difficulty is appropriate for				✓	

		vocational high school students.					
23	Suitability to Students' Level	The task encourages students to express ideas within their language ability.				✓	
24	Layout and Organization	The instrument format is systematic and well organized.				✓	
25	Layout and Organization	The instrument is practical and easy to administer and score.				✓	

C. Suggestions and Comments

_____

_____

D. Validator's Decision

□ The instrument is valid and can be used without revision.

□ The instrument is valid and can be used with minor revision.

□ The instrument requires revision before use.

□ The instrument is not valid and should be redesigned.

Samarinda, 19 June 2026

Validator,

Guritno Aditya Warman, S.Pd

NI PPPK 198710102025211040

Appendix 6

Revision Sheet

LEMBAR REVISI SKRIPSI
UNIVERSITAS WIDYA GAMA MAHAKAM SAMARINDA
FAKULTAS KEGURUAN DAN ILMU PENDIDIKAN
Email: fkip@uwgm.ac.id

NAMA : Amanda Yuliani Auliasari
NPM : 2288203003
PROGRAM STUDI : Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
JUDUL SKRIPSI : THE IMMEDIATE EFFECT OF USING CHATGPT ON STUDENT'S WRITING PERFORMANCE AT VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL X SAMARINDA

No	Nama Dosen dan Jabatan	Catatan Revisi	Tanda Tangan
1	Pembimbing I Dr. Dedi Rahman Nur, M.Pd	1. Tambahkan Penelitian yang mendukung hasil tidak signifikan 2. Perbaiki penulisan	
2	Pembimbing II Sukaena, M.Pd	1. Penulisan diperbaiki 2. Perbaiki (Typos) yang masih ada 3. Rapikan penulisan abstract	
3	Penguji I Widi Syahtia Pane, M.Pd	1. Seragamkan penulisan nama program studi 2. Gunakan mendley 3. Berikan penjelasan kenapa treatment hanya tiga kali	

Mengetahui
Ketua Program Studi

NURDIN ARIFIN, M.Pd
NIK. 2025.091.352

NB:
Lembar revisi tidak boleh menggunakan tulisan tangan kecuali tanda tangan Dosen Pembimbing dan Penguji.