Wanastra: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra
Volume 18 No. 1 March 2026
P-ISSN 2086-6151 E-ISSN 2579-3438
https://doi.org/10.31294/wanastra.v18i1

Artificial Intelligence in English Teaching at an Islamic University Language Center

Alka Fajari, Dody S. Truna[2], Aep Kusnawan[3], Cr. Siti Fatimah Binti Abdul Gani[4]
IAI Persatuan Islam Bandung[1], UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung[23], Universiti Putra Malaysia[4]
email: alkafajari@iaipibandung.ac.id, dodystruna@uinsgd.ac.id, aep_kusnawan@uinsgd.ac.id, sitifatimah@upm.edu.my
e-mail corresponding author: alkafajari@iaipibandung.ac.id

Received : 24-02-2026
Revised : 09-03-2026
Accepted : 31-03-2026

Abstrak *– Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mendeskripsikan penggunaan Artificial Intelligence (AI) dalam pengajaran bahasa Inggris di Language Center UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung. Perkembangan AI telah membawa perubahan dalam praktik pembelajaran bahasa, khususnya dalam penyusunan materi, pemberian umpan balik, serta pengembangan keterampilan menulis mahasiswa. Namun demikian, implementasinya juga memunculkan tantangan terkait integritas akademik dan potensi ketergantungan mahasiswa terhadap teknologi. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan deskriptif kualitatif dengan melibatkan tiga instruktur Language Center sebagai partisipan. Data diperoleh melalui wawancara, observasi, dan analisis data. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa AI membantu proses belajar bahasa di LC UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung dan AI tidak merombak pedagogi pengajar, melainkan memperkuat orientasi pedagogis yang telah ada. Meskipun memberikan manfaat efisiensi dan fleksibilitas, penggunaan AI tetap memerlukan pedoman etis dan pengawasan pedagogis. Penelitian ini menyimpulkan bahwa AI berpotensi meningkatkan kualitas pengajaran bahasa Inggris apabila diintegrasikan secara bertanggung jawab dalam konteks pendidikan tinggi.*

Kata Kunci: Kecerdasan Buatan, Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris, Pendidikan Tinggi

Abstract *- This study aims to describe the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language teaching at the Language Center of UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung. The development of AI has brought changes in language learning practices, particularly in the preparation of materials, providing feedback, and developing students' writing skills. However, its implementation also raises challenges related to academic integrity and the potential for student dependence on technology. This study uses a qualitative descriptive approach involving three Language Center instructors as participants. Data were obtained through interviews, observations, and data analysis. The results show that AI helps the language learning process at the Language Center of UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung and that AI does not overhaul teaching pedagogy, but rather strengthens existing pedagogical orientations. Although it provides the benefits of efficiency and flexibility, the use of AI still requires ethical guidelines and pedagogical oversight. This study concludes that AI has the potential to improve the quality of English language teaching if it is integrated responsibly in the context of higher education.*

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, English Language Teaching, Higher Education

INTRODUCTION

The development of artificial intelligence (AI) over the past decade has brought about significant changes in global educational practices, including in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT) (Uktamovich, 2024). The digital transformation driven by advances in computational technology has enabled the emergence of various AI-based tools such as automated writing assistants, grammar checkers, chatbots, and adaptive learning systems, which are increasingly employed in language learning contexts. Recent studies indicate that the integration of AI into ELT has the potential to enhance instructional efficiency, provide immediate feedback, and promote more personalized and autonomous learning (Vo, 2025).

The rapid development of artificial intelligence (AI) over the past decade has brought about significant transformations in global educational practices, including in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT) (Uktamovich, 2024). The digital transformation driven by advances in computational technologies has enabled the emergence of various AI-based tools, such as automated writing assistants, grammar checkers, chatbots, and

adaptive learning systems, which are increasingly utilized in language learning contexts. Recent studies indicate that the integration of AI into ELT has the potential to enhance instructional efficiency, provide immediate feedback, and promote more personalized and autonomous learning (Vo, 2025).

On the other hand, the use of AI in language learning also raises dilemmas related to pedagogy, technology, and ethics (Ramesh, 2025). Several studies report that although AI helps in grammar correction and written idea development, over-reliance on technology can reduce students' critical thinking processes and create academic integrity issues (Ramesh, 2025; Vo, 2025). These challenges are further exacerbated in higher education settings, where students are expected to develop authentic and reflective academic competencies. Therefore, the role of language educators as facilitators, guides, and controllers of AI use is crucial in ensuring that the technology is used ethically and pedagogically (Amini et al., 2025).

In the context of higher education in Indonesia, the integration of AI into English teaching has broader dimensions. English is positioned not only as a global communication tool but also as an instrument for accessing international academic literature. The Language Center at UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung serves as a strategic unit in strengthening language competency for all UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung students. (Djati, 2024). With students' increasing access to various AI platforms, language educators are required to respond to these developments adaptively without neglecting the academic values and learning ethics that underpin the institution.

The theoretical framework of this study is based on Activity Theory (Engeström, 1987), which conceptualizes learning as a dynamic interaction among instructors, students, and the tools employed within a socio- institutional context. In this framework, artificial intelligence (AI) functions as a technological tool that mediates the language learning process, enabling students to practice language skills in a more contextualized and personalized manner (Ho et al., 2020; Yang & Kyun, 2022) Activity Theory provides an analytical framework for analyzing the needs, activities, and outcomes of the technology-supported learning environment (Ambe, 2012; Jonassen & Rohrer-Murphy, 1999)

Activity Theory (Engeström, 1987) conceptualizes learning as a dynamic interaction among instructors, students, and the tools employed within a socio-institutional context. Within this framework, artificial intelligence (AI) functions as a technological tool that mediates the language learning process, enabling students to practice language skills in a more contextualized and personalized manner (Ho et al., 2020; Yang & Kyun, 2022). In addition, Activity Theory offers an analytical framework for examining the needs, activities, and outcomes of technology-supported learning environments (Ambe, 2012; Jonassen & Rohrer-Murphy, 1999).
Many studies have explored the relationship between AI and language education. Zhi (2024) study focused on the influence of emotional intelligence (EI) and self-efficacy on EFL teachers' use of technology in the classroom. The study explored EFL teachers' perceptions at Chinese universities about the integration of Large Language Models in language education and the factors influencing the integration process. Avsheniuk's study highlighted the positive influence of ChatGPT on critical thinking skills in English language learning in Ukrainian university English departments. However, these findings are largely perception-based and do not fully explore how AI mediates authentic meaning-making in language learning. Therefore, further investigation is needed to examine AI integration from a more in-depth pedagogical and socio-cultural perspective in language education.

Although the discourse on AI in ELT continues to expand, studies that specifically examine instructors' practices and perceptions within university Language Center settings remain limited. This is consistent with the findings of Zawacki (2019), which emphasize the limited contribution of language education perspectives in AI research, as well as the scarcity of studies addressing implementation and pedagogical reflection in higher education. In addition, another gap identified in this systematic review is the very limited number of studies that examine ethical issues related to the application of AI (Yang & Kyun, 2022), Therefore, this study contributes by offering a contextual exploration of instructors' practices and perceptions within the Language Center at UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, a setting that has received little scholarly attention. Most existing research tends to focus on students' perceptions or on the technical effectiveness of AI in specific skills such as writing or reading. In contrast, the perspective of language instructors in higher education plays a crucial role in shaping both the direction and the quality of technology integration in the learning process (Humayra et al., 2025).
Based on this background, the study aims to describe how AI is used in English language teaching and to explore instructors' perceptions of its benefits and challenges within the Language Center at UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung. The research is expected to provide empirical insight that supports the development of a responsible and context-sensitive model for AI integration in higher education.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a qualitative case study design to explore the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language teaching at the Language Center of UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung. A qualitative approach was chosen because the study seeks to gain an in-depth understanding of instructors' experiences, perceptions, and pedagogical considerations in integrating AI into their teaching practices. The participants consisted of three English instructors who are actively teaching and have experience using AI in instructional activities. To ensure confidentiality, each participant was assigned a code T1, T2, and T3 as follows:

Table 1. Participants in the research

Code Name	Length of experience	Academic background	Age	AI tools
T1	5 years	Master degree in English Education	30	Chat gpt , Deepseek, Claude and Elicit
T2	2 years	Master degree in English Education	25	Chat gpt, GrammarlyGO and Quillbot
T3	1 years	Master degree in English Education	25	Chat gpt and Elicit

Participants were selected through purposive sampling based on their experience in integrating AI into English language teaching. The selection criteria required that instructors had actively used AI tools in their instructional practices for at least one semester. Three English instructors who met these criteria were recruited and assigned the codes T1, T2, and T3 to ensure confidentiality. All participants were informed about the research objectives and provided consent prior to data collection.

Data were collected through triangulation of document analysis, non-participant classroom observation, and semi-structured interviews. Instructional documents, including Semester Lesson Plans (RPS), teaching materials, assignment instructions, and selected samples of student work, were collected and analyzed using a structured analysis table. The analysis focused on identifying explicit or implicit references to AI, the alignment between learning objectives and AI-supported activities, instructor mediation strategies, and ethical guidance regarding AI use. This process enabled the researcher to examine the extent to which AI integration was formally reflected in instructional planning.

Classroom observations were conducted during one full teaching session (approximately 90 minutes) for each instructor. An observation checklist was developed to document the instructional context of AI use, patterns of student AI interaction, instructor facilitation strategies, classroom dynamics, and observable challenges such as student dependency or superficial engagement. During the sessions, the researcher acted as a non-participant observer and recorded detailed field notes. Particular attention was given to how students interacted with generative AI platforms such as ChatGPT and Gemini in writing, grammar, and text analysis activities.
Semi-structured interviews were conducted to explore instructors' motivations, pedagogical purposes, perceived impacts on learning quality, challenges, and ethical considerations related to AI integration. The interview guide consisted of twelve open-ended questions aligned with the research objectives. Each interview lasted approximately 30–40 minutes and was audio-recorded with participants' consent before being transcribed verbatim. Member checking was conducted by returning the transcripts to participants to ensure accuracy and credibility.

All qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis supported by NVivo software. The analytical process involved initial coding, categorization of codes into broader themes, and cross-case comparison among T1, T2, and T3 to identify shared patterns and distinctive orientations in AI integration. Triangulation across interviews, observations, and document analysis strengthened the trustworthiness of the findings. Through this systematic and transparent methodological framework, the study provides a rigorous account of how AI is pedagogically positioned within English language teaching in this higher education context.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the thematic analysis of three instructors (T1, T2, and T3), this study identified key patterns related to the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language teaching at the Language Center of UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung. The analysis drew on three main data sources: in-depth interviews with the instructors, classroom observations, and data analysis of the Lesson Plan documents.

1. Summary of Instructors' Responses Based on Interview Questions

This section presents findings from interviews conducted with T1, T2, and T3. The interviews aimed to explore instructors' motivations for adopting AI, the types and contexts of its use, perceived benefits, impacts on learning quality, student responses, challenges, mitigation strategies, ethical considerations, and future prospects. The comparative summary in Table 2 highlights shared patterns and distinct orientations in how each instructor integrates AI into their teaching practices.

Table 2. Interview

No	Focus Question	T1	T2	T3
1	Initial use of AI & motivation	Started in 2023, for efficiency in preparing materials	Started in 2023, interested in exploring educational technology	Started in 2022, in response to academic developments
2	Types of AI used	Generative AI for essay examples	AI for question creation & grammar correction	AI for text analysis & writing revision
3	Context of use	Material preparation & writing examples	Grammar practice variation & feedback	Discussion of academic text structure
4	Main benefits	Saves time & provides varied examples	Faster & more flexible practice	Enriches text analysis
5	Impact on learning quality	Improves preparation efficiency	Supports personalized feedback	Helps demonstrate writing revision
6	Student responses	Enthusiastic but tends to seek instant results	Interested and curious	Some are critical, some overly dependent
7	Challenges	Student dependency	Validity & output accuracy	Student dependency
8	Strategies to reduce dependency	Mandatory oral presentations	Reflective tasks on AI usage	Step-by-step drafting & class discussion
9	Ethical issues	Potential plagiarism	Need for usage boundaries	Threat to the learning process, especially AI-like writing
10	Future outlook	AI will become a standard tool	Institutional regulation is needed	The instructor must be more adaptive

Based on the interviews, the three instructors utilized AI with different orientations but with a similar goal: to support effective learning. T1 focused on streamlining material development, T2 on exploring innovation and personalized feedback, and T3 on analyzing and revising academic texts. Although AI was considered to improve the quality and variety of learning, the main challenges that emerged were student dependency and ethical issues, leading each instructor to implement control strategies such as oral presentations, written reflections, and staged drafts.

2. Findings from Classroom Observation in English Language Teaching

The following section presents the results of classroom observations involving the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in three different class contexts (T1, T2, and T3) at the Language Center of UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung. These observations were intended to illustrate the dynamics of AI use in English language teaching, including the instructional context, patterns of student interaction with AI, students' responses, classroom dynamics, the impact on learning, and the challenges encountered. The data provide a comparative overview of how AI was utilized in writing activities, grammar exercises, and the analysis and revision of academic texts.

Table 3 Observation

No	Aspects Observed	T1	T2	T3
1	Activity context	Students work individually to compose essays with AI assistance, while the instructor monitors and provides oral guidance.	Individual student activity patterns are driven by the fulfillment of needs by AI, with the instructor acting as a facilitator.	Students demonstrate greater independence, instructor focus on clarifying and strengthening reflection.

2	Student AI interaction	Students input prompts to obtain essay examples; some attempt shortcuts, while others focus on textual structure.	Students compile specific prompts and pay attention to the text structure of the AI results.	Students use AI more selectively, evaluating and revising the output.
3	Student responses	Students are enthusiastic but tend toward immediacy; some appear rushed in completing drafts.	Students are enthusiastic but tend toward immediacy; some appear rushed in completing drafts.	Students are enthusiastic but tend toward immediacy; some appear rushed in completing drafts.
4	Classroom dynamics	Instructions are clear; the class remains relatively orderly and focused on AI use and oral presentation.	Students discussing the results of the assignment began to ask about the validity of the AI results.	Students' critical interactions compare AI results with their own understanding.
5	Impact on learning	Writing structure becomes more organized, academic vocabulary increases, and critical thinking is enhanced through oral presentations.	Grammatical errors decrease, linguistic analytical skills improve, and reflective activities strengthen comprehension.	Critical thinking and reflection skills are strengthened through presentations and revisions.
6	Observed challenges	Some students exhibit excessive dependence on AI.	The validity of AI output is occasionally questioned; some students tend to copy without evaluation.	Dependency remains evident; students require guidance to engage in reflection and critical assessment.

Based on the classroom observations, the use of AI showed positive effects on students' academic skills, including improved text structure, greater grammatical accuracy, stronger analytical ability, and more developed argumentation. However, a consistent challenge across all three contexts was students' tendency to rely on AI without engaging in critical evaluation. Differences in how instructors managed AI use also influenced classroom dynamics and the depth of students' reflection. Therefore, integrating AI into the learning process requires clear guidance and well-designed pedagogical strategies that promote reflective thinking and critical evaluation, ensuring that the technology genuinely supports meaningful learning.

3. Analysis of Instructional Materials Based on Instructors' Perspectives

The analysis of instructional documents across T1, T2, and T3 reveals how AI integration is positioned within formal planning and classroom implementation. Although AI is not explicitly stated in the lesson plans of all three instructors, its presence becomes visible in teaching materials and assignment instructions. The table below summarizes how AI is reflected in each component of the instructional documents:

Table 4. Document analysis

Document Components	T1	T2	T3
Lesson plan	Does not explicitly mention AI	Does not explicitly mention AI	Does not explicitly mention AI
Material	Uses edited AI-generated examples of argumentative essays.	Using grammar questions developed with the help of AI	Using AI-generated academic texts for structural analysis
Assignment instructions	Students are permitted to use AI for drafting, with mandatory oral presentations	Students can use AI with usage reflection reports.	AI has been used to help students revise their writing in stages, and then discuss the revisions together in class.

The findings indicate a discrepancy between formal documentation and actual instructional practice. While AI is absent from the written lesson plans, it plays a substantial role in material preparation and task design. The level of integration also varies among instructors: T1 employs AI primarily as a drafting support tool, T2 integrates AI with reflective accountability, and T3 adopts a more intensive and structured use of AI in the writing revision process. This pattern suggests that AI integration is pedagogically driven rather than formally institutionalized, reflecting individual instructor initiatives rather than curriculum-level policy.

Disccussion

The findings of this study indicate that the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English language teaching at the Language Center of UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung is both dynamic and contextual. Although all three instructors incorporate AI into their teaching practices, the depth of integration, pedagogical purposes, and implementation strategies differ significantly. These differences reflect not only variations in professional experience and digital readiness but also distinct ways of positioning AI within their pedagogical frameworks. Drawing on the interview data and document analysis, the discussion is organized around several key themes that represent the dynamics of AI integration in the classroom.

1. Pedagogical Orientation in the Use of Artificial Intelligence.

In the context of integrating Artificial Intelligence (AI) in higher education, pedagogical considerations become a crucial factor in determining how the technology is meaningfully utilized within the learning process (Ramesh, 2025). Pedagogy does not merely refer to teaching methods; it also encompasses how instructors understand learning objectives, facilitate students' cognitive processes, and design learning experiences that foster the development of deeper academic competencies. The primary difference among T1, T2, and T3 lies not only in how they use AI, but in how they interpret the role of technology within the learning process. T1 represents a pragmatic instrumental orientation, in which AI is positioned as an efficiency tool to support lesson preparation and the provision of sample texts. This approach suggests that technology functions as a practical solution to academic workload rather than as a transformation of the learning paradigm. (Avsheniuk et al., 2024). In contrast, T2 adopts an innovative and adaptive orientation by using AI to personalize practice activities and feedback. In this context, AI begins to function as a pedagogical mediator that expands the range of instructional strategies (Ramesh, 2025). Meanwhile, T3 demonstrates a reflective critical orientation, in which AI is used not merely as a tool for text production, but as a means of analyzing academic structure and supporting a staged revision process. (Podgornaya et al., 2025). This approach indicates the use of AI within a process-based learning framework (process-oriented learning), rather than focusing solely on the final product.

These differing orientations indicate that AI integration is strongly shaped by each instructor's pedagogical beliefs. Technology does not automatically transform teaching practices, rather, it is interpreted and adapted according to the professional framework of the language instructor. Therefore, the variation in AI integration observed in this study reflects that digital transformation in language education is constructive and contextual, rather than deterministic. In higher education settings where students are expected to develop critical, analytical, and reflective thinking skills, AI cannot be positioned merely as a technical tool or an instrument of efficiency. Without a clear pedagogical foundation, AI risks promoting instant, product-oriented learning instead of supporting the intellectual processes that lie at the core of higher education. In the cases of T1, T2, and T3, the presence of AI has enhanced the role of mentors by guiding and supporting students' learning processes in the use of technology. AI assists instructors in facilitating teaching tasks and responding to students' needs, thus enabling more adaptive and contextual teaching. This aligns with Saseendran (2025), who argue that the presence of AI reshapes the teacher's role into that of a facilitator and guide, particularly as students increasingly rely on AI in their learning activities.

2. Impacts on the Quality of Learning

The integration of AI by T1, T2, and T3 demonstrates that its impact on learning quality is strongly influenced by each instructor's pedagogical orientation. T1 primarily uses AI as a tool to provide sample argumentative essays that are carefully edited before being presented in class. According to T1, this approach has contributed to improvements in students' structural writing quality, including more systematic paragraph organization, clearer thesis statements, and stronger cohesion. In the interview with TI, he said:

"Earlier in class, I used AI primarily to display examples of argumentative essays that I had selected and edited before publishing to students. So, it wasn't directly from AI. I usually first check the paragraph structure, the clarity of the thesis statement, and its cohesion. From there, students could see a more systematic writing model. I noticed that afterward, they were better able to structure paragraphs coherently, and their thesis statements became clearer. (interview with T1).

Unlike T1, T2 integrates AI primarily in grammar exercises and feedback provision. The impact is most evident in improved linguistic accuracy. Grammatical errors decreased significantly, and students demonstrated greater awareness of their error patterns through reflective tasks on AI use. However, T2 noted that the focus on grammar sometimes led students to choose simpler sentence structures to avoid mistakes. As a result, although accuracy improved, syntactic complexity did not always develop proportionally. In this case, T2 stated:

*"I observed that their grammatical accuracy did improve, particularly with respect to tense usage. However, this improvement also had consequences: some students tended to choose simpler sentence structures in order to avoid errors and minimize the amount of correction required." (*interview with T2*).*

Meanwhile, T3 demonstrates that a higher level of AI integration influences learning quality, particularly in terms of argumentative depth and idea development. Students were able to construct counter-arguments, expand their discussions, and develop more critical arguments based on their experience using AI in the learning process. However, as the intensity of AI use increased, inconsistencies in authorial voice became more apparent. This finding is consistent with Chen et al., (2025), who report a significant negative correlation between AI dependence and academic originality, suggesting that higher AI usage may weaken independent research abilities and logical reasoning. In several student texts, shifts in tone and lexical density were observed, indicating strong AI intervention in the construction of the text.

"I asked students to use AI to review and expand upon ideas they had already written. In this process, they did not copy the output directly; instead, they compared it with their own work and further developed their arguments based on their personal perspectives. I observed that their argumentation became more substantive and their discussions more wide-ranging. Nevertheless, challenges remained. When students relied too heavily on AI, their writing style occasionally became unnatural." (Interview with T3)

When compared holistically, T1 primarily strengthens the quality of academic form and structural organization, T2 enhances linguistic accuracy and metalinguistic awareness, while T3 fosters the development of cognitive and argumentative complexity. These differences suggest that AI does not automatically transform learning practices; rather, it amplifies the pedagogical orientations already adopted by instructors. In this sense, AI functions as an amplificatory tool, reinforcing existing instructional emphases, whether on structure, language use, or depth of thinking. Furthermore, AI enables personalized learning experiences by tailoring content to individual students' needs, learning styles, and learning paces, thereby enhancing engagement and comprehension. AI also supports teachers by automating routine tasks such as grading, attendance tracking, and administrative work, allowing educators to devote greater attention to student engagement and higher-order instructional responsibilities (Dikkatwar et al., 2025).

3. Challenges and Ethical Issues.

All three instructors acknowledged challenges in the use of AI, particularly related to student dependency, output validity, and the potential for plagiarism. In T1's case, the primary challenge was student dependency, especially because AI was used as a source of model essays, and students were allowed to use AI for drafting. This practice is directly connected to ethical concerns, particularly the risk of plagiarism. During classroom observations, students were seen using ChatGPT and Gemini as AI tools. The use of AI tools for generating essays can lead to academic dishonesty, as students may submit AI-generated content as their own work (Khalil & Er, 2023; Podgornaya et al., 2025). (Khalil & Er, 2023)

Because students were exposed to fully developed model texts and permitted to use AI in the early stages of writing, there was a risk that they relied excessively on AI-generated structures and language without engaging in sufficient critical thinking. Students' responses described as "enthusiastic yet instant-oriented" reinforced this concern. To address the issue, T1 required oral presentations. Presentations can function as a method to verify student comprehension, particularly in the context of AI-generated content, thereby helping to ensure academic integrity and foster critical thinking (Fenton, 2025). This indicates that T1 recognized that a well-structured text does not necessarily reflect deep understanding. Such awareness aligns with (Ramesh, 2025).

In contrast to T1, the primary challenge identified in T2 is not student dependency but rather the validity and accuracy of AI-generated outputs. Because AI is employed for test construction and grammar correction, there is concern that its results may be imprecise or insufficiently aligned with the instructional context. The ethical issue emerging in T2 relates to the need for clear boundaries in AI use. This indicates that T2 regards AI as a useful tool that nonetheless requires regulation to prevent overuse or uncritical reliance. Students' responses, described as "interested and curious," reflect a generally positive attitude; however, such engagement still necessitates explicit guidance and pedagogical direction.

In T3, the challenge re-emerges in a more profound form due to the higher level of AI integration, particularly in text analysis and iterative draft revision. Students' responses indicate a dual tendency: while some demonstrate critical engagement with AI-generated suggestions, others display excessive reliance on the tool. In the interview, T3 expressed concern that AI does not consistently differentiate between high-quality academic sources and less reliable materials, and may generate responses that appear convincing yet lack robust scholarly grounding. Within the context of language learning, such limitations may compromise academic rigor if students reproduce AI outputs without engaging in critical reflection or substantive revision. This observation resonates with the findings of Slutskiy (2025) who argues that AI-generated content operates on probabilistic models, is not always accompanied by verifiable citations, and may blur the boundary between fact and fiction in academic contexts.

The ethical concern raised in T3 extends beyond plagiarism to a deeper threat to the learning process itself. The issue lies not merely in the final written product, but in the possibility that students bypass essential stages of cognitive processing, analysis, and revision due to overreliance on AI. Cognitive fatigue and reduced motivation for independent inquiry have likewise been associated with excessive AI dependence (Tian & Zhang, 2025). To mitigate these risks, T3 implements staged drafting and structured classroom discussions, thereby safeguarding the integrity of the learning process rather than focusing solely on the production of linguistically polished texts..

The challenges and ethical issues associated with AI use by T1, T2, and T3 do not operate in isolation; rather, they are closely related to the level of integration and the specific contexts in which AI is employed. Student dependency, the validity of AI-generated outputs, and potential threats to the learning process emerge as key concerns; however, each instructor responds to these issues through different pedagogical strategies. These findings suggest that managing AI in educational settings is not merely a matter of permitting or prohibiting its use, but of regulating its implementation in ways that continue to support meaningful learning processes.

4. The Gap between Practice and Policy.

Although AI has been actively employed in instructional practices, the analysis of the course syllabus indicates that this technology has not yet been explicitly incorporated into official planning documents. This suggests a gap between classroom practice and institutional policy. The integration of AI remains largely individualized and has not been systematically standardized, highlighting the need for clearer policies to support its ethical and sustainable implementation. One of the most significant findings of this study is the evident gap between classroom AI practices and the formal policies articulated in official documents. Document analysis reveals that none of the three instructors (T1, T2, and T3) explicitly include AI in their course syllabi, even though AI has been integrated into their classroom practices. This indicates that AI has become part of everyday instructional activities; however, it has not yet been formalized within official curriculum planning frameworks.

A closer examination shows that all three instructors have already implemented AI in concrete ways within both instructional materials and task design. T1 employs AI-generated examples of argumentative essays, T2 develops grammar exercises with AI assistance, and T3 utilizes AI-generated texts for structural analysis and staged revision. In T3's practice, AI is used to support students in revising their writing iteratively, after which the revised outputs are discussed collectively in class. However, none of these practices is reflected in the official course syllabus. This finding suggests that pedagogical innovation is advancing more rapidly than the revision of academic policies.

This gap becomes particularly salient when examined in relation to each instructor's perspective on the future of AI use in the learning process. T1 anticipates that AI will become a standard instructional tool, T2 emphasizes the need for institutional regulation, and T3 argues that Instructor must become more adaptive. These positions indicate a shared awareness of the long-term implications of AI, while simultaneously revealing the absence of explicit institutional standards governing its use. In other words, pedagogical practices have advanced, whereas policy development has lagged.

Institutional policies on AI use should therefore be developed within a regulatory framework that addresses information security, intellectual property rights, and ethical principles in AI utilization. Such a framework must also remain flexible and responsive to technological change through mechanisms for periodic review and revision. Furthermore, regulations should not hinder innovation or experimentation in AI implementation (Rahmawati et al., 2025). Previous studies indicate that clear and comprehensive regulatory frameworks can promote AI adoption in higher education while safeguarding the interests of all stakeholders.

Language instructors must continuously adapt to rapid technological developments to enhance their professional competence. In doing so, students may benefit from improved learning experiences through innovative and adaptive methods developed by professional educators. The application of artificial intelligence in education has

already generated significant impacts (Rifky, 2024).

Artificial Intelligence does not fundamentally transform instructors' pedagical orientations; rather, it amplifies and reinforces pre-existing instructional beliefs and practices. Consequently, learning quality is shaped not by the technology itself, but by the extent to which AI is pedagogically orchestrated, critically regulated, and meaningfully integrated into instructional design.

CONCLUSION

The integration of Artificial Intelligence in English language teaching at UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung goes beyond the mere adoption of technology; it represents a contextual and reflective pedagogical process shaped by instructors' professional beliefs. The findings indicate that AI functions as an amplificative tool, strengthening the pedagogical orientation already held by each instructor. T1 utilizes AI to reinforce academic structure and textual organization, T2 enhances linguistic accuracy and grammatical awareness through reflective practices, while T3 promotes argumentative complexity and deeper analysis through staged revision. Thus, the study underscores that learning quality is not determined by the level of AI usage alone, but by how AI is positioned within a pedagogical design that prioritizes students' thinking processes.

This study contributes theoretically by demonstrating that AI integration in higher education is not deterministic but constructive and interpretative. AI does not automatically improve learning quality; rather, it becomes effective when accompanied by pedagogical control strategies such as oral presentations, written reflections, and critical discussions. The findings also reveal an important paradox: the higher the intensity of AI use, the greater the potential for enhanced cognitive complexity yet this is accompanied by increased risks of dependency, shifts in authorial voice, and weakened academic originality. These insights enrich ongoing discussions about balancing technological innovation with academic integrity, while providing empirical evidence that strong pedagogical oversight can ensure AI remains within a meaningful learning framework.

From a practical perspective, this study offers strategic implications for higher education institutions by highlighting the urgency of aligning classroom practices with formal policy. The gap between active AI use in teaching and the absence of explicit regulation in curriculum documents signals the need for adaptive, ethical, and forward-looking policy frameworks. The findings may serve as a foundation for developing institutional guidelines that not only regulate AI usage but also encourage its application as a means of strengthening critical, reflective, and collaborative thinking. In this way, the study not only documents the reality of AI integration but also proposes a conceptual model for responsibly integrating technology to enhance the quality of language education in the digital era.

REFERENCES

Ambe, P. (2012). Activity theory and technology mediated interaction: Cognitive scaffolding using question-based consultation on Facebook. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *28*(8). https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.775

Amini, M., Zahabi, A., & Ganapathy, M. (2025). Benefits and Challenges of Integrating AI Tools in Language Education. In *Implementing AI Tools for Language Teaching and Learning*. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-7260-9.ch005

Avsheniuk, N., Lutsenko, O., Svyrydiuk, T., & Seminikhyna, N. (2024). Empowering Language Learners' Critical Thinking: Evaluating ChatGPT's Role in English Course Implementation. *Arab World English Journal*, 210–224. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/ChatGPT.14

Chen, D., Cui, X., & Liang, T. (2025). ChatGPT-Driven Intelligent Educational Assessment: Algorithm, Challenges, and Ethical Considerations. *Proceedings of the 2nd Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area Education Digitalization and Computer Science International Conference*, 88–93. https://doi.org/10.1145/3746469.374648

Dikkatwar, R., Mohite, M., Sharma, S., P. Selvakumar, P. S., Jayadeva, S. M., & Manjunath T. C., M. T. C. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and Adaptive Learning Technologies. In *New Media Applications in Digital Education*. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-5157-5.ch011

Djati, L. C. U. S. G. (2024). *Tugas Pokok dan Fungsi*. Lcuinsgd. https://lc.uinsgd.ac.id/profil/tugas-pokok-dan-fungsi

Fenton, A. (2025). Reconsidering the Use of Oral Exams and Assessments: An Old Way to Move Into a New

Future. *Educational Researcher*, *54*(7), 430–436. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X251333638

Humayra, N. S., Ananti, H. F., Norlia, N., & Murdianingsih, A. (2025). Integrasi Teori Pembelajaran Bahasa untuk Penguatan Pembelajaran Abad ke-21 dalam Konteks Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia. *Jurnal Penelitian Inovatif*, *5*(1), 577–588. https://doi.org/10.54082/jupin.549

Jonassen, D. H., & Rohrer-Murphy, L. (1999). Activity theory as a framework for designing constructivist learning environments. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *47*(1), 61–79. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02299477

Khalil, M., & Er, E. (2023). Will ChatGPT Get You Caught? Rethinking of Plagiarism Detection. In P. Zaphiris & A. Ioannou (Eds.), *Learning and Collaboration Technologies* (pp. 475–487). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-34411-4_32

Podgornaya, A., Sagdatullina, A., Shibanova, N., & Shustova, E. (2025). Ethics of Using AI in Writing Student Research Papers. In V. V. Mantulenko, J. Horák, J. Kučera, & M. Ayyubov (Eds.), *Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference ``Digital Future: Science, Education, and Innovative Development of Socio-Economic Systems''* (pp. 613–617). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-99598- 9_87

Rahmawati, A., Amirah, S., & Wijaya, N. (2025). Integrasi Kecerdasan Buatan dalam Pendidikan Tinggi Indonesia: Peluang, Tantangan, dan Kerangka Implementasi. *Jurnal Teknologi Sistem Informasi*, *6*(1), 114–126. https://doi.org/10.35957/jtsi.v6i1.11329

Ramesh, M. R. (2025). Challenges of integrating artificial intelligence with language curriculum: Addressing pedagogical, technological, and ethical barriers. In *Modern Methods for AI-Integrated Language Curriculum*. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-9606-3.ch008

Rifky, S. (2024). Dampak Penggunaan Artificial Intelligence Bagi Pendidikan Tinggi. *Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary Social Technology*, *2*. https://doi.org/10.31004/ijmst.v2i1.287

Saseendran, H., Selwin, S., Vemavarapu, K. R., Manikeswari, D., & Soni, A. (2025). The AI Classroom Genie Effect: Empowering Educators for Smarter Teaching and Personalized Engagement. In *Potential of AI to Replace Teachers' Expertise: Ethics and Challenges*. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-0396-3.ch001

Slutskiy, P. (2025). ai, Post-Truth Realities, and Thai Students' Information-Seeking Behavior. *Manusya*, *28*. https://doi.org/10.1163/26659077-20252811

Tian, J., & Zhang, R. (2025). Learners' AI dependence and critical thinking: The psychological mechanism of fatigue and the social buffering role of AI literacy. *Acta Psychologica*, *260*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105725

Uktamovich, O. A. A.-S. and R. A. R. and H. S. and Y. H. Z. and S. S. L. A. K. and G. I. (2024). Artificial Intelligence for English Language Learning and Teaching: Advancing Sustainable Development Goals. *Journal of Language Teaching \& Research*, *15*(6), 1835. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1506.09

Vo, T. K. A. (2025). Transforming Language Learning with AI: Adaptive Systems, Engagement, and Global Impact †. *Engineering Proceedings*, *107*(1). https://doi.org/10.3390/engproc2025107007

Yang, H., & Kyun, S. (2022). The current research trend of artificial intelligence in language learning: A systematic empirical literature review from an activity theory perspective. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *38*(5), 180–210. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.7492

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, 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*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0

Zhi, R., Wang, Y., & Wang, Y. (2024). The Role of Emotional Intelligence and Self-efficacy in EFL Teachers' Technology Adoption. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *33*(4), 845–856. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-023-00782-6