



TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TOOLS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING: OPPORTUNITIES, CONCERNS, AND PEDAGOGICAL READINESS

Daniel Zulhendra¹

Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri Meulaboh, Indonesia

Email: danilzulhendra@staindirundeng.ac.id

Muhammad Faisal²

Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri Meulaboh, Indonesia

Email: muhammadfaisal@staindirundeng.ac.id

Abstract

Artificial intelligence tools are increasingly influencing English language teaching by supporting lesson planning, materials development, automated feedback, assessment preparation, translation, pronunciation practice, and personalized learning. However, teachers' perceptions remain central because the pedagogical value of artificial intelligence depends not only on technological capability but also on teachers' readiness, ethical awareness, instructional beliefs, and classroom decision-making. This study aims to examine English teachers' perceptions of artificial intelligence tools in English language teaching, focusing on perceived usefulness, pedagogical opportunities, ethical concerns, and professional support needs. The study employed a mixed-method design involving a survey of 86 English teachers and semi-structured interviews with 14 selected teachers. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and correlation analysis, while qualitative data were analyzed thematically. The findings show that teachers generally perceived artificial intelligence tools as useful for preparing teaching materials, generating practice tasks, improving writing feedback, adapting text difficulty, and supporting student engagement. However, teachers also expressed

concerns about accuracy, overdependence, academic integrity, data privacy, algorithmic bias, and reduced student originality. The strongest perceived need was professional development on pedagogical integration, ethical use, prompt design, and classroom policy. The study concludes that artificial intelligence tools can support English language teaching when teachers use them critically, selectively, and transparently. Artificial intelligence should not replace teacher judgment but should function as a pedagogical assistant that strengthens instructional design, feedback quality, and learner support.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; English teaching; teacher perception; pedagogical readiness; AI ethics

Article history

Received
Date:

Accepted
Date:

Published
Date:

A. Introduction

Artificial intelligence has become one of the most influential developments in contemporary education. In English language teaching, AI tools are now used for lesson planning, materials development, automated feedback, translation, and pronunciation support, changing how teachers prepare instruction and respond to student needs.

Integrating AI into English language teaching creates new opportunities. Teachers can use AI to reduce routine workload, develop differentiated materials, create examples, and generate assessment items more efficiently, potentially allowing more time for direct interaction with students.

Despite these opportunities, AI integration cannot be treated as a purely technical issue. Its effectiveness depends on how teachers perceive, select, evaluate, and adapt AI outputs for pedagogical purposes—teacher perception therefore becomes a central factor in successful and responsible AI integration.

Teachers' perceptions of AI tools are likely complex. Some may perceive AI as useful for efficiency, creativity, personalization, and student support, while others are concerned about accuracy,

overdependence, academic integrity, and the erosion of authentic language practice.

In English language teaching specifically, this issue is more acute because language learning involves interaction, meaning-making, identity, culture, and feedback. AI tools may generate fluent output, but teachers must judge whether that output supports genuine language development.

Recent studies have begun to examine generative AI in language education. Kohnke, Moorhouse, and Zou (2023b) investigated language instructors' preparedness for generative AI and highlighted the need for structured professional development, while other studies note a gap between enthusiasm for AI tools and teachers' confidence in using them critically.

In many school contexts, teachers still receive limited professional training on AI. Some learn AI tools independently, while others avoid them due to uncertainty about accuracy, ethics, or institutional policy, producing uneven adoption across schools.

The Indonesian English language teaching context also requires careful attention. Teachers work within curriculum targets, assessment requirements, diverse student proficiency levels, and limited technological infrastructure, all of which shape how AI tools are perceived and used.

This study examines teachers' perceptions of AI tools in English language teaching, asking: (1) how teachers perceive the usefulness of AI tools; (2) what pedagogical opportunities they identify; (3) what ethical and instructional concerns they raise; and (4) what professional support they need for responsible AI integration.

B. Method

This study employed a mixed-method research design. The quantitative component used a teacher perception survey to identify general patterns of teachers' perceptions of AI tools, while the qualitative component used interviews to explain and deepen the survey findings.

The participants were 86 English teachers from secondary schools with varying teaching experience, from less than five years to more than fifteen years, and varying levels of prior AI tool use, from frequent users to teachers who had never used AI in teaching.

The quantitative instrument was a Teachers' Perception of AI Tools in ELT questionnaire consisting of 32 items across four dimensions: perceived usefulness, pedagogical opportunities, ethical and instructional concerns, and professional support needs, rated on a five-point Likert scale.

The qualitative instrument was a semi-structured interview guide exploring teachers' experiences using AI tools, the types of AI-supported activities they had tried, their perceived benefits and concerns, and the kind of support they felt they needed.

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, and correlation analysis to examine relationships between perceived usefulness, ethical concerns, and professional support needs.

Data triangulation was conducted by comparing survey findings with interview data, and member checking was conducted with selected interview participants to confirm that the interpretation accurately represented their views.

C. Finding and Discussion

1. Finding

Findings are presented in four parts: teachers' general perceptions of AI tools, perceived pedagogical opportunities, ethical and instructional concerns, and professional support needs, supported by both survey scores and interview excerpts.

Survey findings indicate that teachers generally had positive but cautious perceptions of AI tools, perceiving them as useful for supporting instructional preparation, generating examples, and saving time, while remaining cautious about accuracy and overreliance.

Table 1. Teachers' Perceptions of AI Tools in English Language Teaching

Dimension	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Perceived usefulness	4.18	0.56	High
Pedagogical opportunities	4.12	0.59	High
Ethical concerns	4.05	0.63	High
Professional support needs	4.31	0.52	Very high

Source: Processed from teacher questionnaire data.

The highest mean score was found in professional support needs, indicating that teachers strongly expected training and institutional guidance even while perceiving AI tools positively.

Interview data supported this finding. Teachers stated that AI tools were helpful but required careful use. Several teachers used AI to generate reading passages, simplify texts, and produce comprehension questions, but always reviewed the output before using it in class.

Teachers also indicated that AI tools were most useful during lesson preparation, used to generate ideas rather than fully replace their own teaching materials.

Teachers identified several pedagogical opportunities, most frequently materials development, differentiated instruction, writing feedback, assessment preparation, and text adaptation.

Table 2. Pedagogical Opportunities Perceived by Teachers

Opportunity	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Generating teaching materials	4.39	0.51	Very high
Adapting text difficulty	4.28	0.58	Very high
Supporting writing feedback	4.16	0.62	High
Creating formative assessment	4.10	0.66	High
Providing	4.24	0.55	Very high

vocabulary examples			
Supporting student engagement	3.95	0.71	High

Source: Processed from teacher questionnaire data.

Teachers valued AI tools most for generating teaching materials, reporting that AI helped them produce reading texts, dialogue examples, vocabulary lists, and grammar exercises more quickly than manual preparation.

Text adaptation was another important opportunity. Teachers used AI to simplify reading passages, adjust vocabulary levels, and create easier or more challenging versions of the same text for mixed-proficiency classes.

Writing feedback was also seen as valuable. Teachers recognized that AI tools could identify grammar errors, suggest sentence improvements, and provide alternative expressions, though they emphasized reviewing AI feedback before sharing it with students.

Assessment preparation was another perceived benefit. Teachers used AI to create multiple-choice questions, short-answer tasks, rubrics, and formative quizzes, while noting that AI-generated questions still required manual checking.

Although teachers recognized the usefulness of AI tools, they expressed strong ethical and instructional concerns, including accuracy, overdependence, academic integrity, privacy, and bias.

Table 3. Teachers' Ethical and Instructional Concerns

Concern	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Inaccurate or misleading outputs	4.34	0.57	Very high
Student overdependence	4.27	0.61	Very high
Academic integrity	4.22	0.66	Very high
Data privacy	4.08	0.69	High
Bias in AI-	3.94	0.72	High

generated content			
Reduced originality in student writing	4.19	0.64	High

Source: Processed from teacher questionnaire data.

The highest concern was inaccurate or misleading outputs. Teachers reported that AI sometimes generated explanations that sounded convincing but were not fully accurate, which made them cautious about relying on AI without verification.

Student overdependence was another major concern. Teachers worried that students might rely on AI to complete writing assignments, translate texts, or answer comprehension questions without developing their own language skills.

Data privacy was also mentioned. Some teachers were unsure whether students should enter personal information or assignment details into AI platforms, and wanted clearer school-level guidelines.

Interview data revealed that teachers' concerns were not anti-technology attitudes. Rather, teachers wanted responsible use, with clear boundaries rather than outright rejection of AI tools.

Survey results showed that professional support needs received the highest overall score. Teachers expected training on AI literacy, prompt writing, ethical use, lesson integration, and assessment policy.

Table 4. Professional Support Needed for AI Integration

Support Area	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Training on AI literacy	4.42	0.50	Very high
Training on prompt design	4.33	0.55	Very high
Ethical guidelines for AI use	4.51	0.49	Very high
Classroom policy for student AI use	4.37	0.57	Very high
Strategies for checking AI outputs	4.29	0.61	Very high

Examples of AI-integrated lesson plans	4.25	0.58	Very high
--	------	------	-----------

Source: Processed from teacher questionnaire data.

Teachers wanted professional development that was practical rather than theoretical, with examples of how to use AI tools to prepare reading materials, design writing feedback, and create speaking or listening activities.

Teachers also emphasized the need for school policy. Without policy, teachers felt uncertain whether AI use should be allowed, restricted, or encouraged, and wanted shared rules regarding AI-assisted assignments.

Correlation analysis showed that perceived usefulness was positively correlated with professional support needs: teachers who perceived AI tools as useful also reported stronger needs for training and institutional guidance.

Table 5. Correlation among Main Variables

Variable	Perceived Usefulness	Ethical Concerns	Professional Support Needs
Perceived usefulness	1.00	0.34**	0.48**
Ethical concerns	0.34**	1.00	0.56**
Professional support needs	0.48**	0.56**	1.00

*Source: Processed from teacher questionnaire data. Note: ** $p < .01$.*

The positive relationship between usefulness and support needs shows that teachers were not resistant to AI; instead, they wanted to use it more effectively, and a similar positive relationship was found between ethical concern and support needs.

2. Discussion

Findings show that English teachers perceived AI tools as useful but requiring critical and ethical control. This balanced perception is important, as teachers did not view AI as a threat to be avoided nor as a replacement for their professional judgment.

The high score for perceived usefulness indicates that teachers recognized the practical benefits of AI—generating teaching materials, adapting reading texts, and creating vocabulary and assessment items more efficiently.

Text adaptation was one of the most valued functions, pedagogically significant because English teachers often teach classes with mixed proficiency levels; AI tools help create differentiated versions of a single text more quickly than manual rewriting.

Writing feedback was another important opportunity. AI tools can identify grammar errors, suggest alternatives, and improve sentence clarity, which is valuable for teachers who handle many student writing assignments and limited time for individual feedback.

Findings also reveal that ethical concerns are central to teacher perceptions. Teachers were most concerned about inaccurate outputs, student overdependence, academic integrity, privacy, and bias in AI-generated content.

The concern about accuracy is especially important in English language teaching, since AI outputs may appear fluent and authoritative but can contain errors, oversimplifications, or examples that are pedagogically inappropriate for a given proficiency level.

Student overdependence and academic integrity are also major issues. Teachers worried that students might use AI to write essays or complete assignments without learning, a concern consistent with broader debates on AI in education.

The high score for professional support needs is one of the most important findings. Teachers need practical training, not only general awareness, to design prompts, evaluate AI output critically, and integrate AI responsibly into lessons.

Correlation analysis strengthens this interpretation: teachers who perceived AI as useful also wanted more professional support, meaning positive perception does not automatically produce confident or ethical use without accompanying training.

The study has several pedagogical implications. English teachers should use AI tools as assistants for preparation, feedback, and adaptation rather than as replacement teachers, and AI-generated materials should always be reviewed before classroom use.

AI integration also requires a shift in teacher role. Teachers become evaluators, curators, prompt designers, and ethical guides, deciding when AI is useful, when it is not, and how to model responsible use for students.

Overall, this study shows that teachers' perceptions of AI tools in English language teaching are multidimensional. Teachers recognize opportunities but also identify risks, and the success of AI integration depends on structured professional support and clear institutional policy.

D. Conclusion

This study examined teachers' perceptions of artificial intelligence tools in English language teaching. Findings show that teachers generally perceived AI tools as useful for generating teaching materials, adapting texts, providing writing feedback, and preparing assessments, while expressing strong ethical and instructional concerns about accuracy, overdependence, academic integrity, privacy, and bias. Professional support needs received the highest overall score, and correlation analysis showed that perceived usefulness and ethical concern were both positively associated with support needs—teachers who saw AI as useful, or who were most concerned about its risks, wanted more training rather than less. These findings suggest that responsible AI integration in English language teaching requires structured professional development, clear school policy, and continued teacher judgment rather than uncritical adoption. Future research may examine how targeted training programs shape teachers' confidence and critical use of AI tools over time, and how student perceptions interact with teacher practices in AI-supported English language classrooms.

Declaration of AI-Assisted Technologies

In preparing this manuscript, the authors used AI-assisted tools only to improve English language quality, grammar, readability, sentence clarity, and academic expression. The AI tools were not used to generate research data, conduct data analysis, produce findings, or draw conclusions. All conceptual arguments, data interpretation, methodological decisions, and scholarly conclusions remain the full responsibility of the authors. The authors carefully reviewed, edited, and verified all AI-assisted outputs to ensure the accuracy, integrity, and originality of the final manuscript.

Bibliography

- Barrot, J. S. (2023). Using ChatGPT for second language writing: Pitfalls and potentials. *Assessing Writing*, 57, 100745. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100745>
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. New York: Routledge.
- Chapelle, C. A. (2009). The relationship between second language acquisition theory and computer-assisted language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93, 741-753. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00970.x>
- Chen, X., Xie, H., & Hwang, G. J. (2020). A multi-perspective study on artificial intelligence in education: Grants, conferences, journals, software tools, institutions, and researchers. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 1, 100005. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2020.100005>
- Chiu, T. K. F., Xia, Q., Zhou, X., Chai, C. S., & Cheng, M. (2023). Systematic literature review on opportunities, challenges, and future research recommendations of artificial intelligence in education. *Computers and Education: Artificial*

- Intelligence, 4, 100118.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100118>
- Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: The state of the field. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20, 22.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00392-8>
- Dodigovic, M. (2007). Artificial intelligence and second language learning: An efficient approach to error remediation. *Language Awareness*, 16(2), 99-113.
<https://doi.org/10.2167/la416.0>
- Godwin-Jones, R. (2022). Partnering with AI: Intelligent writing assistance and instructed language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, 26(2), 5-24.
- Huang, J., Saleh, S., & Liu, Y. (2021). A review on artificial intelligence in education. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 10(3), 206-217.
<https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2021-0077>
- Jeon, J. (2022). Exploring AI chatbot affordances in the EFL classroom: Young learners' experiences and perspectives. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.2021241>
- Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Kuechemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Guennemann, S., Huellermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., Stadler, M., Weller, J., Kuhn, J., & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, 102274.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274>

- Kessler, G. (2018). Technology and the future of language teaching. *Foreign Language Annals*, 51(1), 205-218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12318>
- Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023a). ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. *RELC Journal*, 54(2), 537-550. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868>
- Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023b). Exploring generative artificial intelligence preparedness among university language instructors: A case study. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 5, 100156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100156>
- Lee, I. (2020). Utility and limitation of automated writing evaluation in EFL writing classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(6), 777-798. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819826241>
- Luckin, R., & Cukurova, M. (2019). Designing educational technologies in the age of AI: A learning sciences-driven approach. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(6), 2824-2838. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12861>
- Moorhouse, B. L., Yeo, M. A., & Wan, Y. (2023). Generative AI tools and assessment: Guidelines of the world's top-ranking universities. *Computers and Education Open*, 5, 100151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2023.100151>
- Nguyen, A., Ngo, H. N., Hong, Y., Dang, B., & Nguyen, B. P. T. (2023). Ethical principles for artificial intelligence in education. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28, 4221-4241. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11316-w>
- Ouyang, F., Zheng, L., & Jiao, P. (2022). Artificial intelligence in online higher education: A systematic review of empirical research from 2011 to 2020. *Education and Information*

- Technologies, 27, 7893-7925.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-10925-9>
- Ranalli, J. (2018). Automated written corrective feedback: How well can students make use of it? *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 31(7), 653-674.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1428994>
- Roll, I., & Wylie, R. (2016). Evolution and revolution in artificial intelligence in education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 26, 582-599.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-016-0110-3>
- Son, J. B., Ruzic, N. K., & Philpott, A. (2023). Artificial intelligence technologies and applications for language learning and teaching. *Journal of China Computer-Assisted Language Learning*, 3(1), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jccall-2023-0015>
- Tlili, A., Shehata, B., Adarkwah, M. A., Bozkurt, A., Hickey, D. T., Huang, R., & Agyemang, B. (2023). What if the devil is my guardian angel: ChatGPT as a case study of using chatbots in education. *Smart Learning Environments*, 10, 15.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-023-00237-x>
- Warschauer, M., & Ware, P. (2006). Automated writing evaluation: Defining the classroom research agenda. *Language Teaching Research*, 10(2), 157-180.
<https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168806lr190oa>
- Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 45(3), 223-235.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1798995>
- Zawacki-Richter, O., Marin, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence

applications in higher education: Where are the educators?
International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher
Education, 16, 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>