KONFIKS Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra & Pengajaran
p-ISSN: 2355-2638, e-ISSN: 2746-1866, Hal. 405-415 Vol. 13 No. 2, 2026 https://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/konfiks

THE PATTERN OF ENCOURAGEMENT OF MAN 2 MALANG CITY STUDENTS IN WRITING CHATGPT-ASSISTED REVIEWS

Azizatul Qolbi[1)], Moch. Syahri[2)], Gatut Susanto3)
[1,2,3] Universitas Negeri Malang
Jl. Semarang 5 Malang 65145 Jawa Timur Indonesia
[1]Email: azizatul.qolbi.2402118@students.um.ac.id
[2]Email: moch.syahri.fs@um.ac.id
[3]Email: gatut.susanto.fs@um.ac.id

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengeksplorasi pola prompting murid dalam interaksi dengan ChatGPT pada kegiatan menulis teks resensi. Fokus utama penelitian terletak pada bagaimana murid merancang dan menggunakan prompt sebagai strategi dalam mengarahkan respons AI pada tahap revisi (rewriting), bukan semata-mata pada hasil tulisan yang dihasilkan. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dengan desain deskriptif-analitis. Subjek penelitian terdiri dari murid pada dua kelas Fase F peminatan Sains dan Teknologi di MAN 2 Kota Malang. Aktivitas pembelajaran mengadopsi strategi proses menulis Donald M. Murray sehingga ChatGPT diintegrasikan secara spesifik sebagai mitra dialogis pada fase revisi teks resensi. Data berupa 154 prompt yang diperoleh dari 61 unit interaksi murid dengan ChatGPT yang dianalisis melalui proses pengkodean tematik. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa interaksi murid membentuk pola strategi prompting yang beragam, meliputi prompting evaluatif, revisi terarah, dan kontrol respons. Strategi tersebut mencerminkan tingkat keterlibatan kognitif yang berbeda dalam memanfaatkan AI sebagai scaffolding digital dalam Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) murid. Namun, sebagian besar prompt masih bersifat umum dan berorientasi pada perbaikan teknis, yang mengindikasikan upaya minimalisasi beban kognitif (cognitive load) dalam proses revisi. Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa kualitas interaksi dengan AI sangat bergantung pada kemampuan murid dalam merancang prompt secara spesifik dan reflektif. Penelitian ini menegaskan bahwa prompting merupakan kompetensi kunci dalam pembelajaran berbasis AI dan perlu dikembangkan secara eksplisit sebagai bagian dari literasi digital dalam praktik pedagogis.

Kata Kunci: *ChatGPT, literasi AI, pembelajaran digital, prompting, resensi*

Abstract

This study aims to explore the pattern of students' motivation in interaction with ChatGPT in review text writing activities. The main focus of the research lies in how students design and use prompts as strategies in directing AI responses at the revision stage (rewriting), rather than on the written output. This research uses a qualitative approach with a descriptive-analytical design. The research subjects consisted of students in two Phase F classes specializing in Science and Technology at MAN 2 Malang City. The learning activity adopts Donald M. Murray's writing process strategy so that ChatGPT is specifically integrated as a dialogical partner in the revision phase of the review text. Data in the form of 154 prompts obtained from 62 units of student interaction with ChatGPT were analyzed through a thematic coding process. The results showed that student interactions formed a diverse pattern of impulse strategies, including evaluative impulses, directed revisions, and response controls. These strategies reflect different levels of cognitive engagement in utilizing AI as a digital scaffolding in students' Proximal Development Zones (ZPDs). However, most prompts are still oriented towards general and technical improvements, indicating an effort to minimize the cognitive load in the revision process. These findings suggest that the quality of interaction with AI is highly dependent on students' ability to design prompts in a specific and reflective way. The study emphasizes that prompting is a key competency in AI-based learning and needs to be explicitly developed as part of digital literacy in pedagogical practice.

Keywords: ChatGPT, AI literacy, digital learning, discovery, survey

Permalink/DOI : https://doi.org/10.26618/ngge6963

p-ISSN: 2355-2638, e-ISSN: 2746-1866, Hal. 405-415 Vol. 13 No. 2, 2026 https://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/konfiks

1. INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation in contemporary education is no longer just instrumental, but has moved towards a new epistemological paradigm that is changing the way knowledge is produced, distributed, and constructed. The presence of artificial intelligence (AI), especially in the form of generative language models such as ChatGPT, has presented new possibilities in building learning interactions that are dialogical, adaptive, and reflective (Fatah & Halid, 2026). In this case, learning is no longer positioned as a linear process of knowledge transmission, but as a process of co-construction of meaning that involves dynamic interactions between humans and intelligent systems. In the context of academic literacy, these changes have significant implications, especially in the development of high-level thinking skills (HOTS).

One of the concrete manifestations of HOTS in learning Indonesian is the ability to write short story review texts. Writing reviews requires integration between textual comprehension, critical analysis, argumentative evaluation, and synthesis skills (Larsen et al., 2022). Reviewing writing is not only reproductive, but is a complex cognitive process that involves the deconstruction and reconstruction of meaning logically and systematically (Enjang, 2025). Thus, the proficiency of writing reviews is an important indicator for the achievement of students' HOTS competencies in responding to and critically evaluating literary works.

Furthermore, review writing needs to be understood as a process that takes place in stages, not just an instant product. In the theoretical perspective of the writing process, according to Donald M. Murray, writing includes the stages of planning, drafting, and revising, with the affirmation that revision is at the core of writing activities (Murray, 1978). This means that the quality of writing is largely determined by the extent to which the writer is able to review, evaluate, and improve the text that has been produced. Thus, the revision stage becomes the most potential cognitive space in developing students' critical thinking skills. At this stage, the author evaluates, reflects, and refines the text that has been produced.

The theoretical ideology that is the basis of curriculum demands often clash with the capacity of students in the field. Preliminary data shows that about 68% of students have not been able to adequately develop critical arguments in review writing, while another 72% are still stuck in surface descriptive practices without analytical elaboration (Mertayasa et al., 2025). In addition, only about 18% of students are able to compose a complete review structure, including coherent onboarding, interpretation, evaluation, and synthesis. This condition suggests that learning to write reviews is still at a lower level of cognitive thinking, and has not fully led to the development of analytical and evaluative skills (Noviarini, 2025). This phenomenon is reinforced by the finding that around 65% of students do not receive specific and constructive feedback in the process of learning to write (Nur, 2024). The absence of adequate scaffolding causes the learning process to be stagnant and tends to be mechanistic. This condition reflects the failure of the learning system in creating a dialogical space that allows students to develop a reflective awareness of the texts produced and consumed by students.

On the other hand, the emergence of ChatGPT as an AI-based technology offers opportunities as a scaffolding in learning as well as new problems. A number of previous studies have shown that the integration of AI in learning can increase learning engagement by 30-40%, as well as improve the quality of writing in organizational aspects and cohesion by 25-35% (Sari et al., 2026). In addition, the use of dialogue-based systems such as ChatGPT is reported to be able to increase the exploration of ideas and the flexibility of students' thinking (Simanungkalit et al., 2025). However,

Permalink/DOI : https://doi.org/10.26618/ngge6963

few are able to use ChatGPT strategically to deepen arguments and conduct critical reflection. The rest tend to use ChatGPT pragmatically to get instant answers without a deep negotiation process. This shows that the existence of technology does not automatically result in meaningful learning, but is largely determined by the quality of the interactions that occur.

In this context, prompting is a key aspect that determines the quality of interaction. Prompting refers to the way students formulate commands or questions to an AI system to elicit a specific response (Kim et al., 2025). In learning, prompting is not only technical, but also reflects the student's thought process in directing, evaluating, and developing ideas. Therefore, prompting pattern analysis can provide an overview of how students use AI as a cognitive tool in the writing process. However, as far as the readings done by the researchers are concerned, studies of how these drive patterns are formed specifically in human-AI interactions, especially in the context of review writing, are still relatively limited.

Previous research tends to focus on two main aspects, namely (1) the effectiveness of the use of AI on learning outcomes, and (2) students' perception of the use of technology. Several studies have shown that AI is able to significantly improve the quality of writing (Marzuki et al., 2023). Meanwhile, other studies highlight the motivational and affective aspects of the use of technology (Kusworo et al., 2024). However, most of the research has not studied the processual dimension in depth, especially related to the patterns of interaction that occur between students and AI in forming critical thinking skills. In other words, there is a significant research gap, namely the lack of exploration of internal mechanisms that bridge the use of technology with improving students' cognitive quality. Existing research tends to be results-oriented, thus ignoring interaction dynamics, which are key to understanding the effectiveness of AI-based learning. In addition, research that specifically links prompting patterns to review writing skills is also still very limited, so research that is able to fill this gap is needed. This research is important because the use of AI in learning can function as a cognitive bridge (Mauliska & Sholehah, 2024). However, if not managed properly, it can lead to cognitive overload that hinders the depth of analysis.

This research was conducted at MAN 2 Malang City with students from two Phase F classes specializing in Science and Technology. In the learning practice during the study, review writing activities have been designed based on a process that includes the planning, drafting, and revision stages. ChatGPT is used specifically in the revision stage as a tool to evaluate and improve the text that students have written. As one of the progressive educational institutions, the use of AI is essential in developing students' academic literacy, especially in review writing skills that require the integration of textual comprehension, critical analysis, and argumentative evaluation.

Based on this description, this study specifically focuses on analyzing student prompting patterns in interaction with ChatGPT at the review text revision stage. This focus is based on the assumption that the revision stage is at the core of the writing process that allows for the intensive development of critical thinking. This study does not examine the use of ChatGPT in general, but specifically examines how students use ChatGPT as a dialogue partner in improving, evaluating, and deepening the quality of the review text that has been written.

The focus of the research is directed at the forms of prompting patterns that appear in interactions. The analysis is carried out on the cognitive processes reflected in these interactions. Analysis is not only aimed at the cognitive processes reflected in the series of interactions. Thus, this study places human-AI interaction as the main locus in understanding the

construction of thinking that occurs through the process of revision and development of writing. Based on this focus, this study aims to explore the prompting patterns used by students in interacting with ChatGPT as well as analyze its contribution to the development of review writing skills.

The novelty of this research lies in its attempt to uncover the procedural mechanisms that link the use of ChatGPT with the development of students' thinking and writing skills. In contrast to previous research that was more oriented towards the effectiveness of the use of AI or user perception of technology, this study focuses on prompting patterns as a form of cognitive interaction that mediates the process of idea formation, argument evaluation, and writing revision. In addition, this study specifically examines the relationship between prompting patterns and review writing learning. Thus, this research is expected to make a conceptual contribution in understanding the role of prompting as a cognitive *scaffolding* instrument in AI-assisted writing learning.

Theoretically, this research is expected to enrich the study of AI-based learning, especially in understanding the interactive and cognitive dimensions of prompting. Practically, this research is expected to be the basis for designing more effective learning strategies through the reflective and directed use of ChatGPT.

2. METHODS

This study uses a qualitative approach with an exploratory design that aims to examine in depth the patterns of students' motivation in interaction with ChatGPT in review writing activities. The qualitative approach was chosen because this study focuses on the interaction process that represents students' cognitive dynamics with data in the form of text. Exploratory design is used to uncover a phenomenon that is still relatively new, especially related to the use of artificial intelligence in text-based learning. In addition to qualitative analysis, this study is also equipped with a descriptive quantitative analysis in the form of calculation of the frequency and percentage of prompting patterns. This is used to strengthen the interpretation so that the research results are not only descriptive, but also have data support in the form of numbers.

Learning activities are designed by adopting Donald M. Murray's writing process strategy, which divides writing activities into three stages: pre-writing, drafting, and revision. The main focus of using ChatGPT is specifically placed on the rewriting stage. The unit of analysis is focused on the interaction segment that contains an indication of the prompting process, which is a conversation that shows cognitive development efforts such as the elaboration of ideas and critical reflection. Data was obtained through documentation of ChatGPT interaction transcripts which were then analyzed using qualitative content analysis techniques and thematic coding

The subjects in this study were 62 students in Phase F of the Science-Technology specialization at MAN 2 Malang City who were deliberately selected based on their active involvement in AI-based interactions. The main source of data in this study is a transcript of the interaction between students and ChatGPT obtained through conversation link documentation. The unit of analysis in this study is focused on the interaction segment that contains an indication of the prompting process, which is the part of the conversation that shows cognitive development efforts, such as elaboration of ideas, strengthening arguments, clarifying concepts, and critical reflection.

Data collection was carried out through the technique of documenting student interaction with ChatGPT. This process begins by identifying all the conversation links generated by students at the review text revision stage. Next, the researcher accesses and copies the content of the conversation as raw research data. The collected data are then selected through a

p-ISSN: 2355-2638, e-ISSN: 2746-1866, Hal. 405-415 Vol. 13 No. 2, 2026 https://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/konfiks

reduction process by considering relevance to the research context. Only interactions related to the process of revision, evaluation, and development of the text are used as research data. The selected data is then compiled in the form of a systematic text corpus. In this process, the researcher maintains the authenticity of the data by not making changes to the content of the conversation, so that the data still represents the authentic practice of students' interactions with ChatGPT in the context of learning.

The data analysis in this study uses qualitative content analysis techniques combined with thematic approaches. The analysis was conducted to identify prompting patterns that appear in students' interactions with ChatGPT at the text revision stage. The analysis process is carried out through several stages. First, the researcher performed an in-depth reading of all the data to understand the overall context of the interaction. Second, the researcher encodes a unit of meaning that indicates cognitive activity, such as asking for evaluation, correcting arguments, or reflecting on the content of writing. Third, the codes are grouped into categories that represent the form of encouraging students.

The validity of the data in this study was maintained through several strategies, including data triangulation to ensure the consistency of the patterns found. Second, data traceability is guaranteed through the use of ChatGPT links as verifiable primary sources. Third, the researcher compiles an audit trail to document all research processes. The research procedure is carried out in stages, starting from data collection and organization, followed by reduction and coding, then analysis of interaction patterns, to drawing conclusions. All of these stages are carried out systematically to ensure that the research results have high validity and credibility.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Distribution of Student Prompting Interaction Patterns in the Use of ChatGPT

The results of the analysis of 154 *prompts taken* from the conversations of 62 students showed that the use of ChatGPT in the context of review writing was not homogeneous, but rather showed a spectrum of complex, layered, and dynamic interaction patterns. This complexity is not only reflected in the various activities carried out by students, but also from the depth of the cognitive processes behind them. The interactions that occurred showed that students did not only use ChatGPT as a technical tool, but as a dialogical partner in building, evaluating, and revising knowledge repeatedly. In this context, ChatGPT serves as an epistemic medium that allows the process of interactively constructing meaning. Students not only produce texts, but also reflect on the quality of texts, both from linguistic and argumentative aspects. This indicates a shift from reproductive learning practices to more reflective and evaluative practices.

Based on the results of coding and categorization of all interaction data, seven main patterns were found that represented the form *of encouraging students*, namely: (1) requests for evaluation of assessment sharpness, (2) reinforcement of argumentative reasons, (3) linguistic improvements, (4) revision of conclusions, (5) improvement of the text as a whole, (6) identification of weaknesses of the text, and (7) rejection of AI suggestions. These seven patterns do not stand alone, but intersect and form an ecosystem of interactions that show a repetitive learning process.

Permalink/DOI : https://doi.org/10.26618/ngge6963

Table 1. Distribution of *Student* Motivation Interaction Patterns

Yes	Patterns *of Student Motivation* Interaction	Frequency (n = 154)	Percentage (%)
1	Assessment sharpness evaluation request	26	16,9%
2	Reinforcement of argumentative reasons	24	15,6%
3	Language enhancement	28	18,1%
4	Revision of conclusions	22	14,2%
5	Overall text enhancement	20	13,2%
6	Identify weak/ambiguous parts	25	16,2%
7	Rejection/criticism of AI suggestions	9	5,8%

The dominance of linguistic improvement patterns shows that students have a high awareness of the importance of linguistic aspects in review writing. However, this dominance also suggests that the orientation of improvement still tends to be on the surface of the surface, where the main focus is on the form of language, not on the depth of analysis. Meanwhile, a high percentage of evaluation patterns of assessment and weakness identification indicate the development of metacognitive awareness, in which students begin to question the quality of the arguments they construct. The pattern of reinforcement of argumentative reasons suggests that students are beginning to understand the importance of justification in assessment, although in practice it is still not fully supported by strong textual evidence. On the other hand, the pattern of revision of conclusions and refinement of the text suggests that there is an effort to establish global coherence in writing, although the revisions made still tend to be partial.

The most significant finding is the emergence of a pattern of rejection of AI suggestions. Although the percentage is relatively low, this pattern shows an early indication of critical thinking as students do not fully accept the advice given, but rather begin to evaluate the relevance and accuracy of the information. To provide a more concrete picture of each interaction pattern, the following is an example of student statement excerpts classified by the category *of* student motivation patterns.

Table 2. Sample Student Statement Citation Based on *Prompting Pattern*

Yes	Interaction Patterns	Data Code	Student Statement
1	Evaluation of assessment acuity	S12	Is this assessment still general or specific?
		S15	Is the assessment in this paragraph accompanied by a clear reason?
		S16	Assess the clarity of the assessment and identify the strongest/weakest parts
2	Reinforcement of argumentative reasons	S6	Is my reason correct and all-encompassing?
		S58	Is this assessment accompanied by a strong enough reason?
3	Language enhancement	S4	Please change the language more formally
		S13	Recreate with the correct language
		S17	What is the choice of words in this text?
4	Revision of conclusions	S3	Please revise my conclusions according to criticism and suggestions
		S18	Does this conclusion summarize the entire content of the review?

Permalink/DOI : https://doi.org/10.26618/ngge6963

5	Overall text enhancement	S5	Make the review text the correct version
		S30	Fix it according to the suggestions given
6	Identifying text weaknesses	S23	Indicate areas that need clarification
		S28	Identify sentences that are less effective or ambiguous
7	AI suggestion rejection	S48	I don't match the response given
		S56	Is this advice really necessary?

Based on the citation table, it can be seen that each interaction pattern has a clear empirical representation in the form of direct statements of students. This quote shows that interactions with ChatGPT are not only mechanistic, but also involve complex thought processes, albeit at different levels of depth. Overall, the results of this study show that the use of ChatGPT in learning to write reviews has significant potential in encouraging the emergence of student *motivation patterns* , especially in the aspects of evaluation and reflection. However, this potential has not been fully optimally actualized as there is still a tendency to use AI that is procedural and oriented towards technical improvement, rather than the development of deep critical thinking.

Characteristics of Student Encouragement Strategies in Interaction with ChatGPT

Further analysis of the interaction data showed that students' use of ChatGPT in review writing could not be understood only as an activity of receiving help, but rather as a strategic practice in designing and directing *prompts.* Thus, the main focus in these findings lies in how students build communication patterns with AI to achieve specific goals in the writing process. The data showed that students did not interact randomly, but formed *a relatively consistent and repetitive prompting pattern. This pattern reflects how students position ChatGPT as an evaluator, editor, or revision partner. In this context, prompting strategies are an important indicator of how students control the direction of interaction, rather than just following the flow of responses from AI.*

Based on thematic analysis, *student impulse* strategies can be classified into three main forms, namely evaluative impulse, directed revision prompt, and response control prompt. These three strategies show different levels of engagement in managing interactions with ChatGPT. The first strategy is evaluative pushing, which is the most dominant pattern. In this strategy, students use ChatGPT to ask for a quality assessment of the text they have created. The requests made focus on specific aspects, such as sharpness of judgment, clarity of reasoning, and linguistic quality. This pattern shows that students are consciously using ChatGPT as an external validation tool to assess the quality of their writing. However, the dominance of this strategy also shows that most students still rely on AI as an authoritative source in determining the quality of texts.

The second strategy is to *encourage* directional revisions characterized by the use of specific instructions to correct certain parts of the text. In this pattern, students not only ask for evaluation, but directly direct the AI to make revisions as needed. This strategy shows increased control over interactions, as students begin to determine which parts need to be improved and how to make improvements. However, revisions still tend to be partial, such as focusing on language or conclusions, without thorough integration of the text structure.

The third strategy is to *encourage* response control, which is the most complex pattern and indicates a higher level of engagement. In this strategy, students not only accept or request revisions, but also direct, limit, and even reject the responses provided by ChatGPT. This pattern reflects the awareness that AI responses don't always have to be received directly. Thus, students begin to position themselves as interaction controllers, not just recipients of

p-ISSN: 2355-2638, e-ISSN: 2746-1866, Hal. 405-415 Vol. 13 No. 2, 2026 https://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/konfiks

information. To clarify the classification of prompting strategies, the following systematic table is presented:

Table 3. Classification of Student Motivation Strategies in Interaction with ChatGPT

Yes	Push Strategy	Analytical Description	Interaction Indicators
1	Evaluative	Text quality assessment request	Evaluation of sharpness, reasoning, and language
2	Targeted Revisions	Specific instructions for proofreading sections	Language, conclusion, or structure revision command
3	Response Control	Directing or rejecting AI responses	Criticism, restriction, or answer selection

In addition to these classifications, it was found that *the push* strategies used by students were repetitive and layered. Students don't just use one type of *prompt*, but combine multiple strategies in a series of interactions. For example, students can start with an *evaluative prompt*, then proceed with a revision command, and end with a control command. This pattern suggests that interactions with ChatGPT take place as an iterative negotiation process, rather than as one-way communication. However, the quality of *the prompting* strategies used still shows limitations. Most of the *proposed instructions* are still general and less specific, resulting in a response that is also general. This condition suggests that even though students have used various *prompting strategies*, their effectiveness is not optimal because they are not supported by the ability to formulate appropriate instructions.

Another significant finding was the tendency of students to focus more on impulses that are local in nature, i.e. correcting certain parts separately. This suggests that *the push strategies used* have not fully led to the development of a holistic text. In other words, students are still using ChatGPT as a partial correction tool, not as a comprehensive reconstruction tool.

Overall, the results of this study show that students' interactions with ChatGPT are more appropriately understood as practices that encourage strategies that reflect a level of control and involvement in the learning process. The emerging patterns show that students are not only using AI as an aid, but also as objects that can be directed and controlled through the *clues* they create. However, these findings also reveal that *the ability to encourage students* is still in the developmental stage. Although it has demonstrated a variety of strategies, the quality of the prompts used has not been fully optimal in generating in-depth and targeted responses. Therefore, a learning approach is needed that explicitly trains driving skills as part of digital literacy competencies.

Pushing Strategies as a Cognitive Mechanism in AI-Based Learning Interactions

The findings of this study put *Request* as a central element in understanding students' interactions with ChatGPT. Not just as a form of technical communication, but as a representation of cognitive processes mediated by technology. In this context, *Request* It serves as an epistemic instrument that allows students to articulate their thinking needs, direct the flow of dialogue, and reconstruct their understanding through text-based interactions. Thus, the quality of learning that occurs is no longer solely determined by the sophistication of AI systems, but rather by the user's capacity to strategically design and manage prompts. In the framework of contemporary digital literacy, this phenomenon indicates a shift from only being able to use technology to being able to control technology as a cognitive partner. This is in line with the development of the

Permalink/DOI : https://doi.org/10.26618/ngge6963

p-ISSN: 2355-2638, e-ISSN: 2746-1866, Hal. 405-415 Vol. 13 No. 2, 2026 https://journal.unismuh.ac.id/index.php/konfiks

concept *AI Literacy* which emphasizes that interaction with intelligent systems demands new skills, namely the ability to formulate appropriate, contextual, and goal-oriented inputs (Ng et al., 2021). In other words, *Request* can be understood as a concrete form of an external thought process, in which an individual's cognitive structure is reflected in the way they structure questions or instructions to the AI. More structured and specific *Prompt* submitted, the more likely it is to get an in-depth and meaningful response.

On the other hand, a critical analysis of the findings of this study shows that there is a gap between theoretical potential and empirical practice. Although the students have shown variation in the strategy *Request*, most of them are still in the operational stage which is procedural and not yet fully reflective. *Fast* Those used tend to be general, repetitive, and oriented towards instant results, such as linguistic enhancement or validation of judgments, without being accompanied by an in-depth exploration of the content or structure of the argument. This condition indicates that *Request* It has not been used as a tool to build complex thinking, but it is still positioned as a means to get quick and practical answers. From the perspective of social constructivism, interaction with ChatGPT can be understood as a form of *scaffolding* Technology-Mediated (Riantoni et al., 2025). Through interaction with ChatGPT, students gain cognitive support to improve the quality of their comprehension. However, unlike conventional scaffolding that is adaptive and controlled by the teacher, scaffolding in the context of AI depends on the quality of the prompt proposed by the user. As such, the effectiveness of the support provided by ChatGPT is not automatic, but is highly dependent on the student's ability to initiate the right interaction. This shows that *Request* serves as a connecting mechanism between the potential of AI systems and individual learning needs.

In the context *of self-directed learning*, prompting strategies reflect the dimensions of self-regulation which include planning, monitoring, and evaluation. Evaluative encouragement activities demonstrate students' efforts to monitor the quality of writing. Meanwhile, the prompting of a directed revision reflects the regulatory process in correcting the errors that have been identified. Selective prompting or even rejecting AI responses indicates the existence of a reflection dimension. The rejection of AI responses indicates that students begin to evaluate the relevance and credibility of the information received. However, this process has not taken place in its entirety as most students still rely on AI as a source of validation. The self-regulation that is formed tends to be external, not internal.

This phenomenon leads to a paradox in the use of AI in learning. On the one hand, ChatGPT offers high efficiency in speeding up the revision process and improving the technical quality of writing. But on the other hand, this efficiency has the potential to reduce the depth of cognitive processes if it is not balanced with a critical and reflective impulse strategy. In this context, there is a tendency *pseudo-cognitive involvement*, which is a condition in which students seem to be actively interacting with AI, but are not fully engaged in the process of deep thinking (DePaula et al., 2018). Activities that encourage general nature produce responses that are also general, so they do not encourage the elaboration of significant ideas. The implications of these findings suggest that the success of AI integration in learning cannot be separated from the ability of users to strategically manage interactions. Therefore, *Request* It needs to be positioned as a core competency that must be developed explicitly in the learning process. It is not enough for students to be taught using AI, but it needs to be guided to understand how to design effective prompts, evaluate the responses generated, and integrate the results of those interactions into a

Permalink/DOI : https://doi.org/10.26618/ngge6963

broader frame of mind. Without these capabilities, the use of AI has the potential to result in superficial and unsustainable learning (Sakti et al., 2024).

Theoretically, this study contributes by placing prompting strategies as a key variable in human-AI interaction in the context of education. This expands the technology-based learning discourse that has been more focused on the effectiveness of tools, to be more oriented towards the quality of interaction. Thus, AI-based learning is no longer understood as the transfer of knowledge from the system to the user, but as a process of co-construction of meaning mediated by the user's ability to design and direct interactions. However, this research is limited to the analysis of the prompting patterns that students use in interacting with ChatGPT. This study did not analyze the quality of the responses generated by ChatGPT or its relationship with the quality of the review text written by students. Therefore, the research findings are not intended to explain the causal relationship between prompting strategies, the quality of AI responses, and student writing outcomes, but rather to capture the characteristics of interactions that students build through prompts as part of the AI-assisted learning process. The study of the connection between prompt quality, AI response, and writing product quality is an opportunity for further research.

4. CONCLUSION

The findings of the study show that the encouragement strategies used by MAN 2 Malang City students in revising review texts are diverse and form certain patterns. This diversity reflects the level of involvement in the learning process. However, most of these strategies are still in the operational stage that tend to be procedural, characterized by the use of common prompts, oriented towards technical improvements, and dependent on external validation from AI. This condition shows that although interaction with ChatGPT has opened up space for evaluative and reflective activities, the depth of the thought process that occurs is not fully optimal. Thus, it becomes clear that the quality of learning is not only determined by the sophistication of the system, but by the ability of students to formulate, direct, and evaluate interactions strategically. Therefore, the skills of pushing need to be understood as an important new form of literacy in the context of digital education.

The implications of these findings underscore the importance of changing pedagogical approaches, from simply using technology to developing competencies in managing interactions with technology. Learning involving AI needs to explicitly integrate prompting strategy training so that students are not only passive users, but are able to act as active agents.

5. REFERENCES

DePaula, N., Fietkiewicz, K.J., Froehlich, T.J., Juta, A.J., Dorsch, I., & Ilhan, A. (2018). Challenges for Social Media: Misinformation, Freedom of Speech, Civil Engagement, and Data Regulation. *Proceedings of the Association of Information Science and Technology*, *55*(1), 665–668.

Enjang, E. T. S. (2025). The Role of ChatGPT in Improving Indonesian Academic Writing Skills: A Systematic Literature Review. *KUNKUN: Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *2*(3), 159–172.

Fatah, K., & Halid, A. (2026). Integration of ChatGPT in the Learning Process: Educational Opportunities and Challenges in Indonesia. *Al-KALIMANTAN: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *3*(3), 210–221.

Kim, J., Yu, S., Lee, S.-S., & Detrick, R. (2025). Student prompt patterns and their influence on AI-assisted academic writing: Focuses on students' AI literacy levels. *Journal of Technology Research in Education*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2025.245604

3

Kusworo, K., Goreta, G., Hanafi, I., Susanto, T. T. D., & Astuti, I. A. D. (2024). Chat GPT as a New Era in Learning Transformation: A Systematic Literature Review. *SAP (Educational Article Arrangements), 8*(3), 480–485.

Larsen, T.M., Endo, B.H., Yee, A.T., Do, T., & Lo, M.M. (2022). Investigating the Internal Assumptions of the Revised Bloom Taxonomy. *CBE Life Sciences Education*, *21*(4), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.20-08-0170-CORRECTION

Marzuki, Widiati, U., Rusdin, D., Darwin, & Indrawati, I. (2023). The impact of AI stationery on student writing content and organization: an EFL teacher's perspective. *Education Convincing*, *10*(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2236469

Mauliska, N., & Sholehah, C. A. (2024). Exploring the Use of WRAP (Writing Assistance via Prompting) Techniques in Improving Writing Skills. *Najah: Journal of Research and Community Services*, *2*(3), 1–8.

Mertayasa, I. K., Yhani, P. C. C., & Saputra, P. W. (2025). The Education Revolution With ChatGPT: A Systematic Literature Review of Utilization and Impact in Educational Transformation. *Journal Of Indonesian Scholars For Social Research*, *5*(1 Special Issues), 107–122.

Murray, D.M. (1978). Write before you write. *College Composition and Communication*, *29*(4), 375–381.

Ng, D.Tk., et al. (2021). Conceptualizing AI literacy: An Exploratory Review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 2, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100041*

Noviarini, T. (2025). The Role of ChatGPT in Learning to Write English for Sharia Economics Students: A Student Perspective at STIES Mitra Karya Bekasi. *J-SES: Journal of Science, Education and Studies*, *4*(3).

Nur, S. (2024). The Utilization of ChatGPT as an Assistant in the Creative Process of Indonesian Literature. *Journal of Ingenuity: Journal of Education and Teaching*, *4*(1), 63–75. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.jcerdik.2024.004.01.07

Ramadhanty Wahidah, A., Nurfadhillah, S., & Puspita Rini, C. (2023). Analysis of Punctuation Writing Errors in Class IV Description Essay Mi Hudaatul Umam Tangerang Regency. *Pendas: Scientific Journal of Basic Education*, *8*(2), 3982–3989. https://doi.org/10.23969/jp.v8i2.10307

Riantoni, C., Maison, M., & Pathoni, H. (2025). Electric DC AI scaffolding: Experiment with simple techniques with ChatGPT to cultivate high-level thinking skills. *Indonesian Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, *8*(3), 549–567.

Sakti, Y. P. B., Hadi, M. N., Abadi, M. M. K., & Putra, R. A. S. (2024). Systematic literature review: The influence of the use of ChatGPT in the learning process. *Proceedings of the National Seminar on Information Technology and Systems*, *4*(1), 15–37.

Sari, D. I., Mazid, S., & Subowo, A. (2026). The Meaning of Generative AI in Education: A School's Perspective on Strengthening Digital Citizenship. *Integralism*, *37*(1), 27–41.

Simanungkalit, K. E., Sultoni, A., & Hilmi, H. S. (2025). Effectiveness, Implementation Challenges, and Benefits of ChatGPT in Enhancing Students: Systematic Literature Review: Effectiveness, Implementation Challenges, and Benefits of ChatGPT in Enhancing Students. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Education and Service*, *1*(1), 33–46.