AJELS can be found on EBSCOhost databases
https://doi.org/10.59960/12.2.a1


# AI Anxiety and Readiness of English Language Teachers and Students: A Philippine University Case Study

**Maria Ana G. De Guzman, Pia Patricia P. Tenedero, Wilfred Gabriel A. Gapas, & Abigail M. Deabanico**

*Received: June 21, 2024*
*Reviewed: October 15, 2024*
*Revised: November 1, 2024*
*Accepted: November 4, 2024*

Corresponding author
**Maria Ana G. De Guzman**
*University of Santo Tomas, Manila, the Philippines; De La Salle University, Manila, the Philippines*
mgdeguzman@ust.edu.ph

**Pia Patricia P. Tenedero**
*University of Santo Tomas, Manila, the Philippines; Macquarie University, Australia*

**Wilfred Gabriel A. Gapas**
*University of Santo Tomas, Manila, the Philippines*

**Abigail M. Deabanico**
*University of Santo Tomas, Manila, the Philippines*

Additional information is available at the end of the article



## Abstract

While the use of generative artificial intelligence (GAI) is steadily gaining ground in schools globally, higher education institutions in the Philippines have been slow to construct policy to govern its use and help ensure responsible application to benefit teaching and learning goals. As of the time of this writing, only one state university has documented in its official website a policy statement relating to AI use. Benchmarking on this practice while acknowledging the unique context of each university, a three-part project was designed to help understand the attitudes and application of GAI in the English language teaching (ELT) in a top-ranking, private university in Metro Manila. The focus on ELT is justified by the critical implication of GAI use in relation to writing and research pedagogy. This quantitative study evaluates the readiness and anxiety of English language teachers and students toward the use of GAI tools and the demographic variables that have statistically significant influence on their self-reported attitudes. The results show that while both teachers and students share a positive attitude and readiness towards integrating AI in the ELT classroom, there are concerns which could be allayed in the presence of robust policies which will define the ethical use of GAI tools in producing authentic assessments. Future investigation could focus on identifying strategies to effectively integrate the use of AI in the ELT classroom.

**Keywords**: Generative artificial intelligence, Chat-GPT, English language teaching, readiness and anxiety, Philippine higher education institution

## Introduction

The growing popularity of Generative AI (GAI) since 2022 has been attracting scholarly attention in recent years due to the unprecedented and disruptive ways this form of technology is modifying usual practices in various domains of human life (Bilgic et al., 2022; Offiah et al., 2023; Prescott & Hanley, 2023; Sollosy & McInerney, 2022). In the context of language education, the scholarly discourses on this issue have tended to focus on what GAI can offer (e.g., Hwang & Chen, 2023; Kohnke et al., 2023; Peña-Acuña & Crismán-Pérez, 2022; Sharadgah & Sa'di, 2022) while marginally problematizing ethical concerns such as GAI (co)authorship in research writing (Stokel-Walker, 2023). Meanwhile, other learning issues have emerged in the classroom, such as students' increasing dependence on GAI, such as ChatGPT, to complete writing assignments instead of composing their own original work. This practice raises questions and concerns associated with plagiarism and the teaching/learning of academic composition. While previous publications – including UNESCO's (Miao et al., 2021) report *AI and Education: Guidance for Policymakers* – tended to highlight the need for a sound AI policy, this rhetoric appears supported by limited empirical work that can concretely inform the language curriculum.

In the Philippines, one of the early policy statements in response to the emergence of GAI tools such as ChatGPT in 2022 is the *Principles for Responsible and Trustworthy Artificial Intelligence* by the University of the Philippines (UP) System (n.d.). This document prescribes values to uphold in integrating AI in teaching/learning and "indicate the way forward on the development and use of AI in the University and the country" (para. 12). In other words, they operate as a framework for all UP campuses and are then reflected through campus-specific guidelines, as was recently the case of the UP Open University (Cañas-Llamas, 2024).

While this state university has released a formal statement about GAI, a comprehensive university in the Philippines has responded by organizing a series of faculty development seminars to inform teachers on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats related to using GAI in academic contexts. The general message in these professional development sessions is to embrace, not resist, AI. However, with this call, an institutional policy still needs to guide the use of GAI in the higher education curricula. For instance, the extent and purposes for teachers and students to use GAI needs to be clarified. In addition, the implications of these allowable practices to learning outcomes and the overall teaching/learning experience remain debatable.

## Artificial Intelligence in (Language) Education

The impact of AI in various aspects of Philippine education has recently been gaining recognition. For example, former Department of Education (DepEd) Secretary Leonor Briones stressed to an audience of DepEd leaders in 2019 how AI can evolve workplaces and societal institutions. In her speech, she called upon education leaders to be prepared to contend with the consequential challenges of AI through professional development and

facility upgrading efforts (Department of Education, 2019). However, at the time, she did not refer to AI's potential for content generation – a development that has become more pronounced in recent years through GAI.

The emergence of GAI can be seen as one stage in the gradual evolution of AI over the past 60 years. Yasmin and Mazhar (2022) traced the groundbreaking work of Warren McCulloch and Walter Pitts' notion of artificial neurons in 1943 as the first effort toward AI, although it was not considered AI at the time. AI was reportedly only first promoted as a concept and an academic discipline by computer scientist John McCarthy in 1956. Since those early years, AI has evolved towards ubiquity: It has been integrated into modern technologies and social media and applied in different disciplines and industries such as healthcare, marketing, entertainment, and education (Bhise et al., 2022). More importantly, generating content across communication modalities has become possible with the emergence of GAI tools in 2022, such as ChatGPT, Midjourney, Stable Diffusion, and Sora.

In language education, teaching and learning approaches have likewise evolved alongside developments in AI and machine learning. Although AI has been available within the language teaching/learning ecosystem through communicative chatbots and robots (e.g., Fryer et al., 2020; Sha, 2009;), automated writing feedbacking tools (e.g., Godwin-Jones, 2022; Lee & Briggs, 2021), and immersive virtual and augmented realities (e.g., Lee & Ahn, 2021; Lee & Park, 2020), these developments point to the enhancement of the capabilities of existing AI-powered tools used in teaching and learning languages. For example, Lin's (2023) short communication on ChatGPT illustrates how it can be utilized as a tool to concordance and create frequency lists and to aid in language instruction. However, she highlights the key limitations of the tool, such as the authenticity of the linguistic data provided and the lack of expertise that teachers usually have in using the tool. Meanwhile, regarding GAI chatbots, Jeon et al. (2023) argue that when they resemble human characteristics, they could be instrumental in providing authentic interactions with learners while increasing their interpersonal communication skills.

More broadly, scholars such as Godwin-Jones (2021) stress that the evolution of GAI tools for language education has supplied its stakeholders with more resources involving big data but must be judiciously used and monitored, considering its prevailing limitations. In this respect, an abundance of scholarship across disciplines has weighed the strengths and drawbacks of GAI tools, most particularly OpenAI's ChatGPT. For example, Su and Yang (2023) explored the possible advantages and difficulties of incorporating AI chatbots – specifically, ChatGPT and GPT-4 – into the classroom. To direct the application of ChatGPT and other GAI in educational settings, the study used the IDEE theoretical framework for educational AI. This framework consists of four parts: defining the intended results, determining the extent of appropriate automation, ensuring action on ethical issues, and assessing efficacy. The study highlighted several advantages of using ChatGPT in the classroom, such as giving students a more effective and individualized learning experience and giving teachers quicker and easier ways to provide feedback. The study, however, also discussed several difficulties that accompany this integration, including the technology's unproven efficacy, data quality constraints, and safety and ethical issues that need to be

properly addressed. Similarly, using SWOT analysis, Farrokhnia et al. (2023) weighed ChatGPT's benefits, drawbacks, limitations, and affordances. Apart from the provision of personalized and real-time feedback, they highlighted its ability to facilitate complex learning and enable accessibility to knowledge. However, they emphasize that its use is possibly inimical to pursuing the desired learning goals, especially when it contributes to the decline of critical thinking skills and the discrimination of vulnerable learners.

Alongside the assessment of specific GAI tools, researchers have also examined the ethical issues around the educational integration of GAI. Based on a systematic analysis of extant research in this nascent field of study, Plata et al. (2023) identified three recurrent themes, namely, enforcing academic integrity, educating both teachers and students on avoiding academic misconduct, and promoting the usage of GAI tools to increase productivity in both the classroom and businesses. It is perhaps understandable that academic integrity is at the core of most of these studies because the generative capacity of tools such as ChatGPT has resulted in the need to reconsider what counts as "original" work (Luo, 2024). Specifically, Luo (2024) calls for "nuanced conceptualisations of originality in higher education policies and practices" (p. 661), where disciplinary demands and intended learning outcomes are considered and collaboration is championed over monitoring for compliance. Originality, in other words, can no longer be seen from a binary either/or perspective but rather on a continuum where "different degrees of collaboration between students and AI" is present (Luo, 2024, p. 661). It is also worth noting that even experienced scholars, such as journal editors and reviewers in fields such as applied linguistics, were mostly unable to distinguish AI-generated texts from human-generated ones (Casal & Kessler, 2023). Casal and Kessler (2023) also point out that there appears to be no consensus among the selected knowledge gatekeepers in applied linguistics, who served as their respondents, on the acceptable threshold of ethical AI use in academic writing and publication. However, beyond dealing with cases of academic dishonesty, researchers such as Floridi et al. (2020) and Vinchon et al. (2023) have forwarded specific ethical factors and practices necessary to protect people's welfare and uphold justice while AI is used.

## Research on Education Stakeholder Dispositions Towards Generative AI

Alongside these assessments of prominent Generative AI tools such as ChatGPT and their accompanying ethical issues, there is also much scholarly interest in the disposition of learners and teachers toward (the value of) these tools. Much of these dispositions were evident in news reports online, particularly during the early weeks of ChatGPT's release. Sullivan et al.'s (2023) content analysis of these articles reporting the disruption of ChatGPT in the higher education milieus of specific Global North countries revealed a mixture of sentiments, particularly on scholarly integrity concerns and its affordances for innovating new assessment methods. However, they noted that the prevailing discourse on the issue at the time, as reported by journalists, had yet to consider how the tool could promote engagement and protect vulnerable learners and the views of learners themselves.

Succeeding studies have begun to explore the dispositions of both groups of stakeholders. Chan and Hu (2023) investigated how university students in Hong Kong felt about using GAI technology in higher education. They discovered that, overall, students had a good view of GAI and were aware of its potential to provide individualized learning support, writing help, and research capabilities. However, issues with accuracy, privacy, ethics, and the effect on social values and individual growth were also mentioned. The study highlights how crucial it is to comprehend student perspectives to properly customize GAI integration. Similarly, Delcker et al. (2024) looked at first-year students' expectations and perceptions of AI tools in higher education. The results indicated a general preference for mindless AI technologies over mindful ones. For common assignments in higher education, such as written papers or presentations, mindless AI tools offer functions like translations or summaries. Students' perceptions of their abilities, knowledge, and attitudes affect their intention to use these tools. The intended usage of AI tools is positively impacted by a positive attitude toward these tools, including an interest in critical conversations about them. Students who are curious about technology are more likely to test it factually, thereby giving them practical knowledge of its advantages and disadvantages. To improve learning processes, the study emphasizes the necessity for educators to support students' AI competencies and include such tools in instructional designs.

Aside from studies investigating students' attitudes toward GAI, Barrett and Pack (2023) investigated how university students and instructors felt about using GAI appropriately during the writing process. The survey found slight differences in opinions between students and teachers on what constitutes "appropriate" usage of GAI tools. It also revealed a deficiency in institutional and classroom readiness for using GAI in instruction. The results emphasized how important it is to have clear policies and provide professional development for teachers to successfully implement GAI in educational settings.

Factors that could possibly influence one's attitude toward AI have been reported by Suárez et al. (2023). Their findings indicate that customers who have a negative attitude towards innovation also continue to have this attitude about embracing AI, although this strong association can be mitigated by age and socioeconomic status. By illustration, younger people with better socioeconomic standing were found to have more positive attitudes about robots and artificial intelligence. Furthermore, opinions are influenced by sex, demonstrating how being male modifies the effects of age and socioeconomic situation on opinions.

Meanwhile, in a study involving university students, Wang et al. (2023) investigated the role of supportive environments and expectancy-value beliefs in fostering university students' intentions to learn AI. Their results illustrate younger students were more influenced by supportive social norms and were more likely to fit the profile of high support and expectancy-value belief than their senior counterparts. The significant other's influence is predicted to wane as people use technology more frequently, depending more on their own prior experiences than on the opinions of others to inform how they see it. Junior students may be more receptive to the feedback they receive from parents, peers, and teachers.

In nurse education, Labrague et al. (2023) investigated the readiness of student nurses in the Philippines to use AI in their studies. Their findings revealed modest barriers

in their readiness to use AI: Self-rated technological competency, knowledge of AI-powered technology, and perceptions of AI applications in nursing practice are factors related to their preparedness. Further, factors such as time restrictions, a lack of computer literacy, and ignorance of AI are possible obstacles. Nursing faculty may better equip aspiring nurses to navigate the AI-driven healthcare environment and improve patient care outcomes by developing technological competency, boosting awareness of AI, and offering practical experiences.

In terms of teachers' perceptions towards using GAI, while there is an acknowledgment of a general threat posed by GAI to academic integrity, teachers appear to have a positive attitude towards it. Darayseh (2023) surmised that science instructors generally favor implementing AI applications in the classroom. Furthermore, the variables that most affect teachers' behavioral intention toward AI applications include self-efficacy, projected benefits, simplicity of use, and attitudes to these tools. Darayseh contends that instructors could have plausibly received some basic training in information skills already, so when they think about incorporating technology into their lessons, they immediately assess the tool's educational value before deciding whether to use it or not. However, the ease with which science instructors are able to integrate AI tools also influences how they feel about utilizing AI to enhance instruction.

The adoption of AI instructional materials and the views of educators, especially in basic education, have also been examined. Hong et al. (2024) explored the attitudes of 226 teachers in South Korea toward the adoption of AI textbooks, particularly their expectations and reservations toward these materials. Based on their survey findings, they found that teachers generally favor the use of such textbooks in their classes and have experienced using them as tools for learning. However, the teachers were concerned about the need to resolve issues surrounding these digital textbooks, such as workload reduction to prepare for classes using AI digital books, financial support, and the establishment of technological infrastructure needed to facilitate these classes.

Meanwhile, Hwang (2024) used a qualitative approach to examine how pre-service English teachers in Korea weigh *TechBoox*, a language textbook configured within a three-dimensional metaverse space. Through reflection papers and semi-structured interviews of 23 participants, it was found that immersive features of the instructional material were widely viewed as a strength since it provides opportunities for context-rich language learning. However, Hwang highlights the technological limitations in integrating such material, including the possible distractions from the learning task. It also underscores the important role of teachers as facilitators of learning and the need for them to develop constantly engaging materials should this resource be used in longer terms.

There are also investigations on student and teacher perceptions toward (G)AI in language education contexts. In their comprehensive review, Alshumaimeri and Alshememry (2024) tackled the usage of AI in English as a foreign language instruction. Their assessment of earlier studies emphasized the impact of AI technologies on language acquisition, including chatbots, augmented reality, and virtual reality. The prospective impacts of GAI on language teaching and learning were highlighted, especially in respect of language skill development,

instructors' and students' opinions on using AI applications, and educators' mistrust of AI technology.

Other publications employed empirical methods to expose these dispositions toward (G)AI technologies. Belda-Medina and Calvo-Ferrer (2022) examined prospective educators' views on the use of conversational AI in language acquisition using a mixed-methods design. Over four weeks, 176 education undergraduate students from Poland and Spain engaged with three conversational agents. Positive findings about participant perceptions were found, especially with attitudes to chatbots and perceived ease of usage. The more moderate behavioral intention scores, on the other hand, suggested using conversational AI in language learning with caution.

Furthermore, Kohnke et al. (2023) investigated the attitudes of higher education English language instructors towards integrating GAI tools in English language teaching. Through qualitative interpretive methods, the study examined instructors' intentions to use AI tools and the institutional support and professional development required for effective implementation. Conducted through semi-structured interviews with twelve instructors at a higher education institution in Hong Kong, the findings highlighted the importance of instructors' familiarity and confidence in using AI-driven teaching tools. The study identified the challenges and concerns language teachers face and emphasized the need for tailored support and professional development programs to address these challenges and ensure the successful adoption of AI technologies in language education.

Overall, these studies on the perceptions of students and teachers in integrating (G)AI have not only shed light on these dispositions but also exposed their implications for teaching praxis. For instance, Chiu (2023) underscored the importance of (a) humility, cooperative learning, and continuing professional development initiatives that enable a growth mindset among educators; (b) prioritizing the development of digital, media, and information literacies, and (c) employing interdisciplinary teaching strategies to equip learners with the needed professional capacities. The research generally underscores that the benefits of GAI in delivering tailored learning experiences and enabling feedback are present, but urgent questions about its effectiveness, the quality of the data, and ethical issues persist.

Although these extant studies could be instrumental in shaping policies on AI use, particularly in the higher education language curriculum, there is an impetus to still investigate the dispositions of both learners and teachers toward the use and integration of GAI in English language courses. Dispositions and perceptions of stakeholders could determine the attainment of quality education and affect learner motivation and success (Könings et al., 2013). In fact, these stakeholder views enable the co-construction of learning spaces (Elen et al., 2007). In this study's context, it can be said that the attitudes and perceptions toward GAI of key education stakeholders can influence the success (or failure) of learning and teaching events where these technologies are integrated.

The present study is the first of a three-part project that investigates the attitudes and potential applications of GAI in the English language curriculum of a Philippine university, which serves as a case study. The overall goal of this project is to engage with the challenges of GAI, primarily through a policy statement similar to the UP document. In this first phase,

using a quantitative approach, we report on the attitudes of both English language instructors and students toward GAI tools in their teaching and learning processes. Specifically, it is guided by two questions:

1. What variables influence students' and teachers' attitudes toward AI in the ELT context?
2. How do the attitudes of English teachers and their students align or diverge?

Addressing these issues is paramount if higher education stakeholders are hoping to properly embrace GAI and its attendant (dis)affordances. The crucial first step is to examine the attitudes of English language teachers and students on the potential role of GAI tools in their teaching and learning experiences. Next, we will discuss the approach we took in this study.

## Methodology

### Locale and Participants

This study used a quantitative approach, analyzing data collected through a survey administered with consent to English language teachers and students enrolled in English language courses in a top, comprehensive university in the Philippines. The university that served as the locale of the study is taken as a representative case of a private higher education institution, given its status as one of the top-ranking universities in the country. In recruiting participants, faculty members of the Department of English and their students were tapped to participate in the study since among all other disciplines, language teaching and learning is most likely to integrate the use of Generative AI. To accomplish this, purposive sampling was applied based on the most recent population data when the research was being conducted. As of the academic year 2022-2023, the Philippine university had 36 English language teachers (full-time and part-time) and 32,397 students enrolled in the various faculties, colleges, and institutes (Eguia, 2023). The Slovin formula was used to account for the sample size of the students invited to take the survey.

$n = N / (1 + Ne2)$
where:
n = sample size
N = population size
e = acceptable margin of error
The computation for the sample size was 395.

It is worth noting that since the total number of teachers in the university's English department is only 36, the Slovin formula was not employed in determining the sample size since 30 is the minimum number of observations sufficient to conduct significant statistical analysis.

**Ethical considerations**

As part of part of a bigger project examining AI attitudes and application in a university English language curriculum, protocols to ensure the ethical conduct of the study were set in place, including informed consent, anonymity and confidentiality, and data management. These research protocols (Research Protocol CB-23-35) were certified and approved by the Philippine Social Science Council.

**Variables**

In this study, teachers' and students' demographic profiles, level of education, level of English, and technology usage were quantitatively analyzed for their correlation with their level of anxiety and readiness to adopt ChatGPT in teaching and learning. Moreover, teachers' years of experience in the profession were also considered as additional variables. The assumption is that the younger, the higher the degree of education, and the more engaged with technology use, the more positive the attitude and the higher the readiness of the respondents to use ChatGPT. For instance, younger respondents may exhibit higher levels of readiness and lower anxiety levels compared with their older counterparts, who may be less acquainted with technology. Also, respondents with higher levels of education may view ChatGPT as being more accessible and valuable for enhancing and enriching teaching learning outcomes.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

These variables are measured through a researcher-made questionnaire, which was first pilot-tested to ensure validity and reliability prior to distribution via Google Form to student- and teacher-respondents. The tool was sampled to 4 teachers and 40 students (10% of the sample size) for two weeks. The pilot testers were selected through convenience sampling. The result was then used to finalize the survey instrument, which was designed to determine attitudes toward the use of AI in academic contexts. It is organized in two parts. The first part consists of short-answer items gathering information about the respondents' demographic profile, level of education, teaching experience (for teacher-respondents), English usage, and technology usage. These variables will be correlated with the responses to the second part, which inquiries into the respondents' attitudes towards AI in terms of their anxieties toward and readiness to use it. The statements in these sections are adapted from two related studies. The statements on the anxiety level of respondents are adapted from Hemachandran et al.'s research (2022) on challenges and risks related to the application of large language models in

education. The statements on the readiness to use AI are adapted from the study of Zhu et al. (2023) on strategies for integrating ChatGPT in education settings.

After gathering the survey responses, four statistical tests were applied to determine statistical correlation of variables. These tools are discussed in turn.

**Cronbach's Alpha value for consistency and reliability**

The Cronbach Alpha value usually ranges from 0 to 1. A zero value indicates that there is no correlation between the items at all. A value of one means that the items are perfectly correlated. The acceptable range is usually .7 and any value near .7 indicates that items are minimally acceptable, but not ideal.

**Frequency and Percentage (Demographic Data)**

Frequency analysis deals with the number of events for each response choice in the questionnaire. The frequency of responses was then transformed into percentages.

**Means and Standard Deviation (Likert Scale Responses)**

To gain valuable insights into the participants' perceptions and behaviors calls for the use of standard deviation in the analysis of responses to a Likert-scale questionnaire measuring teachers' and students' attitudes, levels of awareness, and use of ChatGPT for academic purposes. This analysis is useful to understand the degree of agreement or disagreement among teachers and students regarding their attitudes, degree of awareness, and usage of ChatGPT.

**ANOVA (Differences in attitudes, degree of awareness, and usage of ChatGPT)**

In comparing the dis/continuities regarding the variables in the study, the responses were subject to Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The results of the data analyses using these statistical approaches are discussed next.

## Results

First, we describe the profile of the English language instructors and students, whose attitude toward the academic use of GAI we examined. Their gender, age, educational, linguistic, and digital background are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1**
***Demographics of English Language Students and Teachers***

| Demographic Variable | Category | Student (n=432) | Faculty (n=36) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Percentage | Percentage |
| **Gender** | Male | 36.3 | 29.6 |
| | Female | 63.7 | 70.4 |
| **Age** | 11-17 | 5.8 | - |
| | 18-24 | 93.5 | - |
| | 25-34 | - | 7.4 |
| | 35-44 | - | 44.4 |
| | 45-54 | - | 33.3 |
| | 55-above | - | 14.8 |
| **Affiliation** | Accountancy | 8.8 | - |
| | Commerce & Business Admin | 16.4 | - |
| | Education | 8.3 | - |
| | Arts & Letters | 29.1 | 100.00 |
| | Engineering | 9.5 | - |
| | Fine Arts & Design | .5 | - |
| | Music | 7.2 | - |
| | Nursing | 6.9 | - |
| | Tourism & Hospitality Management | 9.2 | - |
| | Ecclesiastical Studies | 4.2 | - |
| **Level of Education** | Undergraduate | 98.4 | - |
| | College Graduate | .9 | - |
| | MA | | 59.25 |
| | PhD | | 40.74 |
| **English Use** | First Language | 9.7 | - |
| | Second Language | 83.6 | 100.00 |
| | Foreign Language | 5.8 | - |

Table 1 continued...

| Demographic Variable | Category | Student (n=432) | Faculty (n=36) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Percentage | Percentage |
| **Digital Device Use** | Laptop/Desktop | 9.5 | 3.70 |
| | Laptop/Desktop, Smartphone | 85.0 | 55.60 |
| | Laptop/Desktop, Smartphone, Others | 5.6 | 40.70 |
| **AI Awareness** | ChatGPT | 74.8 | 55.60 |
| | ChatGPT & Others | 25.2 | 44.40 |
| **AI App Use** | Yes | 70.7 | 66.70 |
| | No | 29.1 | 33.30 |

Table 1 shows the demographic profile of the students and faculty, which gives an idea of the overall representation of the respondents. What is immediately salient is the higher representation of females for both students (63.7%) and faculty (70.4%). Male respondents for students comprised only 36.3% of 432 respondents while the male faculty made up only 29.6% of the total academic staff for the English department of the university. We recognize that this disproportion in gender with the overrepresentation of females could impact the study's findings as attitudes and readiness might differ across genders. In terms of age, the majority of students were between the ages of 18 and 24 years old while the majority of faculty were middle-aged. As expected, the greater majority of student respondents were undergraduates. The academic staff on the other hand had 59.25% with MA degrees while 40.74% had PhDs. Given the status of English as an official language in the Philippines, it is unsurprising that a large proportion of students (85%) and all academic staff speak English as a second language.

In terms of device usage, both teachers and students lean more toward using their laptops or desktop and their smartphones. When asked about their awareness of the various Generative AI applications, a great proportion of teachers and students reported awareness of ChatGPT, while the remaining know of other Generative AI applications aside from ChatGPT.

The last section of the survey asks the respondents regarding their use of AI applications. Results show that 70.7% of students and 66.7% of teachers reported using AI applications. This indicates a notable prevalence of AI application usage among the respondents.

These demographic variables were then correlated to determine which ones potentially influence English language students' and teachers' attitudes toward AI use for school purposes. We present and discuss in turn quantitative answers to the two research questions.

**Research Question 1: What variables influence students' and teachers' attitudes toward AI use in the ELT context?**

To answer the first research question, we examined the attitude of the two cohorts toward AI use in ELT context in terms of anxiety and readiness. Tables 2 and 3 present the factors that seem to shape teachers' and students' anxiety and readiness to use AI to help them teach/ learn English.

**Table 2**
***Correlation between Variables and Anxiety Statements***

| **Students** | | | **Teachers** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Variables** | **t** | **Sig** | **Variables** | **t** | **Sig** |
| Gender | 0.772 | .471 | Gender | -0.656 | .519 |
| Age | -1.758 | .079 | Age | 0.288 | .776 |
| Education Level | -0.463 | .644 | Education Level | -2.150 | .045 |
| Device Use | 0.047 | .971 | Device Use | -0.145 | .886 |
| AI Awareness | 1.316 | .189 | AI Awareness | -0.281 | .782 |
| AI App Use | 1.952 | .052 | AI App Use | 1.654 | .115 |
| | | | Teaching Experience | 0.327 | .748 |

Table 2 shows the result of the multiple regression to predict the relationship between the attitudes (via anxiety statements) of students and teachers from gender, age, educational level, device use, AI awareness, and usage of AI applications. For the student data, all variables except AI App Use, do not statistically significantly predict attitudes towards Generative AI $F$=1.221, p.>.05. This means, AI App Use result suggests a marginally significant correlation. On the other hand, while most variables do not significantly predict teachers' attitudes towards AI use. However, comparing the results of teachers with those of their students, the results seem to indicate that teachers' attitudes seem to be impacted by their level of education (.045, p<.05), suggesting that English teachers with higher level of education may have lower levels of anxiety toward AI use. On the other hand, students' attitudes are slightly influenced by their use of AI applications.

**Table 3**
***Correlation between Variables and AI Readiness Statements***

| **Students** | | | **Teachers** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Variables** | **t** | **Sig** | **Variables** | **t** | **Sig** |
| Gender | -4.451 | .000 | Gender | -0.952 | .353 |
| Age | 2.438 | .015 | Age | 0.313 | .758 |
| Education Level | -1.526 | .128 | Education Level | -0.035 | .763 |
| Device Use | 0.660 | .510 | Device Use | -0.611 | .549 |
| AI Awareness | 2.628 | .009 | AI Awareness | 0.472 | .643 |
| AI App Use | 0.826 | .409 | AI App Use | -0.327 | .748 |
| | | | Teaching Experience | -0.274 | .787 |

Table 3 accounts for the relationship between the attitudes (via readiness statements) of teachers and students in using AI and demographic variables. The results show that for the student-respondents in the study, gender (.000), age (.015), and awareness of AI (.009) seem to predict their readiness to use AI (similar with Suarez et al., 2023). None of the other independent variables seem to predict AI readiness for the teacher respondents. For the teacher respondents, none of the variables correlate with their readiness to adopt Generative AI. Overall, the results show a disparity in the factors that influence teachers' and students' readiness to use AI. This may be indicative of other factors that may contribute to teachers' readiness.

**Research Question 2: How do the attitudes of English teachers and their students align or diverge?**

The second research question seeks to compare any similarities or differences in the attitudes of teachers and students (in terms of anxiety and readiness statements) towards Generative AI. By identifying areas of (dis) continuities, results could shed light to areas that should be taken into consideration when integrating AI into the curriculum.

**Table 4**
***Teacher and Student Survey Items About Anxiety Toward AI***

| **Item** | **Statement** | **Respondent** | **Mean** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 (S,T) | I am concerned that I might violate copyright policies when I use AI-generated content. | Students | 4.04 |
| | | Faculty | 4.03 |
| 2 (S,T) | I am concerned that AI-generated content may produce information that is biased. | Students | 3.90 |
| | | Faculty | 3.70 |

Table 4 continued...

| Item | Statement | Respondent | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 (S,T) | I am concerned that I might rely too heavily on AI applications to fulfill my academic work. | Students | 3.17 |
| | | Faculty | 2.85 |
| 4 (S,T) | I am concerned that I do not have enough understanding and expertise in using generative AI. | Students | 2.88 |
| | | Faculty | 3.48 |
| 5 (T) | For teachers: I am concerned about my ability to distinguish student-created versus AI-generated content. | Faculty | 3.85 |
| 5 (S)<br>6 (T) | I am concerned that the AI applications are costly in terms of subscription and training. | Students | 2.97 |
| | | Faculty | 3.25 |
| 6 (S)<br>7 (T) | I am concerned that my personal information may be compromised if I use AI applications. | Students | 3.79 |
| | | Faculty | 3.81 |
| 7 (S)<br>8 (T) | I am concerned that the content generated by AI may not be accurate. | Students | 4.08 |
| | | Faculty | 4.18 |
| 8 (S)<br>9 (T) | I am concerned that I might not be able to create my own content without depending on AI applications. | Students | 2.82 |
| | | Faculty | 2.55 |

For item no. 2 in the survey, both cohorts share a moderate concern regarding the possible bias arising from content generated from various GAI platforms as the repository of information where the system learns from stems from existing data which may present biases and inaccuracies. Such acknowledgment is significant, especially in the academe where there is a more pressing need to assess and evaluate the accuracy of information or content that is sourced from GAI. On the other hand, both teachers and students appear to share opinion about the potential inaccuracies of information generated by AI. Teachers and students generated scores of 4.18 and 4.08, respectively, highlighting the need for strong quality assurance measures to safeguard the accuracy of information cited, especially as more online platforms opt for AI assistance.

When it comes to the teachers' sentiments of being able to detect the authenticity of assessments, the Likert scale result was 3.85, which is an indication of an increased level of apprehension. This may indicate that the issue is deemed by teachers as a pressing concern, which may be due to experiences related to AI-generated content in the academe.

An area of concern for both groups is data privacy should one subscribe to an AI platform. The result of 3.81 for teachers and 3.79 for students is an acknowledgment of the potential risks involved concerning the safety of one's personal/sensitive information when one subscribes to AI services.

Finally, when it comes to being dependent on the help of AI for generating content, both teachers and students have some degree of concern though not generally high. This shows that while both groups acknowledge the capabilities of AI in generating content, they maintain a certain degree of confidence in their abilities to produce work with AI assistance.

Furthermore, subscription and training costs were not seen as areas of concern by both respondents.

In summary, the results show a shared concern among teachers and students over copyright issues, thus emphasizing the need for clear-cut policies on the parameters that surround what is considered ethical AI use. Furthermore, there is also a shared concern over possible inaccuracies of information and bias that AI may provide especially since the database where AI derives its data back to 2022. It is also worth taking note the marked apprehension of teachers regarding the plausible effect of AI on authentic assessment. On the other hand, teachers and students showed confidence in their ability to create content independently which may allay fears of overly relying on AI. Finally, cost and training requirements do not appear to influence attitudes among teachers and students.

**Table 5**
***Teacher and Student Survey Items About Readiness to Use AI***

| Item | Statement | Respondent | Mean |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Using AI as an assistant in creating learning materials, such as reviewers, notes, PowerPoint presentations, lectures, etc. | Students | 2.96 |
| | | Faculty | 3.19 |
| 2 | Using AI as a virtual tutor for answering questions | Students | 3.02 |
| | | Faculty | 2.85 |
| 3 | Using AI as a virtual learning buddy, e.g., Presentation Coach and other AI applications that give feedback and assessment on your work | Students | 3.13 |
| | | Faculty | 3.0 |
| 4 | Using AI as a reflective learning tool, i.e., generating reflection essays through AI instead of writing your own reflections | Students | 2.04 |
| | | Faculty | 2.19 |
| 5 | Using AI as expert support for completing complex tasks, e.g., using AI in essay-writing assignments | Students | 2.23 |
| | | Faculty | 2.33 |
| 6 | Using AI as a stimulus for critical thinking, e.g., engaging in debates with chatbots | Students | 2.53 |
| | | Faculty | 2.70 |

Table 5 shows the difference in perceptions between students and teachers regarding their readiness to utilize GAI. In terms of using GAI for the development of learning materials, such as reviews, notes, PowerPoint presentations and lectures, both students (2.96) and teachers (3.19) reported a positive attitude. This means that both groups of respondents recognize the potential benefits of utilizing AI in the development of both teaching and learning materials.

Moreover, the same disposition can be seen towards the use of AI as a "learning buddy", for both students (3.13) and teachers (3.0). This indicates the respondents' readiness to utilize AI to generate feedback and assessment.

On the other hand, the opposite sentiment can be seen from both student (2.04) and teacher (2.19) respondents when it comes to using AI to generate reflections. This may be attributed to the fact that reflections are deeply subjective and involve an introspective process of knowing. This may indicate that both groups have reservations about AI's ability to generate and accurately capture such a complex and high-order level of human thinking.

Also, the same stance can be observed from both respondents (students = 2.23; teachers = 2.33) when it comes to using AI as expert support for completing tasks and as a stimulus for critical thinking (students = 2.53; teachers = 2.70). This is an indication of both groups' moderate levels of readiness. This implies the need for further exploration to increase awareness of the potential benefits and limitations of AI in assisting higher-order thinking skills.

Overall, the findings reflect a general readiness among teachers and students to use AI to increase productivity and assist in teaching and learning. On the other hand, both groups are uncertain of AI's ability to do higher-order thinking skills.

## Discussion

This study set out to investigate how English language instructors and students felt about integrating GAI in the teaching and learning continuum. Results show that respondents' demographic variables such as gender, age, educational attainment, device use, and awareness of AI attitudes toward AI do not predict their anxiety towards AI use. In terms of the degree of AI app use, results imply that it has a significant association with students' anxiety to some extent. This signifies that students' level of anxiety regarding AI use in the ELT environment may be slightly influenced by their past experiences with AI applications. This finding agrees with the study of Wang et al. in 2023. In their study, university students' intentions to learn AI correlated with their positive experiences with AI, which therefore increased the value they put towards learning and engaging with AI. This reinforces the idea that past experiences shape students' perception of technology.

The results for teacher participants indicate that all demographic variables, except for educational attainment, did not influence opinions on integrating AI into the curriculum. This implies that teachers' attitudes and readiness to integrate AI in the classroom are affected by the availability of comprehensive training on AI tools. This opinion is reinforced by the findings of Akanzire et al. in 2023. Their study investigated how Ghanaian teachers felt about GAI tools, particularly ChatGPT and GPT-4. Their results highlighted the significance of continuous teacher training in AI most especially striking a balance between AI use and present, traditional teaching methods. This alignment emphasizes the importance of continuing professional development programs to equip teachers to effectively integrate AI in the classroom. Moreover, the AI training for teachers is recommended to include a more contextualized form of preparation based on the specific teaching needs of an English language educator (Luckin et al., 2022). Thus, administrators of learning institutions should prioritize teacher preparation courses on AI integration to allow for a more fluid transition.

When it comes to the readiness of the respondents toward AI use, the findings of the study show that among student respondents, preparedness to employ AI in the ELT context was significantly predicted by factors such as gender, age, and awareness of the technology. In a study by Labrague et al. (2023) that investigated Filipino student nurses' readiness to adopt AI technology, results reveal that proficiency with technology was a predicting factor while gender was not. In the case of this study, while gender is identified as a predictor, it is crucial to remember, that this finding might have been impacted by the disproportionate number of male and female respondents. Further investigation may be warranted to corroborate this finding.

The preparedness of pupils to accept AI was not significantly correlated with other demographic characteristics. In contrast, the results of the study indicate that demographic variables like gender, age, educational level, device use, AI awareness, and AI app use may not be strong predictors of teachers' readiness to embrace AI technologies in ELT. Also, the results of this study show that English teachers' readiness to adopt Generative AI is not influenced by any of the demographic variables. This contrasts with those of Moorhouse (2024) which shows that AI app use correlates with teachers' perceptions towards the potential of GAI tools to enhance their professional work. It is worth taking note that while a demographic variable may contribute to shaping people's behavior and perception towards AI, factors such as prior experience, knowledge, and institutional support, may have an influence on the readiness of teachers to adopt AI in the classroom.

The study has also shed light on the shared concerns and perspectives, as well as areas of divergence between the teachers and students, which we now discuss in turn.

**Copyright Issues**

The respondents of the study shared apprehensions towards the use of AI as plausible copyright issues are associated with content generated using AI. This concern may indicate an awareness of the ethical and legal consequences of utilizing AI-generated content in the academic setting. This is especially true for English courses that require students to produce authentic content in academic writing tasks or for oral communication purposes. This anxiety may be aggravated by the lack of clear policies and guidelines about the allowable use of AI in the ELT course plans.\

**Bias and Possible Factual Error**

All the participants of the study expressed concern regarding the potential bias and inaccuracies with content that is generated with AI. This finding highlights the importance of critically and diligently assessing the authenticity of student assessment.

### Uncertainty about the Authenticity of Assessments

The teachers in the study are more concerned about whether they can detect if assessments are authentic or not, that is, whether they are products of students' effort, rather than AI. Such anxiety stresses the necessity for educators to have plans and readily available resources to competently judge the authenticity of assessments especially those produced by AI. In the ELT context, this emphasizes the need to have metrics in place (e.g., diagnostic tests, benchmarking activities) that would give the teacher a baseline that could be used to compare with students' final output.

### Security Concerns over Data Protection

The participants of the study voiced concerns over the potential security risks associated with sensitive and personal data should AI be integrated into English language curriculum. Such observation highlights the need for the presence of solid protocols that would address the security of data privacy in the integration of GAI in the curriculum.

### Confidence in Abilities vs. AI Dependence

Both groups exhibit a degree of confidence in their ability to generate their own content, even with their awareness of the possible advantages of using AI. Nonetheless, there is a certain degree of willingness to use AI for specific jobs as seen by the positive attitude about employing AI as a "learning buddy" to generate feedback and assessment in academic requirements like written drafts, or oral communication requirements in public speaking. On the other hand, participants have reservations about utilizing AI in the writing of reflections (production of learning logs, learning journals, portfolio assessment) and deep thinking. This may signify the participant's doubt about the GAI's capacity to mimic intricate human thought processes to be able to produce reflections. Despite the popularity of research on AI in the field of English language education, more studies need to be done to explore the (dis) ability of AI to generate output based on human higher-order thinking skills.

Overall, the (dis)continuities in ELT teachers' and students' attitudes toward generative AI are revealing of their compound awareness of the possible gains, challenges, as well as the ethical issues surrounding GAI integration in the classroom. The results of the study highlight the importance of developing critical thinking abilities, having solid guidelines to ensure data protection, and creating precise standards and procedures to successfully negotiate the rapidly changing AI landscape in educational settings.

## Conclusion

The presence of GAI especially in the ELT context together with the possible advantages it poses to the teaching and learning continuum has made the call for its adoption and integration.

While much dialogue and concern has focused on its potential threat to academic integrity as well as the accuracy and reliability of the information it can generate, it should be noted that there is no point avoiding GAI or even dismissing its existence. Learning institutions should start having a dialogue on how to work around such technology effectively. It is therefore imperative that solid regulations and policies be set in place to safeguard academic honesty, data privacy, and other attendant concerns.

The findings of this study show that both students and English teachers share similar attitudes and readiness toward utilizing AI. However, the presence of apprehensions in certain areas reflects the participants' understanding and awareness of the potential impact AI may have on ELT pedagogical processes. Moreover, teachers' concern about their inability to distinguish between student-made versus AI-generated content underscores the need for teachers to be trained in ways to detect the difference between these two outputs, including the use of effective AI-detectors. At the same time, to avoid an overly suspicious disposition toward students' output (thinking that it could be purely AI generated), teachers could develop critical and creative strategies to allow the proper integration of AI technologies in the classroom with clear limits to ensure that students' final written output will still be largely a product of their own human writing and thinking abilities, only assisted (not dominated) by AI. To realize this, it is pertinent that school administrators, language educators, and technology developers collaborate to create robust guidelines and policies that help ensure the ethical use and effectiveness pedagogy and assessment in the light of GAI integration in the English language curriculum.

## References

Akanzire, B. N., Nyaaba, M., & Nabang, M. (2023). Perceptions and preparedness: Exploring teacher educators' views on integrating generative AI in Colleges of Education, Ghana. *Social Science Research Network*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4628153

Alshumaimeri, Y. A., & Alshememry, A. K. (2024). The extent of AI applications in EFL learning and teaching. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies, 17*, 653-663. https://doi:10.1109/TLT.2023.3322128

Barrett, A., & Pack, A. (2023). Not quite eye to A.I.: Student and teacher perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence in the writing process. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 59*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00427-0

Belda-Medina, J., & Calvo-Ferrer, J. R. (2022). Using chatbots as AI conversational partners in language learning. *Applied Sciences, 12*(17), 8247. https://doi.org/10.3390/app12178427

Bhise, A., Munshi, A., Rodrigues, A., & Sawant, V. (2022). Overview of AI in education. In P. P. Churi, S. Joshi, M. Elhoseny, & A. Omrane (Eds.), *Artificial intelligence in higher education: A practical approach* (pp. 31-62). CRC Press.

Bilgiç, E., Gorgy, A., Yang, A., Cwintal, M., Ranjbar, H., Kahla, K., Reddy, D. S., Li, K., Ozturk, H., Zimmermann, E., Quaiattini, A., Rahimi, S. A., Poenaru, D., & Harley, J. M. (2022). Exploring the roles of artificial intelligence in surgical education: A scoping review. *The American Journal of Surgery*, *224*(1), 205–216. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjsurg.2021.11.023

Cañas-Llamas, A. (2024, January 19). UPOU releases Guidelines on AI Use for Teaching and Learning - University of the Philippines Open University. *University of the Philippines Open University*. https://www.upou.edu.ph/news/upou-releases-guidelines-on-ai-use-for-teaching-and-learning/

Casal, J. E., & Kessler, M. (2023). Can linguists distinguish between ChatGPT/AI and human writing? A study of research ethics and academic publishing. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, *2*, 100068. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2023.100068

Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Students' voices on generative AI: Perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*, 43. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8

Chiu, T. K. F. (2023). The impact of Generative AI (GenAI) on practices, policies, and research direction in education: A case of ChatGPT and Midjourney. *Interactive Learning Environments*. Advanced online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2023.2253861

Darayseh, A. A. (2023). Acceptance of artificial intelligence in teaching science: Science teachers' perspective. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *4*, 100132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100132

Department of Education. (2019, August 29). *Briones discusses education in fourth Industrial Revolution, age of artificial intelligence* [Press release]. https://www.deped.gov.ph/2019/08/29/briones-discusses-education-in-fourth-industrial-revolution-age-of-artificial-intelligence/

Delcker, J., Heil, J., Ifenthaler, D., Seufert, S., & Spirgi, L. (2024). First-year students AI-competence as a predictor for intended and de facto use of AI-tools for supporting intended processes in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *21*, 18. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00452-7

Eguia, A. D. (2023, August 15). UST welcomes 39,152 students on first day of AY 2023-2024. *The Flame*. https://abtheflame.net/news/2023/08/ust-welcomes-39152-students-on-first-day-of-ay-2023-2024/

Elen, J., Clarebout, G., Léonard, R., & Lowyck, J. (2007). Student-centred and teacher-centred learning environments: What students think? *Teaching in Higher Education*, *12*, 105-117. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510601102339

Farrokhnia, M., Banihashem, S. K., Noroozi, O., & Wals, A. (2023). A SWOT analysis of ChatGPT: Implications for educational practice and research. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *61*(3), 460–474. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2195846

Floridi, L., Cowls, J., King, T. C., & Taddeo, M. (2020). How to design AI for social good: Seven essential factors. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, *26*, 1771-1796. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-020-00213-5

Fryer, L. K., Coniam, D., Carpenter, R., & Lăpușneanu, D. (2020). Bots for language learning now: Current and future directions. *Language Learning and Technology*, *24*(2), 8-22. https://hdl.handle.net/10125/44719

Godwin-Jones, R. (2021). Big data and language learning: Opportunities and challenges. *Language Learning and Technology*, *25*(1), 4-19. https://hdl.handle.net/10125/44747

Godwin-Jones, R. (2022). Partnering with AI: Intelligent writing assistance and instructed language learning. *Language Learning and Technology*, *26*(2), 5-24. https://hdl.handle.net/10125/73474

Hemachandran, K., Verma, P., Pareek, P., Arora, N., Kumar, K. V. R., Ahanger, T. A., Pise, A. A., & Ratna, R. (2022). Artificial Intelligence: a universal virtual tool to augment tutoring in higher education. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/1410448

Hong, S. J., Hwang, Y., Park, Y., & Lee, S. (2024). Expectations and concerns about adopting AI digital textbooks: Based on investigation of teachers' use of AI and digital tools. *The Journal of Studies in Language*, *40*(1), 7-20. https://doi.org/10.18627/jslg.40.1.202405.7

Hwang, G.-J., & Chen, N.-S. (2023). Editorial position paper: Exploring the potential of generative artificial intelligence in education: Applications, challenges, and future research directions. *Educational Technology and Society*, *26*(2). https://www.jstor.org/stable/48720991

Hwang, Y. (2024). Reconceptualization of textbook with the metaverse: Pre-service English teachers' experiences and perceptions of designing TechBoox. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2024.2378771

Jeon, J., Lee, S., & Choe, H. (2023). Beyond ChatGPT: A conceptual framework and systematic review of speech-recognition chatbots for language learning. *Computers and Education*, *206*, 104898. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2023.104898

Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023). Exploring generative artificial intelligence preparedness among university language instructors: A case study. *Computers & Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *5*, 100156. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100156

Könings, K. D., Seidel, T., Brand-Gruwel, S., & Van Merriënboer, J. J. G. (2013). Differences between students' and teachers' perceptions of education: profiles to describe congruence and friction. *Instructional Science, 42*(1), 11–30. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-013-9294-1

Labrague, L. J., Aguilar-Rosales, R., Yboa, B. C., & Sabio, J. B. (2023). Factors influencing student nurses' readiness to adopt artificial intelligence (AI) in their studies and their perceived barriers to accessing AI technology: A cross-sectional study. *Nurse Education Today*, *130*, 105945. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2023.105945

Lee, S.-M., & Briggs, N. (2021). Effects of using machine translation to mediate the revision process of Korean university students' academic writing. *ReCALL*, *33*(1), 18-33. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344020000191

Lee, S.-M., & Ahn, T.-Y. (2021). Pre-service teachers' learning experience of using a virtual practicum simulation with AI learners. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, *24*(4), 107-133. https://doi.org/10.15702/mall.2021.24.4.107

Lee, S.-M., & Park, M. (2020). Reconceptualization of the context in language learning with a location-based AR app. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *33*(8), 936-959. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.16092545

Lin, P. (2023). ChatGPT: Friend or foe (to corpus linguists)? *Applied Corpus Linguistics*, *3*, 100065. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acorp.2023.100065

Luckin, R., Cukurova, M., Kent, C., & Du Boulay, B. (2022). Empowering educators to be AI-ready. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *3*, 100076. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100076

Luo, J. (2024). A critical review of GenAI policies in higher education assessment: A call to reconsider the "originality" of students' work. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *49*(5), 651-664. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2309963

Miao, F., Holmes, W., Huang, R., & Zhang, H. (2021). AI and education: guidance for policy-makers. In UNESDOC Digital Library (No. 978-92-3-100447–6). United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://doi.org/10.54675/PCSP7350

Moorhouse, B. L. (2024). Beginning and first-year language teachers' readiness for the generative AI age. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *6*, 100201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100201

Offiah, A. C., Atalabi, O. M., Epelman, M., & Khanna, G. (2024). Disparities in paediatric radiology research publications from low- and lower middle-income countries: A time for change. *Pediatric Radiology*, *54*(3), 468–477. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00247-023-05762-y

Peña-Acuña, B., & Crismán-Pérez, R. (2022). Research on Papua, a digital tool with artificial intelligence in favor of learning and linguistic attitudes towards the learning of the English language in students of Spanish language as L1. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 1019278. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1019278

Plata, S. M., De Guzman, M. A., & Quesada, A. (2023). Emerging research and policy themes on academic integrity in the age of ChatGPT and Generative AI. *Asian Journal of University Education*, *19*(4), 743–758. https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v19i4.24697

Prescott, J., & Hanley, T. (2023). Therapists' attitudes towards the use of AI in therapeutic practice: considering the therapeutic alliance. *Mental Health and Social Inclusion*, *27*(2), 177-185. https://doi.org/10.1108/MHSI-02-2023-0020

Sha, G. (2009). AI-based chatterbots and spoken English teaching: A critical analysis. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *22*(3), 269-281. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588220902920284

Sharadgah, T. A., & Sa'di, R. A. (2022). A systematic review of research on the use of artificial intelligence in English language teaching and learning (2015-2021): What are the current effects? *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, *21*, 337-377. https://doi.org/10.28945/4999

Sollosy, M., & McInerney, M. (2022). Artificial intelligence and business education: What should be taught. *The International Journal of Management Education*, *20*(3), 100720. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2022.100720

Stokel-Walker, C. (2023). ChatGPT listed as author on research papers: many scientists disapprove. *Nature, 613*(7945), 620–621. https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-00107-z

Su, J., & Yang, W. (2023). Unlocking the power of ChatGPT: A framework for applying generative AI in education. *ECNU Review of Education*, *6*(3), 355-366. https://doi.org/10.1177/20965311231168423

Suárez, M. M., Monfort, A., & Hervás-Oliver, J. (2023). Are you adopting artificial intelligence products? Social-demographic factors to explain customer acceptance. *European Research on Management and Business Economics*, *29*(3), 100223. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iedeen.2023.100223

Sullivan, M., Kelly, A., & McLaughlan, P. (2023). ChatGPT in higher education: Considerations for academic integrity and student learning. *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.17

Vinchon, F., Lubart, T., Bartolotta, S., Botella, M., Bourgeois-Bougrine, S., Bonnardel, N., Corazza, G. E., Glaveanu, V., Hanson, M. H., Ivcevic, Z., Karwowski, M., Kaufman, J. C., Okada, T., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Gaggioli, A. (2023). *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, *57*(4), 472-484. https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.597

Wang, F., King, R. B., Chai, C. S., & Zhou, Y. (2023). University students' intentions to learn artificial intelligence: the roles of supportive environments and expectancy-value beliefs. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1), 51. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00417-2

Yasmin, H., & Mazhar, R. (2022). AI in Education. In *CRC Press eBoo*ks (pp. 1–30). https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003184157-1

Zhu, Y., Li, Y., Yang, Y., & Zhai, X. (2023). Intelligent technology drives higher education reform: Key points and reflections on the 2023 Horizon report: Teaching and learning edition. *Open Education Research, 29*(3), 19–30. (in Chinese). https://doi.org/10.13966/j.cnki.kfjyyj.2023.03.002

## Declarations

### Availability of data and materials
The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

### Competing interests
The authors are all active faculty members of the University that served as the locale of the study.

### Funding
This research was supported by the affiliates program of the University of Santo Tomas – Research Center for Social Sciences and Education, Manila, the Philippines.

### Acknowledgements
The authors are grateful for the support of the University of Santo Tomas – Research Center for Social Sciences and Education.

### Use of Generative AI
The authors declare that no GenAI tools were used in the preparation of this article.

**Maria Ana G. De Guzman** is an academic staff at the Department of English of the University of Santo Toma. She is also a research affiliate of the university's Research Center for Social Sciences and Education. Her research interests include technology in language education, corpus linguistics, workplace discourse analysis, and language justice.

**Pia Patricia P. Tenedero, Ph.D.** is an assistant professor in the Department of English of the University of Santo Tomas (Philippines). She is also an honorary research fellow of the Linguistics Department of Macquarie University (Australia). As a sociolinguist, her research interest gravitates toward language practice, language ideology, and discourse analysis in globalized work contexts, language learning, and social media.

**Wilfred Gabriel A. Gapas** is an instructor in the Department of English, Faculty of Arts and Letters, and affiliate of the Research Center for Social Sciences and Education at the University of Santo Tomas, Manila. He holds a professional teaching certificate from the University of the Philippines – Open University. His research interests include critical and corpus-assisted discourse studies, multimodality, multilingualism, media discourses, language ideologies, and visual research methodologies.

**Abigail M. Deabanico** teaches English at the University of Santo Tomas in Manila, Philippines. Her teaching background includes teaching at the primary to tertiary levels locally and abroad. She has been a textbook editor and evaluator. Her research interests include critical discourse analysis, stylistics, translation, and gender studies.