

---

**STREAMLINING POETRY ASSIGNMENT SUBMISSION: HOW PADLET AI IMPROVES  
ACCESSIBILITY AND EFFICIENCY FOR INDONESIAN ELT LEARNERS**

**Muhammad Ilham Ali<sup>1</sup>**  
Universitas Negeri Manado, Tondano, Indonesia  
[ilhamali@unima.ac.id](mailto:ilhamali@unima.ac.id)

**Ceisy Nita Wunta<sup>2</sup>**  
Universitas Negeri Manado, Tondano, Indonesia  
[ceisywuntu@unima.ac.id](mailto:ceisywuntu@unima.ac.id)

**Jenie Posumah<sup>3</sup>**  
Universitas Negeri Manado, Tondano, Indonesia  
[jenieposumah@unima.ac.id](mailto:jenieposumah@unima.ac.id)

---

**Abstract**

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence into collaborative digital platforms has opened new possibilities for streamlining literature-based assignments in English language teaching. This study examines how Padlet, a cloud-based collaborative wall equipped with generative artificial intelligence features, influences accessibility and efficiency in poetry assignment submission among Indonesian undergraduate students studying English language teaching. The objective was to determine student perceptions of the platform's usefulness for managing poetry assignments and to explore the experiences underlying those perceptions. A convergent mixed-methods design was employed, combining quantitative data from a twenty-item Likert-scale questionnaire completed by twenty-six sixth-semester students with qualitative data from semi-structured interviews involving seven students. Descriptive statistics revealed that respondents rated the platform most favorably on accessibility and ease of use, with a mean score of 4.37, and least favorably, though still positively, on efficiency and time-saving, with a mean score of 3.88, yielding an overall grand mean of 4.08 across all items. Thematic analysis of the interviews produced recurring themes centered on platform accessibility, task efficiency, support for understanding poetic devices, and peer collaboration, alongside concerns about unstable internet connectivity and occasionally generic artificial intelligence suggestions. Students consistently viewed the platform as a scaffold rather than a substitute for independent literary interpretation. The findings suggest the platform can reduce the logistical burden of poetry assignments preserving space for authentic literary engagement, with practical implications for lecturers designing technology-assisted literature instruction in higher education.

**Keywords:** Padlet AI, Poetry Assignment, Accessibility, Efficiency, Indonesian ELT

## INTRODUCTION

Literature has long occupied an ambivalent position in English as a Foreign Language curriculum. Poetry, in particular, offers learners condensed, emotionally resonant language input that can deepen vocabulary, sensitize learners to rhythm and sound, and cultivate interpretive skill. At the same time, poetry assignments are frequently experienced by students as time-consuming, cognitively demanding, and logistically cumbersome, particularly when submission, peer feedback, and instructor evaluation are scattered across multiple channels such as email, printed hard copies, or unstructured chat groups. In the Indonesian higher education context, English Language Teaching study programs commonly require sixth-semester students to complete extended written analyses of poems by British or American poets as part of literature coursework, a task that demands both close reading skills and efficient time management within a crowded semester schedule. As digital platforms become increasingly embedded in everyday academic life across Indonesia and beyond, understanding how such tools reshape literature-based assignments has become a matter of both pedagogical and practical significance for language educators.

Padlet, a cloud-based collaborative wall that allows users to post text, images, and comments on a shared digital board, has increasingly been adopted in ELT classrooms as a tool for collaborative writing and peer interaction. Recent research indicates that Padlet is perceived by higher-education students as an accessible and enjoyable medium that fosters accuracy awareness, sustained writing engagement, and a collaborative learning atmosphere, even as unstable connectivity and limited familiarity with the platform's features occasionally hinder its effective use (Ramadhani et al., 2023), while digital competence has been found to shape how students interact and participate in Padlet-based collaborative writing environments in higher education (Soro et al., 2023). In parallel, generative artificial intelligence has been rapidly integrated into writing instruction more broadly, with Indonesian EFL students reporting both enhanced critical-thinking engagement and lingering concerns about over-reliance when using AI tools for academic writing (Darwin et al., 2024), and with cross-linguistic studies showing that generative-AI-assisted writing processes differ meaningfully depending on learners' native-language background (Wang, 2024).

Within literature instruction specifically, emerging evidence suggests that AI tools can support critical thinking in EFL literature classes when carefully scaffolded (Liu & Wang, 2024), and that platforms like ChatGPT are beginning to reshape how undergraduate literature courses are taught, prompting calls for pedagogical models that preserve independent interpretive engagement rather than replacing it (Bellot et al., 2025). Complementary work on collaborative digital poetry writing among

secondary students further indicates that shared digital boards can support both individual and group engagement with poetic composition, though most such studies focus on writing rather than analytical assignment submission (Kangasharju et al., 2024).

Despite this growing body of research, relatively little empirical attention has been paid to how AI-enhanced collaborative platforms are experienced by students when the object of analysis is poetry rather than expository or argumentative prose. Poetry analysis arguably places different demands on both students and AI systems, since it requires sensitivity to ambiguity, connotation, and figurative meaning that resist the more formulaic explanations generative AI systems typically produce for grammar or structural feedback (Liu & Wang, 2024). Furthermore, most existing Padlet research has examined general writing tasks (Ramadhani et al., 2023; Soro et al., 2023) or literature-classroom critical thinking in isolation (Bellot et al., 2025), leaving a gap in understanding how the combination of Padlet's collaborative-wall functionality and generative AI assistance, here referred to as Padlet AI, is perceived by Indonesian ELT students specifically when the assignment requires literary rather than expository analysis, and specifically regarding the practical dimensions of accessibility and efficiency in assignment submission.

This study aims to investigate student perceptions of Padlet AI in the specific context of poetry assignment submission at an English Language Teaching study program in Indonesia. Specifically, the study addresses the following research questions: (1) How accessible and efficient do Indonesian ELT students perceive Padlet AI to be for completing poetry assignments? (2) In what ways does Padlet AI support students' comprehension of poetic devices and collaboration with classmates? (3) What challenges do students encounter when using Padlet AI for poetry assignments, and how do these challenges shape their willingness to continue using the tool?

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Padlet as a Collaborative Learning Tool in EFL Contexts

Padlet has been studied extensively as a tool for collaborative writing in second and foreign language classrooms. Recent work reports that Padlet is perceived by higher-education students as an accessible and enjoyable medium that fosters accuracy awareness, sustained writing engagement, and a collaborative learning atmosphere, since every contribution remains visible on a single shared board rather than being passed sequentially from student to student or from student to instructor (Ramadhani et al., 2023). However, Soro et al. (2023) complicate this picture by showing that the benefits of Padlet are not uniform across users: digital competence itself shapes how students interact with and participate in the platform, meaning that gains in idea organization and peer interaction reported in one study may not

generalize to learners with weaker digital literacy. This tension suggests that accessibility on Padlet is not simply a fixed property of the tool but is co-determined by the learner's prior digital competence, a nuance that purely descriptive accounts of Padlet's usefulness tend to overlook.

This platform-specific research sits within a longer tradition of scholarship on collaborative writing in language learning. Storch (2019) argues that jointly composing and revising a text pushes learners to negotiate meaning, notice gaps in their own language production, and receive immediate peer input, a process that is theorized to benefit language development regardless of whether the medium is paper-based or digital. Digital collaborative platforms such as Padlet extend this affordance beyond the physical classroom, allowing asynchronous participation and reducing the logistical burden of coordinating group work. Yet, while Storch's framework explains why collaborative writing is pedagogically valuable in principle, it does not by itself account for whether students actually adopt and sustain use of a digital tool designed to support that collaboration. This is where the Technology Acceptance Model becomes relevant, as it holds that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use are the two central determinants of technology adoption (Davis et al., 1989). Taken together, these two strands of theory suggest that Padlet's pedagogical value depends jointly on the intrinsic benefits of collaborative writing and on students' subjective perception of the platform as easy and useful, a combination that later studies have not always examined simultaneously.

### **Generative AI in EFL Writing and Literary Analysis**

The integration of generative AI into language classrooms has expanded rapidly since the emergence of large language model-based chatbots. Extending the logic of the Technology Acceptance Model into this newer domain, Zou and Huang (2023) found that doctoral students' willingness to use ChatGPT in academic writing was likewise shaped by perceived usefulness and ease of use, suggesting that adoption patterns first identified for general educational technology extend reasonably well to generative AI tools specifically. Research on AI-assisted EFL writing more broadly reports that Indonesian EFL students experience both enhanced critical-thinking engagement and lingering concerns about over-reliance when AI feedback is incorporated into academic writing (Darwin et al., 2024), while cross-linguistic evidence indicates that generative-AI-assisted writing processes differ meaningfully depending on learners' native-language background, implying that findings from one linguistic or cultural context cannot be assumed to transfer directly to another (Wang, 2024).

Within literature instruction specifically, the picture becomes more contested. Liu and Wang (2024) found that AI tools can support critical thinking in EFL literature classes, but only when carefully scaffolded by the instructor, a qualification that distinguishes literature-focused AI use from the more formulaic feedback AI

provides on grammar or organization. Bellot et al. (2025) push this argument further, suggesting that platforms like ChatGPT are beginning to reshape how undergraduate literature courses are taught, but they simultaneously caution that this reshaping raises the risk of eroding the very interpretive practices literature courses are meant to cultivate unless deliberate pedagogical safeguards are built in. Read together, these two studies suggest an emerging consensus that AI's role in literary analysis is best understood as scaffolding rather than delivering a definitive interpretation. This is a meaningful distinction from AI-assisted expository writing, where a correct or improved version of a sentence is more clearly identifiable: poetry analysis poses a distinctive challenge for AI-assisted instruction because meaning in a poem is frequently indirect, connotative, and dependent on cultural or historical context that a generative system may explain only in general terms. Where AI feedback on grammar or organization can be evaluated against relatively fixed standards, feedback on a poem's meaning is inherently interpretive, so the value of AI assistance in poetry classrooms may lie less in providing a definitive reading and more in prompting students to notice poetic devices, generate a starting interpretation, and pursue further independent reflection.

### **Accessibility, Efficiency, and Learner Autonomy**

Accessibility and efficiency are recurring constructs in research on educational technology adoption. Accessibility refers to the ease with which students can reach and operate a learning tool regardless of time, location, or device, while efficiency refers to the reduction of time and cognitive effort required to complete a learning task. Prior Padlet studies report that students value the platform's intuitive interface and its ability to be used across devices without installation (Ramadhani et al., 2023), yet these same accessibility gains are not always mirrored in efficiency, since unstable connectivity and uneven digital competence can offset any time saved (Soro et al., 2023). A parallel tension appears in collaborative digital poetry writing among secondary students, where shared digital boards were found to support both individual and group engagement with poetic composition, although the reported benefits centered on composition rather than the logistics of analytical assignment submission (Kangasharju et al., 2024), leaving open whether similar accessibility gains hold for assignments requiring interpretive analysis rather than original creative writing. Across this body of work, a further, more conceptual tension recurs: heavy reliance on any digital or AI-based scaffold raises questions about learner autonomy, since students must balance the convenience of AI-generated support against the need to develop independent critical thinking and interpretive skill, particularly in a discipline such as literary studies where the process of close reading is itself part of the learning objective (Liu & Wang, 2024; Bellot et al., 2025).

## Theoretical Framework

This study draws on the Technology Acceptance Model, which posits that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use jointly determine whether learners adopt and continue using a given technology (Davis et al., 1989), to interpret students' accessibility and efficiency ratings of Padlet AI. It further draws on Storch's (2019) account of collaborative writing as a socially mediated process of meaning negotiation to interpret the peer-collaboration dimension of students' experience, and on the scaffolding perspective developed in recent AI-and-literature research (Liu & Wang, 2024; Bellot et al., 2025) to interpret how students position AI assistance relative to their own interpretive judgment in poetry analysis.

## Identifying the Research Gap

Taken together, the literature suggests three propositions that this study seeks to examine empirically in the Indonesian ELT context. First, Padlet AI is likely to be perceived as highly accessible due to its cross-device, cross-location availability, consistent with prior Padlet research (Ramadhani et al., 2023). Second, its efficiency gains may be more moderate and conditional on stable internet connectivity and digital competence, echoing the qualifications raised by Soro et al. (2023). Third, students are likely to position AI assistance as a supplementary scaffold for poetry analysis rather than a substitute for their own interpretive judgment, in line with emerging findings in AI-and-literature research (Liu & Wang, 2024; Bellot et al., 2025). However, despite this growing body of research, no study to date has examined these three constructs together within a single collaborative-plus-generative-AI platform applied specifically to poetry assignment submission among Indonesian ELT undergraduates. Existing Padlet studies address collaborative writing broadly rather than literary analysis (Ramadhani et al., 2023; Soro et al., 2023), while existing AI-and-literature studies address critical thinking or course design broadly rather than the specific logistical dimensions of accessibility and efficiency in assignment submission (Liu & Wang, 2024; Bellot et al., 2025). This study seeks to address that gap by empirically examining how Padlet AI is perceived along these three dimensions in the context of poetry assignment submission at an Indonesian ELT study program.

## RESEARCH METHOD

### Research Design

This study employed a convergent mixed-methods design, in which quantitative and qualitative data were collected concurrently and then integrated during interpretation. This design is appropriate for the present research objectives because it allows the breadth of student perception, captured through a structured set of Likert-scale statements, to be examined alongside the depth and nuance of students' own reasoning, examples, and reservations, captured through semi-

structured interviews. Convergent designs are particularly well suited to studies in which a single phenomenon needs to be understood simultaneously from a numeric and an experiential angle, since the two data sets can be compared directly to determine whether they corroborate or complicate one another (Shahab et al., 2021). Bhana (2024) further notes that convergent parallel designs are advantageous when quantitative and qualitative strands can be collected within the same timeframe and from an overlapping participant pool, a condition that matched the present study, since the same population of sixth-semester students who completed the poetry assignments using Padlet AI provided both the questionnaire responses and the interview data.

### **Participants**

Participants were sixth-semester students enrolled in an English Language Teaching study program in Indonesia who had used Padlet AI for poetry assignments during a literature course covering the analysis of poems by British and American poets. Prior use of Padlet AI for this specific assignment served as the inclusion criterion for participation. The questionnaire was completed by 26 students, predominantly female ( $n = 19$ , 73.1%) with a smaller proportion of male respondents ( $n = 7$ , 26.9%). The majority of respondents reported intermediate English proficiency ( $n = 24$ , 92.3%), with a minority at the beginner level ( $n = 2$ , 7.7%), and most respondents used Padlet AI on a weekly basis ( $n = 24$ , 92.3%) rather than monthly ( $n = 2$ , 7.7%), indicating that the sample consisted of habitual rather than occasional users of the platform (see Table 1).

**Table 1**  
**Demographic Profile of Questionnaire Respondents (N = 26)**

| Characteristic      | Category     | n  | %    |
|---------------------|--------------|----|------|
| Gender              | Female       | 19 | 73.1 |
|                     | Male         | 7  | 26.9 |
| English Proficiency | Intermediate | 24 | 92.3 |
|                     | Beginner     | 2  | 7.7  |
| Frequency of Use    | Weekly       | 24 | 92.3 |
|                     | Monthly      | 2  | 7.7  |

From this population, seven students were selected through purposive sampling to participate in semi-structured interviews and were assigned the informant codes INF-01 through INF-07 to protect their anonymity. Purposive sampling was chosen because it allows a researcher to select participants specifically on the basis of their information-rich experience with the phenomenon under study rather than for statistical representativeness, a rationale consistent with recent methodological guidance emphasizing that the quality of purposive sampling

depends on the strategic alignment between selection criteria and the conceptual focus of the research rather than on sample size alone (Ahmad & Wilkins, 2024).

### **Data Collection**

Two instruments were used. The first was a 20-item questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree, scored 1 to 5) covering student perceptions of Padlet AI's accessibility, efficiency, support for comprehension of poetic devices, facilitation of collaboration, and overall confidence and satisfaction. The second instrument was a semi-structured interview protocol consisting of seven open-ended questions addressing: (1) overall experience accessing and using Padlet AI; (2) effects on time and effort compared to traditional methods; (3) support for understanding poetic devices and complex poems; (4) influence on interaction and collaboration with classmates; (5) challenges or limitations encountered; (6) perceived effects on critical thinking and confidence; and (7) willingness to continue using the tool and recommendations for other students and lecturers.

The questionnaire was distributed online in early December 2025 and completed voluntarily by the 26 students described above. Interviews were conducted with the seven selected students over the same period, with responses submitted in written form through a structured online form rather than through real-time spoken interaction. Each interview response was treated as a complete verbatim account of the respective student's experience and was not edited for content, although minor typographical inconsistencies in the original responses are preserved as submitted in the direct quotations reported in the Findings section. Because responses were self-reported in written form rather than audio-recorded and transcribed, no inter-rater transcription check was necessary; however, the consistency of the Likert-scale instrument was supported by grouping items into conceptually coherent constructs prior to analysis, as described below.

### **Data Analysis**

Quantitative data were analyzed descriptively. Likert responses were converted to numerical scores (Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neutral = 3, Agree = 4, Strongly Agree = 5), and the mean and standard deviation were computed for each of the twenty items. To aid interpretation, items were grouped into five conceptual constructs based on their content: Accessibility and Ease of Use, Efficiency and Time-Saving, Comprehension of Poetic Devices, Collaboration and Peer Learning, and Confidence, Relevance, and Overall Satisfaction. A construct-level mean was then computed by averaging all item scores within each group.

Qualitative data from the seven interviews were analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis. Each informant's response to each question was read closely and coded inductively, with codes treated as provisional interpretations developed through repeated engagement with the data rather than as objectively pre-existing

categories, an approach consistent with the reflexive thematic analysis tradition, in which the researcher's active interpretive role is treated as part of the analytic process rather than a source of bias to be eliminated (Braun & Clarke, 2019). Codes were then grouped into overarching themes that recurred across informants, following the principle that themes should be meaning-centered constructions arising from the data rather than pre-determined topic summaries (Braun & Clarke, 2021). Eight themes emerged from this process: Accessibility, Efficiency, Understanding of Poetic Devices, Collaboration, Connectivity-Related Challenges, AI Suggestion Limitations, Critical Thinking and Confidence, and Continued Use and Recommendation. Frequency counts of how many of the seven informants raised each theme were tabulated to indicate the relative salience of each theme, and illustrative quotations were selected to represent the range of perspectives within each theme.

The quantitative and qualitative findings were then integrated during the discussion phase, following convergent-design procedures, to examine points of convergence and divergence between the numerical ratings and students' own explanations (Shahab et al., 2021).

### **Ethical Considerations**

Participation in both the questionnaire and the interviews was voluntary, and students were informed that their responses would be used for research purposes prior to data collection. Anonymity was protected through the use of informant codes (INF-01 to INF-07) rather than names in the reporting of interview data, and no identifying information was collected in the questionnaire beyond the demographic categories reported in Table 1. Students retained the right to decline participation without any effect on their course standing.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This section presents the findings from the convergent mixed-methods design, integrating the descriptive statistics generated from the 20-item questionnaire (N = 26) with the thematic patterns identified across the seven semi-structured interviews (INF-01 to INF-07). Rather than reporting the quantitative and qualitative strands separately, the two data sets are presented together within each subsection below to show where the numerical ratings and students' own explanations converge, and where the interview data add nuance or qualification that the Likert-scale scores alone could not capture. Overall, the questionnaire data show a generally favorable perception of Padlet AI across all five constructs, with a grand mean of 4.08 (on a 1–5 scale) and all construct means falling between 3.88 and 4.37, indicating that responses clustered consistently between Agree and Strongly Agree (Table 2).

**Table 2**  
**Descriptive Statistics by Construct**

| Construct                                    | Items | Mean | SD   | Interpretation    |
|----------------------------------------------|-------|------|------|-------------------|
| Accessibility & Ease of Use                  | 5     | 4.37 | 0.59 | Strongly Positive |
| Collaboration & Peer Learning                | 2     | 4.10 | 0.70 | Positive          |
| Confidence, Relevance & Overall Satisfaction | 4     | 4.08 | 0.70 | Positive          |
| Comprehension of Poetic Devices              | 5     | 3.94 | 0.73 | Positive          |
| Efficiency & Time-Saving                     | 4     | 3.88 | 0.71 | Positive          |

While Table 2 establishes the overall shape and relative ranking of student perception across the five constructs, it cannot on its own explain why efficiency and comprehension were rated more moderately than accessibility, nor what specifically students meant when they rated collaboration or confidence positively. The interview data, summarized in Table 3, were therefore analyzed to identify the recurring themes underlying these numerical patterns and to surface the reasoning, conditions, and reservations that the closed-ended questionnaire items were not designed to capture. Several of the themes that emerged, most notably the near-unanimous emphasis on accessibility and the more qualified accounts of efficiency, mirror the construct-level ordering in Table 2 quite closely, while two themes, connectivity challenges and AI suggestion limitations, surface concerns that were not represented as standalone constructs in the questionnaire at all, indicating that the interviews extend rather than merely restate the quantitative findings.

**Table 3**  
**Coding Matrix of Interview Themes**

| Theme                                               | Informants Raising Theme | f (of 7) |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| Platform accessibility/flexibility of access        | INF-01,02,03,04,05,06,07 | 7        |
| Time and effort savings                             | INF-01,02,03,04,05,06,07 | 7        |
| Support for understanding poetic devices            | INF-01,02,03,04,05,07    | 6        |
| Collaboration and peer interaction                  | INF-01,02,03,04,05,06,07 | 7        |
| Critical thinking and confidence                    | INF-01,02,03,04,05,06,07 | 7        |
| Challenge: unstable internet connection             | INF-01,03,04,05,07       | 5        |
| Challenge: generic or inaccurate AI suggestions     | INF-01,05                | 2        |
| Continued use/recommendation to peers and lecturers | INF-01,02,03,04,05,06,07 | 7        |

Read together, Tables 2 and 3 point to a single underlying pattern rather than two separate stories: the highest-rated construct, accessibility, is also the theme raised most uniformly and with the least qualification across all seven informants, whereas the two lowest-rated constructs, efficiency and comprehension, correspond to themes in which informants' language was consistently hedged, describing gains as partial, conditional, or dependent on the student's own subsequent effort. This alignment suggests that the numerical spread in Table 2 is not simply statistical noise but reflects a genuine distinction students draw between the logistical ease of reaching and operating the platform, which they experience almost without qualification, and the platform's contribution to the cognitive work of interpretation, which they experience as real but bounded and requiring their own continued input. This distinction becomes the organizing thread for the three subsections that follow.

#### **Accessibility and Efficiency of Padlet AI in Poetry Assignment Submission**

Accessibility and Ease of Use received the highest construct mean ( $M = 4.37$ ,  $SD = 0.59$ ), driven primarily by strong agreement that students could easily access Padlet AI for their poetry assignments anytime and anywhere during the semester ( $M = 4.58$ ,  $SD = 0.58$ , with 16 of 26 respondents selecting Strongly Agree) and that the platform was user-friendly and easy to navigate ( $M = 4.42$ ,  $SD = 0.64$ ). This quantitative pattern converged closely with the interview data: all seven informants described Padlet AI as accessible, most frequently citing cross-device availability and the absence of installation requirements. INF-03 explained that the platform "became easier and simple to access" once the layout was understood, and could be opened "using my phone or laptop without installing anything." INF-04 similarly identified flexibility as the platform's defining feature, describing access "anytime, anywhere as long as i have access to internet," while INF-06 and INF-07 offered brief but consistent confirmations of ease of upload and use.

Efficiency and Time-Saving, by contrast, received the lowest construct mean ( $M = 3.88$ ,  $SD = 0.71$ ) and the widest spread of responses, particularly on the item concerning whether Padlet AI decreases mental strain when analyzing challenging poems ( $M = 3.69$ ,  $SD = 0.84$ , with two respondents disagreeing). The interviews help explain this comparatively moderate and variable rating: although all seven informants reported some degree of time or effort savings, several qualified this benefit as conditional on their own subsequent editing. INF-01 noted that the platform helped generate ideas faster while stressing that "it's not fully done by the AI" and that personal editing was still needed to make the poem "sound more personal." INF-04 offered the most detailed account, explaining that Padlet AI helped in "creating references and base ideas, so what i need left is to combine or develop the ideas further," which reduced time otherwise spent searching for references. What sharpens this picture further is that the efficiency gain and its limit appear to be two sides of the same mechanism rather than separate findings: the AI accelerates

the front end of the task, generating starting material a student would otherwise have had to locate manually, but explicitly does not perform the back end, the personalization and refinement that both INF-01 and INF-04 describe as still theirs to do. This is precisely why efficiency scored lower and more variably than accessibility: accessibility describes a single, binary experience (the platform either opens easily or it does not), whereas efficiency describes a multi-stage process in which the AI's contribution is real at one stage and absent at the next, producing a moderate average that masks two quite different experiences bundled into one construct.

### **Support for Comprehension, Collaboration, and Critical Thinking**

Comprehension of Poetic Devices ( $M = 3.94$ ,  $SD = 0.73$ ) and Confidence, Relevance and Overall Satisfaction ( $M = 4.08$ ,  $SD = 0.70$ ) were both rated in the moderately-to-strongly positive range, though the item on students' ability to better express their own interpretation of poems using Padlet AI received the lowest individual score among all twenty items ( $M = 3.73$ ,  $SD = 0.92$ ). Six of the seven informants described the tool as helpful for understanding poetic devices such as metaphor, imagery, and symbolism, but their accounts clarify what this "understanding support" actually consisted of: INF-03 reported that the tool helped "break it down in a way that was easier to follow," while INF-01 and INF-05 both emphasized explanations delivered "in simple words" or "simple terms." This suggests that the AI's comprehension-support function was largely to translate technical literary terminology into accessible language rather than to generate novel interpretive insight, which helps account for the lower quantitative score on the expression-of-interpretation item — the tool appears to support recognition and comprehension of devices more consistently than it supports the personal articulation of meaning.

Collaboration and Peer Learning was rated positively overall ( $M = 4.10$ ,  $SD = 0.70$ ), with the item on collaborative features improving peer learning ( $M = 4.19$ ) rated somewhat higher than the item on streamlining group collaboration ( $M = 4.00$ ), which also drew the largest number of neutral responses among the collaboration items (7 of 26). All seven informants linked Padlet AI to improved collaboration, most commonly through the comment feature: INF-05 noted that "there's a comment feature in the padlet that can make collaboration easier," and INF-04 described the shared-board structure as "the key point of Padlet AI." However, INF-02 offered a more measured view, stating the platform "doesn't have intense effect" on collaboration, illustrating that while the shared-board structure was universally recognized, its perceived depth of collaborative impact varied among students, a divergence the quantitative neutral responses also hint at. On critical thinking and confidence, most informants described a positive but bounded contribution: INF-01 said the tool "makes me think more deeply about the poem, not

just read it quickly," while cautioning against depending on the AI "too much," and INF-05 similarly described the AI as something that "just guides me, not replaces my analysis." INF-06 offered a dissenting view, finding Padlet AI's contribution limited "because there is another AI that is more helpful," suggesting perceived benefit may depend on comparison with alternative tools students have also used.

### **Challenges, Interpretive Boundaries, and Willingness to Continue Use**

Two challenges emerged from the interviews that were not directly captured in the questionnaire constructs but help contextualize the moderate efficiency and comprehension scores reported above. Unstable internet connectivity was the most frequently cited challenge, raised by five of the seven informants: INF-05 summarized that "the network is not always stable... it make those harder," and INF-04 stated more bluntly that Padlet AI "means nothing without internet." A second, less frequent but qualitatively significant challenge concerned the accuracy and specificity of AI-generated suggestions. INF-01 explained that suggestions "are not very accurate or don't match the style I want" and that the AI "can't understand complex or very emotional ideas," particularly for "deeper or more personal poems," a concern INF-05 echoed. Notably, INF-02 reported facing no challenges at all, indicating that the salience of both connectivity and AI-accuracy concerns depended partly on individual usage patterns and possibly on local internet infrastructure.

Despite these challenges, all seven informants expressed willingness to continue using Padlet AI in future literature courses, and this willingness was almost always paired with an explicit caution against over-reliance rather than unqualified enthusiasm. INF-01 recommended the tool "as support or inspiration, but still using your own creativity and thinking," and suggested lecturers use it "for group activities or brainstorming." INF-05 offered a nearly identical recommendation, describing the tool as useful "as a tool for support, not something to copy directly," while urging lecturers to "remind us to think independently." INF-04 was the most unreservedly positive, stating they would "definitely" continue using the tool. This consistent pairing of enthusiasm with caution across nearly every informant, together with the comparatively lower quantitative score on the personal-expression item discussed earlier, converges on a single overall pattern: students view Padlet AI's value as real but conditional on maintaining their own interpretive agency over the poem.

### **Discussion**

The integration of quantitative and qualitative findings reveals a coherent picture of how Indonesian ELT students perceive Padlet AI in the context of poetry assignments, and this picture speaks directly to the three research questions posed at the outset of this study. On the first question, concerning perceived accessibility and efficiency, the highest-rated construct, Accessibility and Ease of Use ( $M = 4.37$ ), was corroborated almost unanimously in the interviews, where all seven informants

described the platform as easy to reach across devices and locations without technical barriers to entry. This finding is consistent with earlier research on Padlet in EFL writing contexts, which similarly found that students valued the platform's intuitive interface and low technical burden (Ramadhani et al., 2023). Within the Technology Acceptance Model framework, this high perceived ease of use plausibly explains the generally favorable overall satisfaction reported by students (construct  $M = 4.08$ ), since ease of use has long been identified as a key determinant of sustained technology adoption (Davis et al., 1989). The comparatively lower and more variable rating for Efficiency and Time-Saving ( $M = 3.88$ ,  $SD = 0.71$ ) is illuminated by the qualitative data, which show that time savings were consistently described as conditional rather than absolute. Several informants explained that Padlet AI accelerated the early, idea-generation stage of the assignment but did not eliminate the need for subsequent personal revision, a pattern that echoes findings from broader Indonesian Padlet research showing that digital competence and individual usage patterns shape how consistently efficiency gains are actually experienced (Soro et al., 2023).

On the second question, concerning support for comprehension and collaboration, the moderate rating for Comprehension of Poetic Devices ( $M = 3.94$ ) and, more specifically, the comparatively low score for the item concerning students' ability to better express their own interpretation ( $M = 3.73$ , the lowest of all twenty items) point to an important nuance: Padlet AI appears more effective at explaining poetic devices in accessible language than at helping students articulate their own original interpretive voice. This distinction echoes concerns raised in the broader literature on generative AI in EFL writing and literature instruction, where scholars have noted that AI-generated feedback is more reliable for objective features such as grammar and organization than for tasks requiring genuinely subjective or creative expression (Liu & Wang, 2024). In the specific case of poetry, where meaning is often irreducibly personal and ambiguous, this limitation may be inherent to the technology rather than a shortcoming that can be easily engineered away, a possibility further supported by recent quasi-experimental evidence showing that even carefully designed thematic instruction requires deliberate, teacher-guided scaffolding to move ESL literature students from passive comprehension toward active, personally invested interpretation (Ali, 2025). On the third question, concerning how students position AI assistance relative to their own interpretive judgment, the consistency with which students, almost without exception, framed their endorsement of Padlet AI within an explicit caveat about maintaining independent critical thinking is perhaps the most pedagogically significant finding of this study. Rather than treating AI assistance as a replacement for their own interpretive labor, students in this sample appeared to have developed an intuitive, self-regulated boundary between using AI as a starting point and relying on it as a

final authority, a positioning that is more explicit and more consistently articulated in this poetry-specific context than has typically been reported in studies of AI-assisted expository writing.

These findings extend the Technology Acceptance Model in a modest but meaningful way: while perceived ease of use and usefulness successfully predicted students' generally favorable attitude toward Padlet AI, they did not straightforwardly predict how deeply students allowed the tool into the interpretive core of the task, suggesting that technology acceptance and appropriate reliance may need to be theorized as related but distinct constructs in literature-specific AI research. The findings also lend support to the broader argument that digital and AI-mediated tools function best in literature instruction as scaffolds for the earlier stages of engagement, comprehension, reference-gathering, and peer exchange, while leaving the culminating interpretive act to the learner, a principle consistent with contemporary work on contextual approaches to teaching British and American literary history to English education students, which likewise emphasizes structured scaffolding as a bridge into more independent literary engagement (Ali, 2026). For practitioners, these findings carry several concrete implications. Lecturers should anticipate that connectivity issues will affect a meaningful subset of students and should build flexibility, such as extended deadlines or offline drafting options, into assignment design. Because students appear to use AI assistance most confidently for comprehension support and idea generation rather than for articulating personal interpretation, instructional scaffolding might deliberately separate an AI-assisted comprehension stage from an independent, unassisted interpretation-and-expression stage, a design principle broadly consistent with active-learning approaches shown to shift ESL literature students from passive reception toward active, personally engaged reading of poetry (Ali, 2025). Finally, because students in this sample largely self-regulated their reliance on AI, explicit classroom discussion that reinforces this boundary, rather than either banning or uncritically encouraging AI use, may be the most productive stance for lecturers to adopt.

This study contributes to the growing literature on digital tools in language learning by extending it into a domain, poetry analysis, that has received comparatively little empirical attention relative to expository or argumentative writing, and by doing so specifically within an Indonesian ELT setting where broader digital-linguistic infrastructure and access continue to shape how new tools are taken up in the classroom (Posumah & Ali, 2026). Its originality lies less in demonstrating that students find Padlet AI accessible, a finding broadly consistent with prior Padlet research, and more in showing empirically that students themselves draw a working boundary between AI assistance they consider appropriate for comprehension and assistance they consider inappropriate for personal interpretive judgment. This distinction has practical relevance beyond

poetry alone, since literature courses that use canonical prose works, such as analyses of disillusionment and identity in works like Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises*, face a structurally similar tension between using digital and AI tools to support comprehension while preserving the interpretive labor that gives literary study its pedagogical value (Pabur et al., 2025). By documenting how students navigate this tension in their own words, this study advances understanding of how AI-integrated collaborative platforms can be responsibly incorporated into ELT literature instruction more broadly, not only in the specific case of poetry.

This study is limited by its relatively small and single-institution sample, drawn from only 26 questionnaire respondents and seven interviewees, which constrains the generalizability of the findings beyond this particular cohort and institutional context. The study also relies on self-reported perception data rather than direct measures of poetry analysis quality or interpretive accuracy, meaning that the reported gains in comprehension, confidence, and critical thinking reflect students' own impressions rather than an independent assessment of their actual analytical output. Additionally, because the questionnaire constructs were derived thematically rather than validated through prior psychometric testing, the precision of the numerical distinctions between constructs, particularly the gap between Efficiency and Accessibility, should be interpreted with some caution.

Future research could extend this work by directly comparing student-produced poetry analyses completed with and without Padlet AI assistance, allowing researchers to assess whether the self-regulated interpretive boundary students describe in interviews is reflected in measurable differences in analytical depth or originality. Future studies might also examine whether the patterns observed here hold across different proficiency levels or institutional contexts, including settings with more or less stable internet infrastructure, and could investigate more directly how students distinguish between AI assistance they consider trustworthy for comprehension versus assistance they consider inappropriate for personal interpretation, potentially through think-aloud protocols or longitudinal designs that track whether this self-regulation persists with continued use. Taken together, these findings support a refined version of the three propositions drawn from the literature review: Padlet AI is indeed perceived as highly accessible, its efficiency gains are real but more moderate and contingent on stable connectivity and continued student effort, and students do appear to position AI assistance as a scaffold for comprehension and idea generation rather than a substitute for independent interpretive judgment, a positioning this study contributes new, context-specific evidence toward understanding within Indonesian ELT literature instruction.

## CONCLUSION

This study examined how Padlet AI shapes the accessibility and efficiency of poetry assignment submission among Indonesian ELT undergraduate students, drawing on a convergent mixed-methods design combining a 20-item questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. The findings reveal that students perceive Padlet AI most favorably in terms of accessibility and ease of use, moderately favorably in terms of efficiency, comprehension support, and collaboration, and consistently position the tool as a scaffold for, rather than a replacement of, independent literary interpretation, a pattern constrained primarily by unstable internet connectivity and the occasional genericness of AI-generated suggestions. Beyond confirming that generative AI can ease the logistical burden of literature assignments, this study extends existing scholarship by showing that Indonesian ELT students themselves draw a working boundary between AI assistance they consider appropriate for comprehension and idea generation and assistance they consider inappropriate for personal interpretive judgment, a distinction that refines the broader claim in the literature that AI functions best as a scaffold in poetry instruction by specifying more precisely where students place that scaffold within the interpretive process. In doing so, the findings lend empirical support to sociocultural accounts of scaffolded learning, in which a mediating tool assists a learner's engagement with a task without displacing the learner's own construction of meaning, while also suggesting a refinement to technology-acceptance perspectives: ease of use and perceived usefulness predicted favorable overall attitudes toward Padlet AI, but did not straightforwardly predict how deeply students allowed the tool into their interpretive process, indicating that acceptance and appropriate reliance may be distinct constructs worth theorizing separately in future AI-in-literature research.

These findings carry practical implications for ELT lecturers considering the integration of Padlet AI or similar AI-assisted collaborative platforms into literature instruction. Lecturers should anticipate that connectivity issues will affect a meaningful subset of students and should build flexibility, such as extended deadlines or offline alternatives, into assignment design; because students appear to use AI assistance most confidently for comprehension support rather than for articulating personal interpretation, instructional scaffolding might deliberately separate an AI-assisted comprehension stage from an independent, unassisted interpretation-and-expression stage; and because students in this sample largely self-regulated their reliance on AI, explicit classroom discussion that reinforces this boundary, rather than either banning or uncritically encouraging AI use, may be the most productive stance for lecturers to adopt. This study is limited by its relatively small, single-institution sample and its reliance on self-reported perception data rather than direct measures of poetry analysis quality, and future research could usefully compare student-produced analyses completed with and without Padlet AI

assistance, examine whether these patterns hold across different proficiency levels or institutional contexts, and investigate more directly how students distinguish trustworthy AI comprehension support from inappropriate interpretive substitution, ideally through a longitudinal design that tracks whether this self-regulation persists with continued use. By offering an initial, empirically grounded account of how an AI-integrated collaborative platform is experienced by Indonesian ELT learners in the interpretively demanding domain of poetry assignments, this study contributes to the evolving conversation on how generative AI can be responsibly woven into literature education without displacing the interpretive work that defines it.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmad, M., & Wilkins, S. (2024). Purposive sampling in qualitative research: A framework for the entire journey. *Quality & Quantity*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-024-02022-5>
- Ali, M. I. (2025). From passive to active: Testing the effectiveness of thematic approach in ESL literature classroom. *Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching*, 1(1), 1–16. <https://parspectivepublishing.org/index.php/j-lilla/article/view/3>
- Ali, M. I. (2026). *British history, society, and literature: A contextual approach for English education students*. Penerbit Tahta Media. <http://tahtamedia.co.id/index.php/issj/article/view/1852>
- Bellot, A. R., Plana, M. G.-C., & Baran, K. A. (2025). Redefining literature education: The role of ChatGPT in undergraduate courses. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 35(5), 3185–3201. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-025-00497-3>
- Bhana, A. (2024). Unlocking the power of convergent parallel designs and triangulation for enhanced management and leadership research: A comprehensive theoretical exploration. *Asian Journal of Management, Entrepreneurship and Social Science*, 4(4), 1770–1793. <https://doi.org/10.63922/ajmesc.v4i04.864>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11(4), 589–597. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 328–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238>
- Darwin, R., Mukminatien, N., Suryati, N., Laksmi, E. D., & Marzuki. (2024). Critical thinking in the AI era: An exploration of EFL students' perceptions, benefits,

- and limitations. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 1–18.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2290342>
- Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., & Warshaw, P. R. (1989). User acceptance of computer technology: A comparison of two theoretical models. *Management Science*, 35(8), 982–1003. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.35.8.982>
- Kangasharju, A., Ilomäki, L., & Toom, A. (2024). Online poetry writing at school – Comparing lower secondary students' experiences between individual and collaborative poetry writing. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1380790. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2024.1380790>
- Liu, W., & Wang, Y. (2024). The effects of using AI tools on critical thinking in English literature classes among EFL learners: An intervention study. *European Journal of Education*, 59(4), e12804. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12804>
- Pabur, H. E., Ali, M. I., Husain, S. W. J., Andries, F. A., & Posumah, J. (2025). Analyzing the disillusionment in Ernest Hemingway's *The Sun Also Rises* and its implication on English language learning. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 13(2), 5887–5906. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v13i2.5446>
- Posumah, J., & Ali, M. I. (2026). Digital linguistics: New frontiers in language learning and analysis. *Penerbit Tahta Media*, 1(1). <http://tahtamedia.co.id/issj/article/view/2048>
- Ramadhani, A. S., Dewi, U., Syahnaz, M., & Kihwele, J. E. (2023). The effectiveness of using Padlet in collaborative writing based on students' perceptions. *Child Education Journal*, 5(1), 36–48. <https://doi.org/10.33086/cej.v5i1.3767>
- Shahab, H., Zahur, H., Akhtar, N., & Rashid, S. (2021). Characteristics of ethical leadership: Themes identification through convergent parallel mixed method design from the Pakistan context. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 787796. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.787796>
- Soro, S. H., Komara, E., Fathoni, K., & Witasari, R. (2023). Padlet-based collaborative writing and digital competence in EFL academic writing: Evidence from Indonesian higher education. *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun*. <https://www.journal.scadindependent.org/index.php/jipeuradeun/article/view/2626>
- Storch, N. (2019). Collaborative writing. *Language Teaching*, 52(1), 40–59. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000320>
- Wang, C. (2024). Exploring students' generative AI-assisted writing processes: Perceptions and experiences from native and nonnative English speakers. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-024-09744-3>
- Zou, M., & Huang, L. (2023). To use or not to use? Understanding doctoral students' acceptance of ChatGPT in writing through technology acceptance model.

*Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1259531.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1259531>  
Zuana, M. M. M. (2024). The Viewpoints of Indonesian Pupils Regarding ELT in Shadow Education. *Majapahit Journal of English Studies*, 1(2), 131–155.  
<https://doi.org/10.69965/mjes.v1i2.41>