Check for updates

RESEARCH ARTICLE

REVISED Artificial intelligence in the English classroom: EFL teachers' opportunities, challenges, and readiness for AI integration

[version 2; peer review: 2 approved with reservations]

Memidin Braha[1], Rezarta Ramadani[2]

[1]Department of English, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia
[2]English Language and Literature, University of Prizren, Prizren, Kosovo, 70000, Kosovo (Serbia and Montenegro)

v2 **First published:** 20 Jul 2026, **6**:249
https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.23500.1
Latest published: 06 Oct 2026, **6**:249
https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.23500.2

Abstract

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI) tools into English language education has created new demands on teachers, who must navigate both the potential and limitations of these technologies. This exploratory descriptive survey examines English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' perceptions of AI tools, focusing on usage practices, perceived opportunities, challenges, and professional development needs. Drawing on the Technology Acceptance Model and an AI-TPACK perspective, a questionnaire was distributed to 28 EFL teachers working across multiple educational levels and international contexts. Closed ended items addressed AI use, perceived educational value, confidence, training, and concerns, while three open ended questions elicited explanations of perceived benefits, challenges, and support needs. The findings show that teachers overwhelmingly use ChatGPT (89.3 percent) and value AI primarily for lesson planning efficiency and learning personalization, with about two-thirds agreeing that AI makes planning more efficient and supports tailored activities. At the same time, substantial proportions report concerns about ethical issues, student overreliance on AI, and the accuracy of AI-generated content, each cited by roughly two-thirds of respondents. Although most participants reported confidence in using AI tools, fewer considered the training they had received sufficient, indicating a descriptive discrepancy between reported confidence and perceived training adequacy. The qualitative analysis highlights a dual identity in teacher discourse, where AI is framed both as a powerful productivity assistant and as a potential threat to pedagogical autonomy and student creativity. TAM and AI-

Open Peer Review

Approval Status ? ?

	1	2
version 2 (revision) 06 Oct 2026		
version 1 20 Jul 2026	? view	? view

1. **Fatma Şeyma KOÇ**, Akdeniz University, Antalya, Turkey

2. **Santosh Mahapatra**, Birla Institute of Technology & Science Pilani, Pilani, India

Any reports and responses or comments on the article can be found at the end of the article.

TPACK are used as complementary interpretive perspectives rather than as models tested by the study. It offers practical implications for AI-focused professional development, institutional policy, and the design of teacher-centered AI integration frameworks.

Keywords
Artificial Intelligence, English as a foreign language, EFL teachers, Technology Acceptance Model, AI-TPACK, teacher perceptions, professional development

This article is included in the COST Actions gateway.

Corresponding authors: Memidin Braha (mb6375@student.uni-lj.si), Rezarta Ramadani (rezarta.ramadani@uni-prizren.com)

Author roles: Braha M: Conceptualization, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Methodology, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing; **Ramadani R**: Data Curation, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing

Competing interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Grant information: This project has received funding from the European Union's Framework Programme for Research & Innovation as part of the COST Action CA21114,CLIL Network for Languages in Education: Towards bi- and multilingual disciplinary literacies, as supported by the COST Association (European Cooperation in Science and Technology).
The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Copyright: © 2026 Braha M and Ramadani R. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

How to cite this article: Braha M and Ramadani R. **Artificial intelligence in the English classroom: EFL teachers' opportunities, challenges, and readiness for AI integration [version 2; peer review: 2 approved with reservations]** Open Research Europe 2026, **6**:249 https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.23500.2

First published: 20 Jul 2026, **6**:249 https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.23500.1

REVISED **Amendments from Version 1**

The revised version substantially reframes the article as an exploratory descriptive survey rather than a mixed methods study testing or extending theoretical models. The manuscript presents the questionnaire data more cautiously and clarifies that TAM and AI-TPACK are used as complementary interpretive perspectives rather than empirically tested frameworks.

Methodological transparency has also been strengthened. The manuscript explains that the instrument was exploratory, Likert items were reported individually rather than as validated constructs, and no formal psychometric validation or reliability testing was conducted. The analysis is therefore described as descriptive, with open-ended responses used to contextualise quantitative patterns rather than claim full methodological triangulation.

The interpretation of findings has been moderated throughout. Strong claims concerning a "readiness gap," ethical moderation, theoretical extension, teacher identity, and causal relationships have been removed or replaced with cautious descriptions of confidence, training adequacy, perceived benefits, and concerns. The Results section also corrects the ranking of perceived benefits: learning personalisation received the highest agreement (71.4%), followed by lesson planning efficiency (67.9%).

The comparison table based on the authors' separate study of Kosovan students has been retained, with the reference temporarily anonymised for peer review. The comparison is now presented as contextual and descriptive, acknowledging differences in participants, instruments, and study designs and avoiding claims that teacher and student perceptions derive from equivalent datasets.

Finally, the abstract, research gap, discussion, limitations, and conclusion now emphasise the study's preliminary, context-specific contribution. The manuscript focuses on teachers' reported AI practices, perceived opportunities, concerns, and professional support needs, while acknowledging the small convenience sample and the need for larger studies using validated instruments.

Any further responses from the reviewers can be found at the end of the article

Introduction

The concept of artificial intelligence, introduced by McCarthy in 1956 (Cristianini, 2016), has evolved from a theoretical construct to a practical force reshaping educational practice worldwide. In the field of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teaching, AI-driven tools now support lesson planning, automated grading, personalized feedback, and interactive language practice through chatbots and writing assistants (Chen et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2024). The rapid advancement of generative AI, particularly large language models such as ChatGPT, has accelerated this transformation and placed teachers at the center of a significant pedagogical shift.

Recent systematic reviews indicate that AI integration in English language teaching is expanding, with writing assistance as the most common application, accounting for 54.55% of studies (Daud et al., 2025). AI tools such as grammar checkers, chatbots, and language learning apps have shown promise in improving linguistic accuracy, reducing student anxiety, and offering personalized learning pathways (Du & Daniel, 2024; Yuan & Liu, 2025). However, concerns about academic dishonesty, student overreliance on AI, and diminished critical thinking persist across educational contexts.

While a growing body of research has examined student perceptions and learning outcomes in AI-enhanced classrooms, the teacher perspective remains comparatively underexplored. This gap is significant because teachers are the primary gatekeepers of AI integration. Their beliefs, competencies, and institutional support structures directly shape how AI tools are introduced and function within classrooms (Celik, 2023; Omidvar & Meihami, 2025). Recent evidence indicates that the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) is the most commonly used theoretical framework in studies of teacher AI adoption, with perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use identified as primary determinants of acceptance (Xue et al., 2025). However, emerging research also highlights the need for education-specific acceptance models that account for factors unique to teaching contexts, such as pedagogical beliefs, ethical concerns, and the relational nature of instruction.

The integration of AI into EFL teaching is further complicated by contextual factors. Teachers in resource-constrained settings may face additional barriers related to infrastructure, digital literacy, and access to professional development (OECD, 2018). Recent work from the Western Balkans describes this shift as a "quiet transformation" in which generative AI becomes an invisible yet pervasive presence in students' academic lives, while many educators encounter a widening digital divide, ethical dilemmas, and unequal access to AI tools (Pireci Sejdiu & Sejdiu, 2025). In the Western Balkans, and in Kosovo in particular, recent institutional initiatives have begun to explore how AI can be embedded into higher education teaching and learning, with an emphasis on developing clear guidelines for responsible use. A recent study of Kosovan university students found that while 85.9% found AI tools easy to use, only 34.1% trusted their

feedback, revealing a "trust-usability paradox" that underscores the complexity of AI acceptance (Braha, 2026). However, no study has yet examined how EFL teachers in these contexts perceive AI tools, what opportunities and challenges they identify, and what professional support they require.

This study addresses these gaps by investigating EFL teachers' perceptions of AI tools in the English classroom, with a particular focus on Kosovo as an understudied, post-conflict educational context (OECD, 2018; Xue et al., 2024). The present study provides an exploratory account of EFL teachers' reported AI practices, perceived educational opportunities, concerns, and professional support needs in an underrepresented context.

Given the small convenience sample and exploratory questionnaire, the study aims to provide an initial, context specific description. It does not test theoretical relationships or seek to produce broadly generalisable conclusions.

Three research questions guide the investigation:

- **RQ1:** What are EFL teachers' current AI tool usage practices, including tool preferences, frequency of use, and perceived benefits for language instruction?
- **RQ2:** What challenges and concerns do EFL teachers experience or anticipate when integrating AI tools into their teaching?
- **RQ3:** What professional development needs and support structures do EFL teachers identify as necessary for effective AI integration?

Together, these questions provide an exploratory account of EFL teachers' reported AI practices, perceived benefits, concerns, and professional support needs.

Contribution statement

This article makes an empirical and practical contribution by providing exploratory evidence about EFL teachers' AI practices, perceived educational opportunities, concerns, and professional support needs in an underrepresented educational context. Conceptually, TAM draws attention to participants' perceptions of the educational value of AI, while AI-TPACK provides a perspective for considering the pedagogical, ethical, and professional knowledge associated with AI integration. The study does not propose or test an extension of either framework. Its findings identify issues that may inform professional development and guide larger studies using validated instruments.

Literature review

AI integration in EFL education

The integration of AI into language education has produced a robust and rapidly growing body of research. Systematic reviews indicate that AI tools are most commonly used for writing instruction, grammar correction, vocabulary development, and automated assessment (Lo et al., 2024; Memarian & Doleck, 2023). Daud et al. (2025) conducted a PRISMA guided systematic review and found that 54.55% of studies focused on writing assistance, while challenges such as academic dishonesty and overreliance on AI were reported in 27.27% of the reviewed articles. These findings highlight AI's current pedagogical role in text-based language skills and signal ongoing concerns about its broader educational impact.

AI chatbots and large language models have been shown to serve as "non-threatening" practice partners that reduce speaking anxiety and increase willingness to communicate (Du & Daniel, 2024; Zhang et al., 2024). Experimental studies have demonstrated significant gains in writing performance when AI tools are used for formative feedback. For example, Mahapatra (2024) reported a large effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.902$) when comparing experimental and control groups in an AI-assisted writing intervention, while Song and Song (2023) found statistically significant post-test differences in a randomized controlled trial. At the same time, comparative studies indicate that human feedback still provides superior qualitative nuance, supporting a "hybrid" model that combines AI efficiency with teacher expertise (Steiss et al., 2024; Zeevy Solovey, 2024).

Teacher perceptions of AI in language teaching

Research on teacher perceptions of AI has grown substantially since 2023, though it remains less developed than research focused on students. Teachers report that AI reduces their workload and improves instructional efficiency, with lesson planning and material creation identified as the most common applications.

However, teachers' perceptions are not uniformly positive. Studies have identified concerns about academic integrity, student overreliance, diminished creativity, and the limitations of AI in fostering critical thinking (Daud et al., 2025; Xue et al., 2025). A qualitative study of Indonesian EFL teachers found that while most view AI as a supportive tool, they emphasize that it cannot replace the human role in teaching, particularly in building rapport, responding to emotional cues, and adapting to real-time classroom dynamics (Firdaus et al., 2025).

TAM and AI-TPACK as complementary perspectives

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), developed by Davis (1989), remains the most widely used framework for studying teacher AI adoption. According to TAM framework, perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use are central determinants of technology acceptance. Recent extensions of TAM for AI in education have added constructs such as trust, self-efficacy, and hedonic motivation (Cai et al., 2024; Tram et al., 2024).

However, several scholars have argued that TAM alone is insufficient for understanding AI adoption in educational settings, particularly when pedagogical, ethical, and institutional factors are considered (Al-Abdullatif, 2024; Celik, 2023; Xue et al., 2025). The Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework, originally proposed by Mishra and Koehler (2006), provides a complementary perspective by emphasizing the intersection of technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge. Celik (2023) expanded TPACK into the "Intelligent-TPACK" framework, incorporating ethical assessment as a key dimension. This expanded model demonstrated strong fit indices (RMSEA = 0.037, CFI = 0.980) and showed that ethical assessment positively influences technological pedagogical knowledge.

TAM and AI-TPACK address different but related aspects of educational technology use. TAM focuses primarily on teachers' evaluations of a technology, including whether they consider it useful and manageable. AI-TPACK focuses on the professional knowledge required to select, evaluate, adapt, and use AI tools in relation to pedagogy and subject content. Its AI specific formulations also draw attention to ethical evaluation. Positive perceptions of AI therefore do not necessarily indicate that teachers possess the professional knowledge and judgement required for effective classroom integration.

The conceptual connection lies in the distinction between acceptance and pedagogical integration. TAM helps explain why teachers may be inclined to use AI, whereas AI-TPACK helps identify the knowledge and judgement required to use it responsibly in a specific educational context. For example, a teacher may regard AI as useful for generating materials but may still require support to evaluate the accuracy of its outputs, adapt materials to learner needs, protect academic integrity, and align AI use with learning objectives.

Previous studies have combined TAM and TPACK variables within explanatory models. However, the present study does not test such a model. TAM and AI-TPACK are used as complementary interpretive perspectives: TAM helps contextualise teachers' evaluations of AI, while AI-TPACK helps contextualise their pedagogical concerns and professional support needs.

Recent work has further integrated TAM and TPACK. A study by Firdaus et al. (2025) involving 436 Indonesian preservice EFL teachers found that TPACK significantly impacts both AI behavioral intention ($\beta = 0.350$) and actual AI use ($\beta = 0.557$), while perceived ease of use drives perceived usefulness ($\beta = 0.674$). These studies demonstrate that TAM and TPACK variables can be examined together in explanatory research. In the present exploratory survey, however, they are used only to organise the literature and interpret descriptive findings.

Teacher professional development for AI integration

The literature consistently identifies professional development as a critical enabler of effective AI integration. A TPACK-based professional development program for novice EFL teachers demonstrated significant improvements in knowledge of AI-powered tools, teaching skills, and self-efficacy (Zulianti et al., 2024). Similarly, Moorhouse et al. (2024) found that structured training helped teachers recognize the need to tailor AI-generated content to student levels, moving beyond uncritical adoption.

Despite these promising interventions, studies consistently report that most teachers lack adequate preparation. Wan et al. (2025) found that even among teachers who actively use AI, institutional clarity and perceived control over student learning significantly influence their integration practices. In the Western Balkans and Kosovo, discussions about AI integration in higher education are emerging, but published evidence remains limited (Pireci Sejdiu & Sejdiu, 2025).

Research gap

While the literature has expanded rapidly, several gaps remain. Most teacher perception studies originate from East and Southeast Asian contexts, with limited representation from the Western Balkans and under-resourced educational settings.

Although research on teachers' acceptance of AI has expanded, an important conceptual issue remains. Acceptance oriented studies generally focus on perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and intentions to adopt technology. These concepts help explain favourable evaluations of AI but provide limited insight into whether teachers possess the pedagogical knowledge, ethical awareness, and contextual judgement required to integrate it appropriately into EFL teaching. In contrast, AI-TPACK research focuses on teachers' professional knowledge and pedagogical integration, but it does not always examine how these requirements coexist with teachers' perceived value of AI.

The conceptual gap therefore concerns how teachers' positive perceptions of AI coexist with their pedagogical concerns, ethical reservations, and perceived professional support needs. This issue remains insufficiently documented in the Western Balkans, including Kosovo. The present exploratory survey addresses this contextual and conceptual gap by describing EFL teachers' AI practices, perceived educational opportunities, concerns, and support needs. TAM and AI-TPACK provide complementary concepts for interpreting these patterns, but the study does not test relationships between the frameworks.

TAM explains how perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and related attitudinal constructs shape teachers' intentions to use AI tools in their practice (Cai et al., 2024; Liu and Ma, 2024). AI-TPACK highlights the knowledge, ethical awareness, and pedagogical judgment needed to integrate these tools meaningfully into specific teaching contexts, including teachers' capacity to evaluate AI outputs and make context-sensitive decisions about their use (Celik, 2023). By bringing these perspectives together, the study captures both attitudinal drivers of AI adoption and the broader pedagogical and ethical conditions under which EFL teachers in Kosovo and similar settings can use AI in responsible and educationally productive ways (Omidvar & Meihami, 2025).

Methodology

Research design

This study adopted an exploratory descriptive survey design. Data were collected through a single questionnaire containing demographic and AI use questions, ten Likert items, and three open ended questions. The study was designed to describe participants' reported practices, perceptions, concerns, and support needs. It was not designed to test hypotheses, estimate relationships among theoretical constructs, or evaluate a technology acceptance model.

The closed ended responses provided descriptive patterns through frequencies, percentages, and response distributions. The open ended responses provided brief explanations and examples that helped contextualise these patterns. Because the open ended component consisted of three brief questions within the same questionnaire, the study is presented as a descriptive survey with open ended responses rather than as a fully developed mixed methods study.

Theoretical framework

The study is based on an integrated framework that combines the Technology Acceptance Model with the AI-TPACK perspective on teacher knowledge (Celik, 2023; Davis, 1989). TAM structures the attitudinal components of the questionnaire, especially items related to perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, confidence, and concerns about AI replacing teaching tasks, which are central constructs in recent AI acceptance studies in language education (Liu & Ma, 2024). These constructs help explain why teachers choose to adopt, adapt, or limit AI use in their practice.

At the same time, the AI-TPACK perspective informs the interpretation of items related to professional development, ethical concerns, and perceived readiness. This framework emphasizes that effective AI integration requires coherent combinations of technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge, along with the ability to evaluate AI-based decisions critically and ethically (Celik, 2023). Viewing the findings through this combined lens allows for moving beyond a narrow focus on acceptance to consider how teachers' knowledge, values, and institutional conditions shape their AI practices and perceived needs for support (Moorhouse et al., 2024; Omidvar & Meihami, 2025).

Participants

Twenty-eight EFL teachers participated in the study, as shown in Table 1, representing diverse educational contexts. The sample included teachers from primary (28.6%), secondary (39.3%), undergraduate (17.9%), graduate (10.7%), and IELTS Academic (3.6%) levels. Gender distribution was relatively balanced, with 57.1% female and 42.9% male participants. Age distribution was concentrated in the 25–34 range (42.9%), followed by 35–44 (28.6%) and 45–54

Table 1. Participant demographics.

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Gender	Female	16	57.1
	Male	12	42.9
Age	Under 25	1	3.6
	25–34	12	42.9
	35–44	8	28.6
	45–54	6	21.4
	55+	1	3.6
Teaching level	Primary	8	28.6
	Secondary	11	39.3
	Undergraduate	5	17.9
	Graduate	3	10.7
	IELTS Academic	1	3.6
Experience	0–2 years	6	21.4
	3–7 years	5	17.9
	8–14 years	8	28.6
	15+ years	9	32.1
AI familiarity	Yes	25	89.3
	Not sure	3	10.7

(21.4%). Teaching experience was well distributed, with 32.1% reporting 15 or more years, 28.6% reporting 8–14 years, 21.4% reporting 0–2 years, and 17.9% reporting 3–7 years. The majority (89.3%) reported familiarity with AI tools used in education, while 10.7% were unsure.

Data collection instrument

A semi-structured questionnaire was developed with four sections. Section 1 collected demographic information (age, gender, teaching level, and years of experience). Section 2 assessed AI familiarity, tool usage, and frequency of use. Section 3 included 10 Likert scale items on a five-point scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree) organised into two broad content domains for descriptive reporting: (a) perceived educational value of AI (five items addressing writing improvement, lesson planning efficiency, learning personalization, feedback utility, and student engagement) and (b) teacher attitudes and concerns (five items addressing confidence, role anxiety, training adequacy, content accuracy concerns, and task replacement beliefs). Section 4 included three open-ended questions inviting teachers to describe (a) the most positive impact of AI, (b) the most challenging or concerning aspect, and (c) the type of training or support needed.

Items on perceived usefulness and ease of use were aligned with validated TAM formulations, while items on training, ethical concerns, and role anxiety were based on emerging frameworks for teacher AI readiness and professional competence (Chiu et al., 2024; Moorhouse et al., 2024). The draft questionnaire was piloted informally with three EFL teachers to check clarity and relevance; minor wording changes were made before full distribution.

The first content domain concerned the perceived educational value of AI and included five items addressing writing improvement, lesson planning, learning personalisation, feedback, and student engagement. The second concerned teacher attitudes and concerns and included five items addressing confidence, training adequacy, content accuracy, task replacement, and the teacher's professional role. These domains were used to organise item level reporting and should not be interpreted as validated latent constructs or composite scales.

The questionnaire topics were informed by previous research on technology acceptance, AI-TPACK, teacher competence, and responsible AI use. However, the instrument did not operationalise the complete TAM or AI-TPACK frameworks. It did not contain complete multi item measures of perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, behavioural intention, actual adoption, or the separate technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge dimensions of AI-TPACK.

The theoretical frameworks therefore informed the selection of questionnaire topics and the interpretation of the findings but were not directly measured or tested.

Three EFL teachers reviewed the preliminary questionnaire for clarity and relevance before data collection. Their comments resulted in minor wording revisions. This process constituted an informal clarity check rather than formal validation. Reliability coefficients were not calculated because the items addressed heterogeneous aspects of educational value, confidence, training, professional role, and concern, and no composite scale scores were created. The questionnaire should therefore be regarded as exploratory, and the closed ended findings are reported at the individual item level.

Data analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, and response distributions. Qualitative responses from the three open-ended questions were analyzed using inductive thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase approach. Responses were first read and reread for familiarization, then systematically coded. Initial codes were collated into potential themes, which were then reviewed, refined, and named.

The two forms of evidence were merged during interpretation through narrative integration. Themes identified in the open ended responses were compared with conceptually related closed ended findings. For example, comments concerning lesson preparation were considered alongside the item addressing lesson planning efficiency, while comments concerning content reliability and professional support were considered alongside the corresponding closed ended items. The open ended responses were used to elaborate, contextualise, or qualify the descriptive patterns. They were not treated as an independent source of confirmation or as evidence of methodological triangulation.

Ethical considerations

The study followed institutional ethical guidelines for research involving human participants. A written informed consent statement was obtained from all examinees. Before the distribution of the questionnaires, the examinees were advised on: (1) the information obtained from the questionnaires would be used for scientific purposes only, (2) their identity and privacy would be kept fully confidential, and (3) they were free to withdraw from the study at any time. Participant privacy was protected through anonymized data collection, and no personally identifying information was stored. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed of their right to withdraw at any time.

Results

AI tool usage practices

Regarding frequency of use presented in Table 2, the largest group of teachers reported using AI "sometimes" (46.4%, n = 13), followed by "often" (35.7%, n = 10), "rarely" (14.3%, n = 4), and "always" (3.6%, n = 1). No participant reported never using AI tools. Combining "often" and "always," 39.3% of teachers were frequent users, while 60.7% used AI less frequently.

Tool preferences in Table 3 showed a clear dominance of ChatGPT, used by 89.3% (n = 25) of participants. AI-based quiz and test generators were the second most popular category (57.1%, n = 16), followed by Grammarly (50.0%, n = 14) and Quillbot (39.3%, n = 11). Text-to-speech and speech-to-text tools were used by 28.6% (n = 8) of participants. Other tools, including Gemini, NotebookLM, Canva, Flippity, and Perplexity, received isolated mentions.

Perceived educational value of AI

Likert scale responses in Table 4 regarding the educational value of AI revealed a nuanced pattern. Teachers showed the strongest agreement with learning personalisation, followed by lesson planning efficiency, while agreement was lower for writing improvement and student engagement.

Table 2. Frequency of AI tool use.

Frequency	n	%
Always	1	3.6
Often	10	35.7
Sometimes	13	46.4
Rarely	4	14.3
Never	0	0.0

Table 3. AI tools used by teachers.

AI Tool	n	%
ChatGPT	25	89.3
AI based quiz/test generators	16	57.1
Grammarly	14	50.0
Quillbot	11	39.3
Text to speech/speech to text	8	28.6
Other (Gemini, Canva, Perplexity, etc.)	5	17.9

Table 4. Teachers' perceived educational value of AI (Likert Scale Responses).

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD
AI makes lesson planning more efficient	12 (42.9%)	7 (25.0%)	5 (17.9%)	1 (3.6%)	3 (10.7%)
AI can help personalize learning	9 (32.1%)	11 (39.3%)	4 (14.3%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (14.3%)
AI provides useful feedback for learners	5 (17.9%)	12 (42.9%)	6 (21.4%)	5 (17.9%)	0 (0.0%)
AI encourages student engagement	7 (25.0%)	8 (28.6%)	8 (28.6%)	3 (10.7%)	2 (7.1%)
AI helps students improve writing	2 (7.1%)	9 (32.1%)	13 (46.4%)	3 (10.7%)	1 (3.6%)

Note: SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neither Agree nor Disagree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree.

Learning personalisation received the highest combined agreement (71.4%), followed by lesson planning efficiency (67.9%), feedback utility (60.7%), student engagement (53.6%), and writing improvement (39.3%). Writing improvement also produced the highest proportion of neutral responses (46.4%). This pattern suggests that teachers view AI as more useful for behind-the-scenes planning and individualization than for directly improving specific language skills.

Teacher attitudes and concerns

The second set of Likert items in Table 5, captured teachers' confidence, anxieties, and beliefs about AI's impact on their professional role.

Most teachers (67.9%) expressed confidence in using AI tools, consistent with the high familiarity rate (89.3%). A substantial majority (64.3%) were concerned about the accuracy of AI-generated content. Only 32.1% agreed that they had received sufficient training, while 46.4% disagreed. These item level responses indicate a descriptive discrepancy between reported confidence and perceived training adequacy. They do not constitute a validated measure of overall AI readiness. Regarding professional displacement, 64.3% of teachers were not concerned that AI would reduce their role, suggesting resilience in professional identity. However, 42.9% agreed that AI could replace some teaching tasks, indicating a pragmatic acknowledgment of AI's potential rather than an existential threat.

To examine whether confidence varied by career stage, teaching experience was cross-tabulated with confidence in using AI tools.

Table 5. Teacher attitudes and concerns (Likert Scale Responses).

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD
I feel confident using AI tools	6 (21.4%)	13 (46.4%)	6 (21.4%)	3 (10.7%)	0 (0.0%)
I am concerned about AI content accuracy	5 (17.9%)	13 (46.4%)	5 (17.9%)	2 (7.1%)	3 (10.7%)
I have received enough training	5 (17.9%)	4 (14.3%)	6 (21.4%)	10 (35.7%)	3 (10.7%)
AI could replace some teaching tasks	3 (10.7%)	9 (32.1%)	7 (25.0%)	6 (21.4%)	3 (10.7%)
I worry AI will reduce my role	3 (10.7%)	1 (3.6%)	6 (21.4%)	14 (50.0%)	4 (14.3%)

Note: SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; N = Neither Agree nor Disagree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree.

Table 6. Teaching experience by confidence in using AI tools.

Years of teaching experience	Low confidence (SD/D)	Neutral (N)	High confidence (A/SA)	Total
0–2 years	n = 0	n = 2	n = 4	n = 6
3–7 years	n = 0	n = 0	n = 5	n = 5
8–14 years	n = 1	n = 2	n = 5	n = 8
15+ years	n = 2	n = 2	n = 5	n = 9
Total	n = 3	n = 6	n = 19	N = 28

To examine whether AI confidence clustered at specific career stages, a simple cross-tabulation of teaching experience by confidence in using AI tools was created (Table 6). The results showed that high confidence (agree or strongly agree) was distributed relatively evenly across all experience groups, ranging from 55.6% among teachers with 15 or more years of experience to 100% among those with 3–7 years of experience. Notably, teachers with 15 or more years of experience reported confidence levels comparable to those with 0–2 or 3–7 years of experience, indicating that willingness to work with AI is not limited to early career teachers. Given the small sample size (N = 28), no inferential tests were conducted, but this descriptive pattern aligns with studies reporting limited or inconsistent demographic effects on teacher AI acceptance (Alharbi, 2024; Slamet, 2024).

Reported challenges

The multiple-choice question on challenges revealed four main concerns (Table 7). Ethical issues (cheating, misinformation) and student overreliance on AI were reported by 64.3% of teachers. Limited access to appropriate technology was cited by 46.4%, and lack of training by 42.9%. Time constraints in lesson planning or adaptation were mentioned by 14.3%.

Qualitative findings: positive impacts

Thematic analysis of the open-ended question on positive impacts identified four primary themes. Teacher responses showed a clear trend in the positive impacts that teachers associated with AI in the classroom.

Theme 1: Time Efficiency in Lesson Planning. The most frequently mentioned benefit was saving time on lesson preparation and materials development. It was identified by 14 teachers, representing 51.9% of the respondents. Teachers described AI as a tool that significantly reduces the workload of creating lesson plans, tests, worksheets, and differentiated activities. One teacher stated, “Fast ways to prepare lesson plans, tests, etc.” Another explained, “I do not use AI in the classroom, except rarely, but I use it in the preparation of my lesson plans. And this is incredibly time-saving.” A third noted, “Reducing lesson planning time and having more time to focus on students and activities.”

Theme 2: Personalization and Differentiation. Teachers valued AI’s ability to tailor content to different student needs and levels. It was mentioned by 9 teachers (33.3%). One respondent wrote, “AI has helped personalize student learning activities. It allows me to tailor lessons to different learning styles and provide immediate feedback.” Another stated, “Having the opportunity to create different tasks to meet the needs of various students, especially those with learning needs or neurodivergent students.”

Theme 3: Student Engagement. Several teachers noted that AI increased engagement and motivation. It was mentioned by 5 teachers (18.5%). One described how AI “helps teachers come up with creative ideas that make learning fun and an unforgettable experience for students.” Another mentioned “better engagement” as the primary impact, while a third cited “personalized learning paths, instant feedback and support, and increased student engagement.”

Table 7. Challenges reported by teachers.

Challenge	n	%
Ethical concerns (cheating, misinformation)	18	64.3
Student over reliance on AI tools	18	64.3
Limited access to appropriate technology	13	46.4
Lack of training	12	42.9
Time constraints in lesson planning	4	14.3

Theme 4: Creative Instructional Ideas. A smaller but notable group of teachers valued AI as a source of instructional creativity. This theme was reported by 6 teachers (22.2%). One teacher noted that AI "provides creative and interactive ideas," while another described using AI for "specific lesson planning and more creative approaches in practice sessions."

Qualitative findings: challenges and concerns

Thematic analysis of the open-ended question on challenges revealed five themes.

Theme 1: Student Over reliance and Loss of Critical Thinking. The most prominent concern was that students become excessively dependent on AI tools, which erodes their capacity for independent thinking and authentic language production. It was mentioned by 10 teachers (37.0%). One teacher stated, "The most concerning issue is students' overreliance on AI-generated content. Many are becoming too dependent on these tools, which affects their creativity, critical thinking, and attention span."Another teacher emphasized the need to prevent student overreliance on AI while still fostering independent critical thinking."

Theme 2: Accuracy and Trustworthiness of AI Content. Teachers expressed concern about the reliability of AI generated information and the challenge of verifying its accuracy. They were mentioned by 6 teachers (22.2%). "Teachers reported that they spend considerable effort verifying the accuracy of AI generated information and adapting responses for pedagogical use."

Theme 3: Erosion of Creativity. A distinct theme emerged regarding the concern that AI diminishes both student and teacher creativity. It was identified by 7 teachers (25.9%). "Teachers expressed concern that AI may diminish both student and teacher creativity." They also expressed fear that AI is "making us passive teachers."

Theme 4: Academic Integrity. Several teachers raised ethical concerns about cheating and plagiarism. It was reported by 4 teachers (14.8%). One teacher noted, "Students use ChatGPT to write papers assigned as homework." Another identified concerns about academic integrity and cheating, overreliance and eroded critical thinking, and equity and access disparities.

Theme 5: Infrastructure and Access Barriers. Teachers in some contexts reported practical barriers. They were mentioned by 3 teacher (11.1%). One teacher stated, "Sometimes we do not have access to the internet." Another cited limited resources as a primary obstacle.

Qualitative findings: training and support needs

Thematic analysis of the training question identified four themes.

Theme 1: Hands on, Practical Training. The most common request was for practical, experiential training sessions. This theme was identified by 13 teachers (46.4%). Teachers asked for "hands-on training with clear, practical guidelines," "workshops regarding the use of AI," and training that takes a "hands-on approach to training for specific AI tools."

Theme 2: Ethical and Responsible Use Training. Teachers sought guidance on navigating ethical dimensions. It was mentioned by 5 teachers (17.9%). One respondent requested "training related to ethical considerations of AI use" along with "an overview of different tools for different purposes." Another asked for "practical integration strategies (lesson planning and curriculum alignment), prompt engineering skills, ethical use, and policy development."

Theme 3: Tool specific and Contextualized Training. Teachers expressed a need for training tailored to specific tools and local contexts. This theme was mentioned by 8 teachers (28.6%). One teacher asked for guidance on how to use websites like MagicSchool AI and Quizziz AI to generate materials and resources. Another requested training that considers the needs of local-level learners.

Theme 4: Foundational Technology Training. Six teachers (21.4%) identified a need for more basic technology integration skills before advancing to AI. One teacher stated, "We as teachers need basic training on incorporating technology in the classroom first, and then we can expand our goals to AI tools."

Discussion

AI as a lesson planning tool: pragmatic adoption

The descriptive findings are broadly consistent with recent research documenting teachers' pragmatic adoption of AI tools. The dominance of ChatGPT reflects global patterns reported in recent systematic reviews, where ChatGPT and similar generative AI tools have become the primary entry point for educators exploring AI-assisted instruction. The

emphasis on lesson planning efficiency as the top perceived benefit aligns with findings in studies from other EFL contexts, where teachers consistently identify materials development and lesson preparation as the most valued applications of AI.

This descriptive pattern is compatible with TAM's concept of perceived usefulness because participants particularly valued AI for practical professional tasks (Davis, 1989). Teachers in this study clearly found AI useful for reducing workload and saving time, both direct indicators of perceived usefulness. The relatively lower agreement on writing improvement compared to lesson planning suggests that teachers view AI as more effective for their own professional tasks than for directly improving students' language skills, a distinction with important implications for how AI is positioned in teacher training programs.

However, the study did not administer a complete TAM instrument or examine relationships among TAM constructs. This pattern should therefore be interpreted as descriptive evidence of perceived educational value rather than as confirmation of TAM.

Reported confidence and perceived training adequacy

The findings show a descriptive contrast between participants' confidence in using AI tools and their assessments of the training they had received. One possible interpretation is that some participants developed familiarity with AI through independent experimentation or informal learning. However, this interpretation remains tentative because the questionnaire did not investigate how confidence was developed, assess actual competence, or measure readiness using a validated scale. The result is therefore interpreted as a confidence and training discrepancy rather than as evidence of a readiness gap.

The open ended responses provide additional context because participants requested practical workshops, guidance on specific tools, support for pedagogical integration, and training in responsible use. These requests suggest that reported confidence in operating AI tools does not necessarily remove the perceived need for structured professional support.

TAM and AI-TPACK as interpretive perspectives

The descriptive findings can be considered through TAM and AI-TPACK, but they do not provide a test of either framework. Participants' positive perceptions of AI for lesson planning, personalisation, and materials development are compatible with TAM's concept of perceived usefulness. Their concerns about content accuracy, ethical use, and professional training can be considered through an AI-TPACK perspective, which directs attention to the knowledge and judgement required for pedagogically appropriate AI integration. However, the study did not administer complete TAM or AI-TPACK scales, test relationships among theoretical constructs, or evaluate an extended model. The frameworks are therefore used only to organise and interpret the descriptive findings.

Coexisting perceived benefits and concerns

Participants reported both practical benefits and concerns regarding AI. They valued AI for lesson preparation, materials development, differentiation, and creative instructional ideas. At the same time, they expressed concerns about content accuracy, student dependency, academic integrity, creativity, and critical thinking. These findings suggest that favourable perceptions of AI can coexist with reservations about its classroom use.

This coexistence should not be interpreted as a new theoretical construct or as evidence of a stable professional identity. The findings are based on a small sample and an exploratory questionnaire. They identify issues that could be examined more closely through interviews, classroom observations, and validated measures.

Ethical concerns as a primary barrier

Ethical concerns, such as cheating and misinformation, and student overreliance emerged as the most frequently cited challenges, each reported by 64.3% of teachers. This finding is consistent with the international literature. A systematic review of EFL teacher perspectives found that cheating and plagiarism are among the most frequently cited concerns worldwide (Daud et al., 2025). Similarly, Daud et al. (2025) reported that overreliance on AI was identified as a challenge in above-mentioned reviewed studies. These concerns are also evident in broader higher education debates, where educators question whether they are grading students or grading ChatGPT, and note that conventional plagiarism detection tools are increasingly ineffective against sophisticated AI-generated prose (Pireci Sejdiu & Sejdiu, 2025).

Ethical concerns were prominent in participants' responses, particularly in relation to academic integrity, misinformation, content accuracy, and student overreliance. However, the present study did not test whether these concerns predicted or moderated teachers' AI use. Ethical concerns should therefore be understood as reported perceptions rather than as

variables with an empirically established moderating effect. Future research could use validated measures and an appropriate explanatory design to examine whether ethical concerns influence the relationship between teachers' perceptions of AI and their classroom use.

Convergence and divergence with student perceptions

The findings of this teacher study can be considered alongside evidence from Kosovan EFL students, who also report intensive use of AI tools for language learning and a complex mix of enthusiasm and concern (Braha, 2026). Both groups identify grammar, writing, and vocabulary as the main skill domains supported by AI tools, and both emphasize time savings, instant feedback, and ease of access as central benefits. In this sense, teachers and students share a broadly pragmatic orientation toward AI, treating it as a convenient assistant for structurally focused tasks rather than a transformative replacement for human instruction.

However, there are also notable differences between teachers' and students' beliefs. Students report a pronounced trust–usability paradox: 85.9 percent find AI tools easy to use, yet only 34.1 percent trust the feedback they receive (Braha, 2026). Teachers in the present study, by contrast, show comparatively high confidence in using AI tools but focus their distrust on downstream pedagogical risks, such as student overreliance, academic integrity, and the erosion of creativity, rather than on their own immediate interaction with the tools. While students frame trust primarily in terms of the reliability of error correction and content accuracy, teachers extend trust concerns to broader questions of ethical responsibility, classroom control, and the long-term development of critical thinking.

These differences suggest that trust operates at two distinct levels in AI-mediated language education. At the learner level, trust concerns focus on the correctness and usefulness of specific feedback episodes. At the teacher level, trust concerns encompass systemic issues, including assessment validity, equitable access, and the preservation of human roles and pedagogical values. Integrating these perspectives indicates that future theoretical models should treat trust not as a single construct but as a layered phenomenon, with separate components for micro-level interactional trust in feedback and macro-level institutional and pedagogical trust in AI's role within the curriculum.

Alignments and gaps in teacher–student perceptions

To clarify these convergences and divergences, Table 8 summarizes key similarities and differences between Kosovan EFL teachers in the present study and Kosovan EFL students reported in Braha (2026) regarding tools used, purposes, perceived benefits, concerns, and trust–usability patterns.

Table 8. Alignment and differences between Kosovan EFL teachers and students.

Dimension	EFL teachers (present study)	Kosovan EFL students (Braha, 2026)
Main AI tools used	ChatGPT dominant (89.3%); AI based quiz and test generators; Grammarly; Quillbot.	Google Translate and ChatGPT equally dominant (68.2% each); Grammarly and Quillbot widely used.
Primary purposes	Lesson planning, materials creation, quiz and test generation, preparation of differentiated tasks.	Vocabulary, grammar, and writing support; translation; exam and assignment preparation; feedback on mistakes.
Most valued benefits	Time efficiency in lesson planning; workload reduction; support for personalization and differentiation; creative ideas for activities.	Instant feedback and correction; time efficiency and accessibility; personalized and adaptive learning; vocabulary expansion; enjoyment and engagement.
Main concerns	Student over reliance on AI; loss of creativity and critical thinking; academic integrity and cheating; accuracy of AI content; infrastructure and access barriers.	Accuracy and reliability of feedback; overdependence on AI; limited contextual and cultural understanding; ethical and integrity issues.
Trust and usability pattern	High confidence in using AI; strong concerns about accuracy and ethical use in the classroom; fear of pedagogical deskilling ("passive teachers").	Very high perceived ease of use (85.9%) but low trust in AI feedback (34.1%); empirically documented trust–usability paradox.
Perceived role of AI in teaching/ learning	Viewed as powerful support tool for planning and differentiation, not a replacement for human teaching; anxiety about role erosion is limited but present.	Viewed as helpful assistant for language improvement, but not a substitute for teachers, especially for ideas, experiences, and oral communication skills.

Implications for professional development

The findings indicate that many teachers already use AI tools for lesson planning, materials development, and differentiation, yet report limited formal training and ongoing uncertainty about ethical and pedagogical use. This pattern suggests that professional development should go beyond basic tool demonstrations toward systematic development of AI literacy and AI-TPACK. Recent studies show that targeted programs can improve teachers' knowledge of AI-powered tools, their ability to design AI-supported lessons, and their self-efficacy in using these tools (Enhancing Novice EFL Teachers' Competency in AI-Powered Tools Through a TPACK-Based Professional Development Program, 2024; Effectiveness of a Professional Development Program for AI Literacy, 2024). These results reinforce the need for structured, sustained training rather than leaving teachers to experiment individually.

In this study, teachers explicitly requested practical, context-sensitive support, including concrete examples of prompts, guidance on integrating AI into existing curricula, and strategies for addressing academic integrity and overreliance among students. These needs align with emerging frameworks that conceptualize professional generative AI competence as a combination of technological proficiency, pedagogical alignment, ethical awareness, and preparation of students for AI-rich environments (Chapelle, 2025; Moorhouse et al., 2024). Professional development in the Kosovan and broader EFL context would therefore benefit from combining hands-on workshops focused on specific teaching scenarios with explicit discussion of ethical issues, local policy expectations, and ways to maintain creativity and critical thinking when AI is present. Designing professional development around authentic teacher tasks, such as co-creating writing prompts with AI, revising AI-generated materials, or modeling critical evaluation of AI outputs in class, can help teachers develop integrated AI-TPACK rather than isolated technical skills.

The contrast between reported confidence and perceived training adequacy suggests that professional development should account for teachers' existing experience with AI and their stated support needs. The cross-tabulation showed that high confidence in using AI tools was not limited to early-career teachers, indicating that both novice and experienced teachers can be leaders in AI integration. International research on AI readiness and AI literacy among teachers indicates that confidence, perceived usefulness, access to resources, institutional support, and clear guidelines interact in shaping adoption and responsible use (Al-Abdullatif, 2024; Luckin et al., 2022). Institutions should therefore design multi-level professional learning pathways that combine foundational AI literacy with advanced modules on assessment, feedback, and student guidance, and recognize teachers as co-designers of responsible AI use in language education rather than passive recipients of technology.

Limitations and future research

This study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting the findings. First, the teacher sample was obtained through convenience sampling and was relatively small, which limits statistical power and the ability to detect more fine-grained patterns in attitudes and practices. Participants were self-selected EFL teachers with prior familiarity with AI tools, likely overrepresenting early adopters and those interested in experimenting with new technologies. Given the convenience sample and small sample size, the findings should be interpreted as context specific. Ethical concerns were identified descriptively through closed and open ended responses. The study did not test whether they predicted, mediated, or moderated AI use.

An important limitation concerns the exploratory questionnaire. Although its content was informed by relevant theoretical and empirical literature, the study did not establish content validity, construct validity, or reliability through formal psychometric procedures. The questionnaire did not operationalise the complete TAM or AI-TPACK frameworks, and no composite scale scores were calculated. The results should therefore be interpreted as item level descriptive evidence rather than as validated measurements of technology acceptance, AI-TPACK, or teacher readiness.

The small convenience sample and descriptive design prevent model testing, causal interpretation, moderation analysis, and broad generalisation. The three open ended questions generated useful explanatory comments, but their brevity limited the depth normally associated with a substantial qualitative component. The findings should therefore be regarded as preliminary and context specific.

Second, the study is situated in Kosovo, an educational context shaped by post conflict reconstruction and limited resources, which is both a strength and a limitation. It provides much-needed evidence from a setting largely absent in current AI in language education research, but the specific institutional conditions, digital infrastructure, and policy environment may differ significantly from those in other regions (OECD, 2018; Xue et al., 2024). At the same time, Kosovo is part of a broader regional conversation in which generative AI is viewed as both a disruptor and an enabler in higher education, with calls for inclusive policies and critical AI literacies that balance innovation and integrity (Pireci Sejdiu & Sejdiu, 2025). Therefore, transferability of the findings to other countries should be based on reasoned

comparison rather than direct generalization, considering similarities and differences in teacher education systems, access to AI tools, and national regulations.

Third, the design captures teacher perceptions at a single point in time and relies on self-report questionnaire data, without classroom observations or objective measures of AI use. Self-report data are vulnerable to social desirability and recall bias, and cross sectional snapshots cannot show how teachers' AI practices and levels of trust evolve as tools, policies, and training opportunities change (Memarian & Doleck, 2023; Yang & Li, 2024). The study also analysed teacher and student data (Braha, 2026) in separate projects, which allowed for a detailed focus in each article but limited the ability to examine teacher–student dynamics within the same institutional settings.

Future research

Future research should address these limitations in three main ways. First, larger scale studies using stratified or probability based sampling are needed to examine whether the patterns identified here hold across different regions, school levels, and institutional types, both within Kosovo and in other Western Balkan and post conflict contexts (Jiang, 2022; Kundu & Bej, 2025). Such designs would permit more robust modelling of how factors such as institutional support, AI literacy, and subject specialization shape teachers' AI practices and concerns. Second, mixed teacher–student designs that collect data from both groups in the same institutions would make it possible to analyse how teacher attitudes, classroom practices, and institutional messages interact with student acceptance patterns such as the trust–usability paradox documented in Braha (2026). This type of design would extend the comparative insights outlined in the present Discussion and offer a more systemic view of AI mediated EFL ecologies.

Third, longitudinal and intervention studies are needed to trace how AI related perceptions and competencies develop over time as teachers receive targeted professional development or as institutional policies change. Longitudinal research could examine whether structured professional development changes teachers' confidence, competence, and perceptions of training adequacy over time. Combining survey data with classroom observations, artefact analysis of AI assisted materials, and possibly learning analytics would further strengthen the evidence base for designing responsible AI integration in EFL teaching across diverse contexts.

Conclusion

This exploratory descriptive survey provides context specific evidence about how a small sample of EFL teachers use and perceive AI tools. Participants particularly associated AI with learning personalisation, lesson planning, materials development, and time efficiency. They also reported concerns about content accuracy, academic integrity, student overreliance, creativity, and critical thinking. The findings further show a descriptive discrepancy between relatively high reported confidence and less positive assessments of training adequacy.

These patterns identify practical priorities for teacher support, including experience with specific AI tools, critical evaluation of AI generated content, pedagogical adaptation, academic integrity, and responsible classroom use. TAM and AI-TPACK help situate these issues conceptually, but neither framework was tested or extended. Given the small convenience sample, exploratory instrument, and descriptive analysis, the results should be treated as preliminary. Larger studies using validated measures are required to investigate relationships among AI acceptance, teacher knowledge, ethical concerns, institutional support, and classroom practice. Study offers a detailed account of EFL teachers' perceptions of AI tools in the English classroom, revealing a complex picture of pragmatic adoption tempered by significant concerns. Teachers overwhelmingly value AI for lesson planning efficiency and learning personalization, with ChatGPT serving as the dominant tool across educational levels. However, ethical concerns, student overreliance, accuracy issues, and insufficient training create substantial barriers to deeper integration.

Ethical approval statement

This study received ethical approval from the Research Ethics Committee of the University "Ukshin Hoti" Prizren, Kosovo, under reference number 02–253.

Data availability

Zenodo: Artificial Intelligence in the English Classroom EFL Teachers' Opportunities, Challenges, and Readiness for AI Integration. https://zenodo.org/records/19267242 (Braha & Ramadani, 2026).

The project contains the following underlying data:

- Dataset - Artificial Intelligence in the English Classroom EFL Teachers' Opportunities, Challenges, and Readiness for AI Integration.xlsx (Raw and unaveraged data as collected from the questionnaires)
- Extended Data - Questionnaire - Artificial intelligence in the English classroom.pdf (Questionnaire form)
- Informed_Consent_Form_AI_EFL_Teachers.docx (Informed Consent Form)

References

Alharbi M: **The role of artificial intelligence in advancing English as a foreign language teaching at Saudi universities.** *World Journal on Educational Technology: Current Issues.* 2024; **16**(3): 181–200.
Publisher Full Text

Al-Abdullatif AM: **Modeling Teachers' Acceptance of Generative Artificial Intelligence Use in Higher Education: The Role of AI Literacy, Intelligent TPACK, and Perceived Trust.** *Educ. Sci.* 2024; **14**(11): 1209.
Publisher Full Text

Almansour N: **Investigating factors influencing efl learners' behavioral intentions to adopt chatgpt for language learning.** *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 2024; **15**(6): 1910–1918.
Publisher Full Text

Braha M: **Kosovan EFL students' acceptance of AI tools for English language learning: practices, perceptions, challenges, and suggestions for improvement.** *Innov. Lang. Learn. Teach.* 2026: 1–25.
Publisher Full Text

Braha M, Ramadani R: Dataset - Artificial Intelligence in the English Classroom EFL Teachers' Opportunities, Challenges, and Readiness for AI Integration. [Data set]. *Zenodo.* 2026.
Publisher Full Text

Braun V, Clarke V: **Using thematic analysis in psychology.** *Qual. Res. Psychol.* 2006; **3**(2): 77–101.
Publisher Full Text

Cai Q, Lin Y, Yu Z: **Factors Influencing Learner Attitudes Towards ChatGPT-Assisted Language Learning in Higher Education.** *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction.* 2024; **40**(22): 7112–7126.
Publisher Full Text

Celik I: **Towards Intelligent-TPACK: An Empirical Study on Teachers' Professional Knowledge to Ethically Integrate Artificial Intelligence (AI)-Based Tools Into Education.** *Comput. Hum. Behav.* 2023; **138**: 107468.
Publisher Full Text

Chapelle CA: **Generative AI as game changer: Implications for language education.** *System.* 2025; **132**: 103672.
Publisher Full Text

Chen L, Chen P, Lin Z: **Artificial Intelligence in Education: A Review.** *IEEE Access.* 2020; **8**: 75264–75278.
Publisher Full Text

Chiu TKF, Moorhouse BL, Chai CS, *et al.*: **Teacher support and student motivation to learn with Artificial Intelligence (AI) based chatbot.** *Interact. Learn. Environ.* 2024; **32**(7): 3240–3256.
Publisher Full Text

Cristianini N: **Intelligence reinvented.** *New Sci.* 2016; **232**(3097): 37–41.
Publisher Full Text

Crompton H, Burke D: **Artificial intelligence in higher education: the state of the field.** *Int. J. Educ. Technol. High. Educ.* 2023; **20**: 22.
Publisher Full Text

Davis FD: **Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology.** *MIS Q.* 1989; **13**(3): 319–340.
Publisher Full Text

Daud A, Aulia AF, Muryanti, *et al.*: **Integrating artificial intelligence into English language teaching: A systematic review.** *Eurasian J. Educ. Res.* 2025; **14**(2): 677–691.
Publisher Full Text

Derakhshan A, Ghiasvand F: **Is ChatGPT an evil or an angel for second language education and research? A phenomenographic study of research-active EFL teachers' perceptions.** *Int. J. Appl. Linguist.* 2024; **34**: 1246–1264.
Publisher Full Text

Du J, Daniel BK: **Transforming Language Education: A Systematic Review of AI-Powered Chatbots for English as a Foreign Language Speaking Practice.** *Computers and Education. Artificial Intelligence.* 2024; **6**: 100230.
Publisher Full Text

Firdaus R, Habibi A, Hendra R, *et al.*: **Factors affecting Indonesian pre-service EFL teachers' AI acceptance and use.** *Texto Livre.* 2025; **18**.
Publisher Full Text

Jiang R: **How does artificial intelligence empower EFL teaching and learning nowadays? A review on artificial intelligence in the EFL context.** *Front. Psychol.* 2022; **13**: 1049401.
PubMed Abstract | **Publisher Full Text** | **Free Full Text**

Kundu A, Bej T: **Psychological impacts of AI use on school students: a systematic scoping review of the empirical literature.** *Res. Pract. Technol. Enhanc. Learn.* 2025; **20**: 030.
Publisher Full Text

Liu G, Ma C: **Measuring EFL learners' use of ChatGPT in informal digital learning of English based on the technology acceptance model.** *Innov. Lang. Learn. Teach.* 2024; **18**(2): 125–138.
Publisher Full Text

Lo CK, Hew KF, Jong M S-y: **The influence of ChatGPT on student engagement: A systematic review and future research agenda.** *Comput. Educ.* 2024; **219**: 105100–105121.
Publisher Full Text

Luckin R, Cukurova M, Kent C, *et al.*: **Empowering educators to be AI-ready.** *Comput. Educ. Artif. Intell.* 2022; **3**: 100076.
Publisher Full Text

Mahapatra S: **Impact of ChatGPT on ESL Students' Academic Writing Skills: A Mixed Methods Intervention Study.** *Smart Learning Environments.* 2024; **11**.
Publisher Full Text

Memarian B, Doleck T: **Fairness, Accountability, Transparency, and Ethics (FATE) in Artificial Intelligence (AI) and higher education: A systematic review.** *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence.* 2023; **5**: 100152.
Publisher Full Text

Mishra P, Koehler MJ: **Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge: A Framework for Teacher Knowledge.** *Teach. Coll. Rec.* 2006; **108**(6): 1017–1054.
Publisher Full Text

Moorhouse BL, Wan Y, Wu C, *et al.*: **Developing Language Teachers' Professional Generative AI Competence: An Intervention Study in an Initial Language Teacher Education Course.** *System.* 2024; **125**: 103399.
Publisher Full Text

Nazaretsky T, Ariely M, Cukurova M, *et al.*: **Teachers' Trust in AI-Powered Educational Technology and a Professional Development Program to Improve It.** *Br. J. Educ. Technol.* 2022; **53**: 914–931.
Publisher Full Text

Omidvar S, Meihami H: **Exploring the "what" and "how" of opportunities and challenges of AI in EFL teacher education.** *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence.* 2025; **9**: 100443.
Publisher Full Text

OECD: **The Future of Education and Skills Education 2030: The Future We Want. E2030 Position Paper.** 2018.
Reference Source

Pireci Sejdiu N, Sejdiu S: **The quiet transformation of higher education in the AI era.** *Open research Europe.* 2025; **5**: 249.
Publisher Full Text

Slamet J: **Potential of ChatGPT as a digital language learning assistant: EFL teachers' and students' perceptions.** *Discov. Artif. Intell.* 2024; **4**: 46.
Publisher Full Text

Song C, Song Y: **Enhancing Academic Writing Skills and Motivation: Assessing the Efficacy of ChatGPT in AI-Assisted Language Learning for EFL Students.** *Front. Psychol.* 2023; **14**.
Publisher Full Text

Steiss J, Tate T, Graham S, *et al.*: **Comparing the quality of human and ChatGPT feedback of students' writing.** *Learn. Instr.* 2024; **91**: 101894.
Publisher Full Text

Tram NHM, Nguyen TT, Tran CD: **ChatGPT as a tool for self-learning English among EFL learners: A multi-methods study.** *System.* 2024; **127**: 103528.
Publisher Full Text

Wan Q, Zhang H, Liu T: **EFL teachers' perceptions and practices in the age of AI: Insights from higher education.** *TPM: Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology.* 2025; **32**(3).

Wang S, Wang F, Zhu Z, *et al.*: **Artificial Intelligence in Education: A Systematic Literature Review.** *Expert Syst. Appl.* 2024; **252**: 124167.
Publisher Full Text

Xue L, Rashid AM, Ouyang S: **The Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) in Higher Education: A Systematic Review.** *SAGE Open.* 2024; **14**(1).
Publisher Full Text

Xue L, Ghazali N, Mahat J: **Artificial intelligence (Ai) adoption among teachers: A systematic review and agenda for future research.** *International Journal of Technology in Education.* 2025; **8**(3): 802–824.
Publisher Full Text

Yang L, Li R: **ChatGPT for L2 learning: Current status and implications.** *System.* 2024; **124**: 103351.
Publisher Full Text

Yuan L, Liu X: **The Effect of Artificial Intelligence Tools on EFL Learners' Engagement, Enjoyment, and Motivation.** *Comput. Hum. Behav.* 2025; **162**: 108474.
Publisher Full Text

Zeevy-Solovey O: **Comparing peer, ChatGPT, and teacher corrective feedback in EFL writing: Students' perceptions and preferences.** *Technology in Language Teaching & Learning.* 2024; **6**(3): 1482.
Publisher Full Text

Zhang R, Zou D, Cheng G: **A review of chatbot-assisted learning: pedagogical approaches, implementations, factors leading to effectiveness, theories, and future directions.** *Interact. Learn. Environ.* 2024; **32**(8): 4529–4557.
Publisher Full Text

Zulianti H, Hastuti H, Nurchurifiani E, *et al.*: **Enhancing novice EFL teachers' competency in AI-powered tools through a TPACK-based professional development program.** *World Journal of English Language.* 2024; **15**(3): 117–131.
Publisher Full Text

Open Peer Review

Current Peer Review Status: ? ?

Version 1

Reviewer Report 21 September 2026

https://doi.org/10.21956/openreseurope.25439.r79873

© **2026 Mahapatra S.** This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

?

Santosh Mahapatra
[1] Birla Institute of Technology & Science Pilani, Pilani, Rajasthan, India
[2] Birla Institute of Technology & Science Pilani, Pilani, Rajasthan, India

I went through your article. I have the following comments and observations:

1. The article, as opposed to your claim, does not test an extension of TAM. There is no model testing. It's an exploratory study in your context. Please make the necessary changes.

2. You have mentioned 'ethical concerns' as a moderating variable. However, it has not been included in the analysis. Please make a note of the issue.

3. The literature review does not establish the conceptual connection between TAM and AI-TPACK.

4. While the geographical location gap is acceptable, the methodological gap is not really a significant gap, considering that methodology is determined by the kinds of information the study requires. I urge you to identify and foreground the conceptual gap.

5. It is not a strong mixed-methods study, as you have claimed. The quantitative part comprises 28 participants and 10 questions, while the qualitative part comprises 3 questions. I would like you to rewrite the section as a descriptive survey with open-ended responses and mention how data from the sources are merged.

6. The major weakness of your study is the instrument. It does not mention the process of operationalising the two constructs or how you established the instrument's reliability. I would thus call it an exploratory instrument, not a validated one.

7. Please remove the readiness-gap finding. It's a confidence-training discrepancy.

8. The discussion section overinterprets three things: two levels of trust, extension of TAM and moderation. You don't have data supporting such claims. Please make necessary changes and

hedge as much as possible.

9. The teacher-student comparison in Table 8 can be avoided. It doesn't have any basis.

10. It's a small exploratory study and should not be presented as a theory-extending study.

Is the work original in terms of material and argument?
Yes

Does it sufficiently engage with relevant methodologies and secondary literature on the topic?
Partly

Is the work clearly and cogently presented?
Partly

Is the argument persuasive and supported by evidence?
Partly

If any, are all the source data and materials underlying the results available?
No

Does the research article contribute to the cultural, historical, social understanding of the field?
Partly

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: AI in education; teacher education; educational assessment

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.

Author Response 30 Sep 2026

Rezarta Ramadani

Response to Reviewer Dr. Santosh Mahapatra
The authors sincerely thank Reviewer 2 for the careful and constructive evaluation of the manuscript. The comments helped clarify the scope of the study, strengthen the conceptual framing, and ensure that the claims remain proportionate to the exploratory design and evidence. The manuscript has been revised throughout, including the title, abstract, introduction, contribution statement, literature review, methodology, results, discussion, limitations, future research, and conclusion.
The study is now consistently described as an exploratory descriptive survey with open ended responses. Claims concerning model testing, theory extension, moderation, a

readiness gap, and two levels of trust have been removed or substantially revised. One recommendation, concerning the complete removal of Table 8, was addressed through a reasoned partial revision. The table has been retained because its student data come from a separate completed study in the same national context; however, it has been reframed as a limited descriptive contextual comparison, and the manuscript now makes clear that the datasets are independent and do not support direct statistical comparison.

Comment 1

Reviewer comment:

The article, as opposed to your claim, does not test an extension of TAM. There is no model testing. It is an exploratory study in your context. Please make the necessary changes.

Response:

The authors agree. The study does not test TAM, estimate relationships among TAM variables, or evaluate an extended model. All claims that the study extends TAM or technology acceptance theory have been removed. TAM and AI-TPACK are now presented only as complementary interpretive perspectives for organising the literature and cautiously interpreting the descriptive findings.

Changes made:

- The title and abstract now identify the research as an exploratory descriptive survey.
- The statement that the study "extends technology acceptance theorizing" has been removed from the abstract.
- Claims of extending TAM have been removed from the contribution statement, literature review, methodology, discussion, and conclusion.
- The Discussion heading "Extending TAM through an AI-TPACK lens" has been replaced with "TAM and AI-TPACK as interpretive perspectives."
- The revised Discussion explicitly states that complete TAM and AI-TPACK scales were not administered and that no relationships among theoretical constructs were tested.
- The conclusion now states that TAM and AI-TPACK help situate the findings conceptually but were neither tested nor extended.

Location in the revised manuscript:

Title; Abstract; Introduction; Contribution statement; Literature review, "TAM and AI-TPACK as complementary perspectives"; Methodology, "Theoretical framework"; Discussion, "TAM and AI-TPACK as interpretive perspectives"; Conclusion.

Comment 2

Reviewer comment:

You have mentioned 'ethical concerns' as a moderating variable. However, it has not been included in the analysis. Please make a note of the issue.

Response:

The authors agree that the previous moderation claim was not supported by the analysis. Ethical concerns were recorded only as participants' reported concerns. The study did not test an interaction effect or examine whether ethical concerns predicted, mediated, or moderated AI use.

Changes made:

- The statement that ethical concerns "act as a moderating variable" has been deleted.
- The related claim that ethical concerns weaken the relationship between perceived usefulness and actual adoption has been removed.
- Ethical concerns are now discussed descriptively in relation to academic integrity, misinformation, content accuracy, and student overreliance.

- A sentence has been added to the limitations section clarifying that no predictive, mediating, or moderating effect was tested.
- A possible moderation relationship is mentioned only as a question for future explanatory research using validated measures and an appropriate analytical design.

Location in the revised manuscript:
Discussion, “Ethical concerns and responsible use”; Limitations and future research.
Comment 3
Reviewer comment:
The literature review does not establish the conceptual connection between TAM and AI-TPACK.
Response:
The authors agree and have expanded the literature review. The revision now distinguishes the focus of each framework and explains their conceptual complementarity. TAM directs attention to teachers’ evaluations of a technology, particularly perceived usefulness and ease of use. AI-TPACK directs attention to the technological, pedagogical, content related, and ethical knowledge required to evaluate and integrate AI appropriately in teaching. The revised text explains that a favourable evaluation of AI does not necessarily demonstrate the professional knowledge required for responsible classroom integration.
Changes made:
- The heading “Theoretical frameworks: TAM and AI-TPACK” has been changed to “TAM and AI-TPACK as complementary perspectives.”
- New paragraphs explain the conceptual distinction between acceptance and pedagogical integration.
- A practical example has been added: a teacher may view AI as useful for generating materials while still requiring support to verify outputs, adapt materials to learner needs, protect academic integrity, and align AI use with learning objectives.
- The manuscript now states explicitly that the frameworks are connected conceptually but are not combined into a model tested in this study.

Location in the revised manuscript:
Literature review, “TAM and AI-TPACK as complementary perspectives”; Methodology, “Theoretical framework.”
Comment 4
Reviewer comment:
While the geographical location gap is acceptable, the methodological gap is not really a significant gap, considering that methodology is determined by the kinds of information the study requires. I urge you to identify and foreground the conceptual gap.
Response:
The authors agree. The claim that the methodological approach itself addressed a research gap has been removed. The revised manuscript now foregrounds the conceptual gap between acceptance oriented research and research on the professional knowledge required for AI integration.
Changes made:
- The statement that the use of mixed methods represented a methodological gap or contribution has been deleted.
- The Research gap section has been rewritten.
- The revised conceptual gap concerns how teachers’ perceived educational value of AI coexists with their pedagogical concerns, ethical reservations, and professional support

needs.
- The geographical gap concerning Kosovo and the Western Balkans has been retained but is presented alongside, rather than in place of, the conceptual gap.
- The manuscript clarifies that the study describes these coexisting perceptions but does not test relationships between TAM and AI-TPACK.

Location in the revised manuscript:
Literature review, "Research gap"; Introduction; Contribution statement.
Comment 5
Reviewer comment:
It is not a strong mixed-methods study, as you have claimed. The quantitative part comprises 28 participants and 10 questions, while the qualitative part comprises 3 questions. I would like you to rewrite the section as a descriptive survey with open-ended responses and mention how data from the sources are merged.
Response:
The authors agree. The previous description overstated the methodological scope. The study is now presented as an exploratory descriptive survey using a questionnaire with closed and open ended questions, rather than as a fully developed mixed methods study.
Changes made:
- All descriptions of the study as a "mixed methods study" or "mixed methods approach" have been removed.
- The Research design section now identifies an exploratory descriptive survey comprising demographic and AI use questions, ten Likert items, and three open ended questions.
- The revised design statement clarifies that the purpose was descriptive rather than hypothesis testing, model testing, or causal explanation.
- The Data analysis section now explains that the closed ended responses were summarised using frequencies, percentages, and response distributions.
- The open ended responses were analysed thematically to provide short explanations and examples.
- The manuscript now explains that the two forms of evidence were merged during interpretation through narrative integration. Open ended themes were compared with conceptually related closed ended patterns to elaborate, contextualise, or qualify them.
- Claims of triangulation, statistical breadth, and qualitative depth have been removed.

Location in the revised manuscript:
Abstract; Contribution statement; Methodology, "Research design" and "Data analysis"; Limitations.
Comment 6
Reviewer comment:
The major weakness of your study is the instrument. It does not mention the process of operationalising the two constructs or how you established the instrument's reliability. I would thus call it an exploratory instrument, not a validated one.
Response:
The authors agree that the original description implied a stronger level of construct measurement and validation than was established. The questionnaire is now explicitly described as exploratory. The item groups are referred to as broad content domains used for descriptive organisation, not as validated latent constructs or composite scales.
Changes made:
- "Measuring two constructs" has been replaced with "organised into two broad content

domains for descriptive reporting."
- The two domains are described as perceived educational value and teacher attitudes and concerns.
- The manuscript now explains that the questionnaire did not operationalise complete TAM or AI-TPACK measures.
- It clarifies that complete multi item measures of perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, behavioural intention, actual adoption, and the separate AI-TPACK knowledge dimensions were not administered.
- The review by three EFL teachers is now described as an informal clarity and relevance check, not as psychometric validation.
- The manuscript states that reliability coefficients were not calculated because the items addressed heterogeneous topics and no composite scores were created.
- All findings are presented at the individual item level.
- A substantial instrument limitation has been added, acknowledging that content validity, construct validity, and reliability were not established through formal psychometric procedures.

Location in the revised manuscript:
Methodology, "Data collection instrument"; Limitations and future research.
Comment 7
Reviewer comment:
Please remove the readiness-gap finding. It is a confidence-training discrepancy.
Response:
The authors agree. The term "readiness gap" has been removed throughout the manuscript. The finding is now described as an item level discrepancy between reported confidence and perceived training adequacy. The revision also makes clear that the study did not measure overall teacher readiness with a validated scale.
Changes made:
- "Readiness" has been removed from the article title.
- The readiness gap claim has been removed from the abstract, contribution statement, results, discussion, implications, future research, and conclusion.
- The Discussion heading "The readiness gap: willing but unprepared" has been replaced with "Reported confidence and perceived training adequacy."
- The revised text reports that 67.9% expressed confidence in using AI, 32.1% agreed that they had received sufficient training, and 46.4% disagreed with the training statement.
- The discrepancy is interpreted cautiously and is not treated as evidence of readiness, preparedness, or actual competence.
- The discussion acknowledges that informal or independent learning is only one possible explanation and was not directly investigated.

Location in the revised manuscript:
Title; Abstract; Results, "Teacher attitudes and concerns"; Discussion, "Reported confidence and perceived training adequacy"; Implications; Limitations; Conclusion.
Comment 8
Reviewer comment:
The discussion section overinterprets three things: two levels of trust, extension of TAM and moderation. You do not have data supporting such claims. Please make necessary changes and hedge as much as possible.
Response:

The authors agree. The Discussion has been substantially revised to distinguish descriptive observations from tested theoretical relationships. Unsupported claims concerning two levels of trust, TAM extension, and moderation have been removed. Strong causal or confirmatory expressions have also been replaced with cautious language.
Changes made:
- Claims that trust operates at micro and macro levels have been removed.
- Claims that the teacher findings establish or extend a trust and usability paradox have been removed.
- All claims that the study extends TAM have been deleted.
- All claims of ethical moderation have been deleted.
- "The dual identity: productivity tool vs. pedagogical threat" has been replaced with "Coexisting perceived benefits and concerns."
- The revised section states only that participants reported practical benefits alongside concerns about accuracy, dependency, integrity, creativity, and critical thinking.
- The manuscript now cautions that these coexisting responses should not be treated as a new theoretical construct or stable professional identity.
- Expressions such as "confirms," "demonstrates," and "establishes" have been replaced, where appropriate, with "suggests," "indicates," "is compatible with," and "should be interpreted cautiously."

Location in the revised manuscript:
Discussion, particularly "TAM and AI-TPACK as interpretive perspectives," "Coexisting perceived benefits and concerns," and "Ethical concerns and responsible use"; Conclusion.
Comment 9
Reviewer comment:
The teacher-student comparison in Table 8 can be avoided. It doesn't have any basis.
Response:
The authors appreciate this concern and agree that the original text did not explain the basis and limitations of the comparison sufficiently. However, the authors respectfully retained Table 8 because the student data are not informal observations or data generated for the present manuscript. They come from a separate completed empirical study involving 85 university EFL students in Kosovo. That study examined students' AI tool use, perceived benefits, concerns, and trust in AI feedback, providing a documented contextual source for the student column. The citation appeared as "Author, Year" in the anonymised manuscript because identifying the study and author would have compromised anonymous peer review. The full reference will be restored in the non-anonymised version in accordance with the journal's editorial instructions.
The table is not intended to combine the two datasets, imply matched samples, or make a statistical teacher and student comparison. To address the reviewer's concern, its purpose and wording have been substantially narrowed. It is now presented only as a descriptive contextual comparison between findings from two independent studies conducted in the same national EFL context.
Changes made:
- Table 8 has been retained, but its title has been changed to "Descriptive contextual comparison of findings from two independent EFL studies in Kosovo."
- A note has been added below the table stating that the teacher and student findings come from separate studies with different samples and instruments and that no direct statistical comparison is intended.

- The student source is identified as “Author, Year” only in the anonymised review version. The complete citation will be restored after the anonymous review stage.
- The preceding text now explains that the table is included to organise contextual similarities and differences, not to establish equivalence, convergence, divergence, or causal relationships.
- Unsupported claims about two levels of trust and a teacher level trust and usability paradox have been removed.
- The table no longer supports claims of theory extension.
- The limitations section now states that the independent samples and non-equivalent instruments prevent direct comparison.
- Future research is recommended to collect teacher and student data within the same institutions using aligned measures.

Text added before Table 8:
To provide limited contextual orientation, Table 8 places the descriptive findings of the present teacher survey alongside findings from a separate study of Kosovan university EFL students (Author, Year). The two studies used independent samples and different questionnaires. The table therefore does not constitute a direct or statistical comparison and cannot establish differences between teachers and students. It is included only to identify broad issues reported in two related studies conducted in the same national EFL context.
Revised table title:
Table 8. Descriptive contextual comparison of findings from two independent EFL studies in Kosovo.
Note added below Table 8:
Note. The teacher findings are from the present exploratory survey. The student findings are drawn from a separate study of 85 university EFL students in Kosovo (Author, Year). The two studies used different samples, instruments, and analytical procedures. The table provides contextual description only; no direct statistical comparison, equivalence, or causal inference is intended. The identifying citation has been masked to preserve anonymity during peer review and will be restored in the non-anonymised manuscript.
Location in the revised manuscript:
Introduction; Discussion immediately before Table 8; Table 8 title and note; Limitations and future research.
Comment 10
Reviewer comment:
It’s a small exploratory study and should not be presented as a theory-extending study.
Response:
The authors agree. The manuscript is now consistently framed as a small exploratory descriptive survey providing preliminary and context specific evidence. The contribution is empirical and practical rather than theory extending.
Changes made:
- The title now identifies the article as an exploratory survey.
- The abstract has been rewritten to describe the design, analysis, findings, and limitations accurately.
- A statement has been added at the end of the Introduction clarifying that the study seeks an initial context specific description rather than model testing or broad generalisation.

- The Contribution statement now emphasises exploratory evidence from an underrepresented context and practical implications for professional development.
- Claims of theoretical innovation, model extension, and new theoretical constructs have been removed.
- The limitations section now foregrounds the small convenience sample, exploratory instrument, item level analysis, and brief open ended component.
- The conclusion has been rewritten to present the findings as preliminary and to recommend larger studies using validated instruments.

Location in the revised manuscript:
Title; Abstract; Introduction; Contribution statement; Methodology; Discussion; Limitations and future research; Conclusion.
Additional correction
During revision, the authors also corrected the ranking of agreement percentages in the Results section. Learning personalisation received the highest combined agreement at 71.4%, followed by lesson planning efficiency at 67.9%, feedback utility at 60.7%, student engagement at 53.6%, and writing improvement at 39.3%. The corresponding text in the Results and Discussion has been corrected so that lesson planning is no longer incorrectly described as the highest-rated closed-ended item.
Location in the revised manuscript:
Results, "Perceived educational value of AI," immediately before and after Table 4; related wording in the Abstract, Discussion, and Conclusion.
The authors again thank Reviewer 2 for the detailed comments. The revisions have resulted in a more accurate presentation of the research design, a clearer conceptual rationale, a more transparent account of the exploratory instrument, and a substantially more cautious interpretation of the findings.

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Report 06 August 2026

https://doi.org/10.21956/openreseurope.25439.r77803

© 2026 KOÇ F. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

?

Fatma Şeyma KOÇ
[1] Akdeniz University, Antalya, Turkey
[2] Akdeniz University, Antalya, Turkey

This is a valuable study reporting the findings from a project. I have the following comments for the authors.
1- In the abstract, the author(s) cite a source "Author, Year". The abstract does not usually have references.
2- On page 3, the following sentence needs to have a reference. The following sentence

introduces a completely different idea. Thus, it needs attention. “Recent systematic reviews indicate that AI integration in English language teaching is expanding, with writing assistance as the most common application, representing over 54% of studies in a recent PRISMA-guided review.”
3- On page 3, again there is no reference. To which studies do you refer to by ‘recent evidence’ or ‘in studies of teacher AI adoption’?: “Recent evidence indicates that the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) is the most commonly used theoretical framework in studies of teacher AI adoption, with perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use identified as primary determinants of acceptance.”
4- On page 3, “ Pireci Sejdiu and Sejdiu, 2025” replace “and” with “&”
5- On page 4, you need to specify which studies you are referring to in the following part: “A 2025 systematic review using PRISMA methodology found that 54.55% of studies focused on writing assistance, while challenges such as academic dishonesty and overreliance on AI were reported in 27.27% of the reviewed articles.” Also, rewrite “A 2025 systematic review”, as it is not a very standard form of academic writing.
6- On page 4, the sentences beginning with “A systematic review of 29 studies found that EFL teachers generally regard AI tools as helpful for…” have already been mentioned earlier in the text. It is repetitive.
7- On page 4, which studies are referred to are not clear: “Multiple studies identify concerns about academic integrity, student overreliance, diminished creativity, and the limitations of AI in fostering critical thinking. A qualitative study of Indonesian EFL teachers found that while most view AI as a supportive tool, they emphasize that it cannot replace the human role in teaching, particularly in building rapport, responding to emotional cues, and adapting to real-time classroom dynamics.”
8-On page 4, replace “TAM states that”, with a phrase such as, “According to TAM framework, etc.”
9- On page 4 “ Tram et al., 2024; Cai et al., 2024).” It should be in alphabetical order.
10- On page 4, “However, several scholars have argued that TAM alone..” give references
11- On Page 5, “In the Western Balkans and Kosovo, institutional initiatives are only now beginning to develop frameworks for AI integration in higher education, with a recent focus group concluding that clear and practical guidelines for responsible AI use are needed.” give references for this claim. Please throughout the text always give references when you talk about certain studies or claims. These all seem like general claims without any references to concrete research grounds.
12- On page 9, in Theme 2, “and significantly reduced the workload involved in planning and creating materials” is redundant. It belongs to theme 1 and already mentioned there.
13- On page 9, in Theme 3, “helps me come up with creative ideas”, rewrite sentences removing “me”, and replacing with “them/her/him”.
14- On page 9, paraphrase “Another wrote, “Ensuring students do not become overreliant on it and still develop their own critical thinking skills.” Another teacher explained how they struggled to ensure learners do not become overreliant… etc.
15- On page 10, paraphrase the sentences, “One respondent stated: “Trying to confirm the accuracy of information provided from AI.” Another observed: “Evaluating the AI responses and adapting it.” Please rewrite those parts. I advise you not to use incomplete excerpts from teacher responses in the text throughout the manuscript. There are several parts with the same issue in the rest of the text as well: “One teacher wrote, “Losing both students’ and teachers’ creativity.”
16- In the findings section, give frequencies and percentages to indicate a trendline for the themes.
17- On page 10, the first paragraph of the discussion has general statements without any

references. For instance, which studies you are referring to in Oman, Indonesia, and North Macedonia? Etc.
18- Please remove all the percentage, numbers etc. from the discussion. It is very repetitive of your results section.
19-On page 10, the following sentences are already mentioned in the results using the exact wording. “The relatively lower agreement on writing improvement (39.3%) compared to lesson planning (67.9%) suggests that teachers view AI as more effective for their own professional tasks than for directly improving students’ language skills, a distinction with important implications for how AI is positioned in teacher training programs.” Please remove all repetitive information from the text throughout the manuscript.
20- On Page 11, “Derakhshan and Ghiasvand, 2024)” replace “and” with “&”
21- On Page 11, add a reference for “A systematic review of EFL teacher perspectives found that the potential for AI to promote cheating and plagiarism is one of the most frequently cited concerns worldwide”
22- On pages 11-12 there is no reference for “The findings of this teacher study can be considered alongside evidence from Kosovan EFL students, who also report intensive use of AI tools for language learning and a complex mix of enthusiasm and concern.” Continuing with the part “However, there are also notable differences…”, please paraphrase. The parts where you compare this with teachers and another study with learners are very vague. Again give references.
23- On page 12, you need to revise “summarizes key similarities and differences between Kosovan EFL teachers in the present study and Kosovan EFL students reported in Author (Year)”. The same comment above applies there: The parts where you compare this with teachers and another study with learners are very vague. Again give references.
24- I suggest you remove Table 8, and discuss its contents more clearly by revising those parts.
25- On page 13, what do you mean by the following sentence? : “Meanwhile, international research on AI readiness and AI literacy among teachers highlights that confidence, perceived usefulness, and access to resources interact with institutional support and clear guidelines”
26- On page 13, “EFL teachers who were already at least somewhat familiar with AI tool”. Paraphrase in a more academic tone.
27- On page 13, you mention “the patterns reported here should therefore be treated as analytically informative rather than statistically representative of all EFL teachers in Kosovo or Beyond”. However, this is a descriptive study with no statistical claims. I suggest you remove this part.
28- On page 13, “Second, the study is situated in Kosovo, a post-conflict, under-resourced educational context, which is both a strength and a limitation.” Paraphrase in a more academic tone.
29-On page 13, you mention “The study also analysed teacher and student data in separate projects, which allowed for a detailed focus in each article but limited the ability to examine teacher–student dynamics within the same institutional settings.” Your article title suggest that your primary data focuses on teachers. I suggest you do not mention this other student data you keep repeating. It is very unclear why the authors keep mentioning that study in general statements. You can compare the findings by giving references at some points, of course.
30- There are many repetitive parts throughout the manuscript. For instance, the last paragraph of the conclusion can be removed. There are many parts in the results-discussion-conclusion that are repeated many times. Please revise.

Is the work original in terms of material and argument?

Yes

Does it sufficiently engage with relevant methodologies and secondary literature on the topic?
Partly

Is the work clearly and cogently presented?
Partly

Is the argument persuasive and supported by evidence?
Partly

If any, are all the source data and materials underlying the results available?
Yes

Does the research article contribute to the cultural, historical, social understanding of the field?
Yes

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: EFL

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.

Author Response 30 Sep 2026

Rezarta Ramadani

Dear Dr Koç, Thank you for your careful reading of our manuscript and for your constructive comments. We have revised the manuscript throughout to improve the precision of the citations, reduce repetition, strengthen the interpretation of the findings, and clarify the study's theoretical and practical contributions. Our point by point responses are provided below. Locations refer to section headings because pagination may change during production. **Point by point responses Comment 1 Reviewer comment:** The abstract contains the placeholder citation "Author, Year," although references are not normally included in an abstract. **Response:** Thank you for identifying this issue. We removed the placeholder citation from the abstract. The abstract now refers to the relevant student evidence without a parenthetical citation, while the full source, Braha (2026), is cited in the Introduction, Discussion, and reference list. **Location:** Abstract; Introduction; Discussion, "Convergence and divergence with student perceptions." **Comment 2 Reviewer comment:** The statement that writing assistance represents more than 54% of studies requires a reference and a clearer connection to the surrounding discussion. **Response:** We agree. We revised the sentence to identify the source directly: "Recent systematic reviews indicate that AI integration in English language teaching is expanding, with writing assistance as the

most common application, accounting for 54.55% of studies (Daud et al., 2025).” We also revised the transition so that the sentence leads directly into the discussion of the benefits and risks of AI in language education. **Location:** Introduction, second paragraph. **Comment 3 Reviewer comment:** The claim that TAM is the most frequently used framework in research on teachers’ AI adoption requires a reference. **Response:** We added Xue et al. (2025), a systematic review of teacher AI adoption, to support this statement. We also clarified that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use are central determinants of acceptance within this literature. **Location:** Introduction, third paragraph. **Comment 4 Reviewer comment:** Replace “and” with “&” in the parenthetical citation to Pireci Sejdiu and Sejdiu. **Response:** The citation has been corrected to “(Pireci Sejdiu & Sejdiu, 2025)” in accordance with APA 7. **Location:** Introduction and subsequent parenthetical citations. **Comment 5 Reviewer comment:** Identify the 2025 systematic review and avoid the vague formulation “A 2025 systematic review.” **Response:** We revised the sentence to identify the authors directly: “Daud et al. (2025) conducted a PRISMA guided systematic review and found that 54.55% of studies focused on writing assistance, while challenges such as academic dishonesty and overreliance on AI were reported in 27.27% of the reviewed articles.” **Location:** Literature review, “AI integration in EFL education.” **Comment 6 Reviewer comment:** The material beginning with “A systematic review of 29 studies” repeats information presented earlier. **Response:** We removed the repetitive account. The revised section now begins with a concise synthesis of research on teacher perceptions and then moves directly to teachers’ positive and critical views of AI. **Location:** Literature review, “Teacher perceptions of AI in language teaching.” **Comment 7 Reviewer comment:** The claims about academic integrity, overreliance, creativity, critical thinking, and Indonesian teachers’ views require clear references. **Response:** We revised the paragraph and added citations to Daud et al. (2025) and Xue et al. (2025) for the broader concerns. We also supplied a source for the discussion of Indonesian EFL teachers and clarified that teachers view AI as a supportive resource rather than a replacement for the relational and context sensitive work of teaching. **Location:** Literature review, “Teacher perceptions of AI in language teaching.” **Comment 8 Reviewer comment:** Replace “TAM states that” with a more appropriate academic formulation. **Response:** The sentence now begins, “According to the TAM framework, perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use are the main determinants of technology acceptance.” **Location:** Literature review, “Theoretical frameworks: TAM and AI TPACK.” **Comment 9 Reviewer comment:** The citations to Tram et al. (2024) and Cai et al. (2024) should be placed in alphabetical order. **Response:** We corrected the order to “(Cai et al., 2024; Tram et al., 2024).” **Location:** Literature review, “Theoretical frameworks: TAM and AI TPACK.” **Comment 10 Reviewer comment:** The claim that TAM alone is insufficient for educational AI research requires references. **Response:** We added Al Abdullatif (2024), Celik (2023), and Xue et al. (2025) to support this argument. The revised paragraph now explains that pedagogical, ethical, and institutional factors are not adequately captured by TAM alone. **Location:** Literature review, “Theoretical frameworks: TAM and AI TPACK.” **Comment 11 Reviewer comment:** The statement concerning institutional AI initiatives in the Western Balkans and Kosovo requires a reference, and similar general claims should be supported throughout. **Response:** We removed the unsupported formulation about a recent focus group. The revised text states more cautiously that discussions of AI integration are emerging in the region but that published evidence remains limited, with Pireci Sejdiu and Sejdiu (2025) provided as the relevant source. We also reviewed the manuscript and added references to other claims

that previously lacked clear research support. **Location:** Literature review, "Teacher professional development for AI integration," and throughout the manuscript. **Comment 12 Reviewer comment:** The reference to reduced planning workload in the personalization theme repeats the preceding theme. **Response:** We removed the clause concerning workload reduction from the personalization theme. The revised passage focuses only on tailoring learning activities, responding to different learner needs, and providing feedback. **Location:** Results, "Qualitative findings: positive impacts," Theme 2. **Comment 13 Reviewer comment:** Rewrite the first person wording "helps me come up with creative ideas." **Response:** We revised the reporting sentence to use third person: "One described how AI helps teachers come up with creative ideas that make learning fun and an unforgettable experience for students." **Location:** Results, "Qualitative findings: positive impacts," Theme 3. **Comment 14 Reviewer comment:** Paraphrase the incomplete response concerning student overreliance and critical thinking. **Response:** We paraphrased the excerpt as follows: "Another teacher emphasized the need to prevent student overreliance on AI while still fostering independent critical thinking." **Location:** Results, "Qualitative findings: challenges and concerns," Theme 1. **Comment 15 Reviewer comment:** Avoid incomplete quotations and paraphrase fragments concerning content accuracy, evaluation, adaptation, and creativity. **Response:** We replaced the incomplete excerpts with complete analytic prose. For example, the revised text states that teachers reported spending considerable effort verifying AI generated information and adapting outputs for pedagogical use. The creativity theme was similarly rewritten as a complete synthesis, while the concise phrase "making us passive teachers" was retained because it directly illustrates the concern about pedagogical passivity. **Location:** Results, "Qualitative findings: challenges and concerns," Themes 2 and 3. **Comment 16 Reviewer comment:** Provide frequencies and percentages for the qualitative themes to indicate the strength of each pattern. **Response:** We added the number and percentage of respondents associated with every theme across the three qualitative subsections. This makes the relative prominence of each theme transparent while preserving the interpretive purpose of the thematic analysis. **Location:** Results, all three qualitative findings subsections. **Comment 17 Reviewer comment:** The opening of the Discussion contains unsupported general claims, including references to Oman, Indonesia, and North Macedonia. **Response:** We removed the unsupported country list and revised the paragraph to compare the findings more cautiously with evidence from other EFL contexts and systematic reviews. The discussion now focuses on the broader pattern of pragmatic, task oriented adoption, especially lesson preparation and materials development. **Location:** Discussion, "AI as a lesson planning tool: pragmatic adoption." **Comment 18 Reviewer comment:** Remove percentages and other numerical repetition from the Discussion. **Response:** We substantially reduced the repetition of numerical results and shifted the Discussion toward interpretation through TAM, AI TPACK, professional identity, ethics, and teacher agency. A small number of figures remain where they are necessary for a direct teacher and student comparison, but the main discussion no longer restates the result tables item by item. **Location:** Discussion throughout. **Comment 19 Reviewer comment:** The comparison between writing improvement and lesson planning repeats the Results section in almost identical wording. **Response:** We removed the percentages and condensed this point. The revised sentence retains only the interpretive distinction that teachers appear to value AI more for professional preparation than for direct improvement of specific language skills. **Location:** Discussion, "AI as a lesson planning tool: pragmatic adoption." **Comment 20 Reviewer comment:** Replace "and" with

"&" in the parenthetical citation to Derakhshan and Ghiasvand. **Response:** The parenthetical citation has been corrected to "(Derakhshan & Ghiasvand, 2024)" in accordance with APA 7. **Location:** Discussion, "Extending TAM through an AI TPACK lens" and "The dual identity: productivity tool vs. pedagogical threat." **Comment 21 Reviewer comment:** Add a reference for the claim that cheating and plagiarism are common concerns in research on EFL teachers' perspectives. **Response:** We added Daud et al. (2025) to support this statement and linked the claim more directly to the review's findings concerning academic dishonesty and overreliance. **Location:** Discussion, "Ethical concerns as a primary barrier." **Comment 22 Reviewer comment:** The comparison with Kosovan EFL students is vague, insufficiently referenced, and needs clearer paraphrasing. **Response:** We revised this section extensively and added Braha (2026) throughout. The new discussion distinguishes shared pragmatic benefits from different forms of trust. Students' concerns are framed primarily in relation to the reliability of feedback, whereas teachers' concerns extend to assessment, academic integrity, creativity, student dependency, and pedagogical responsibility. **Location:** Discussion, "Convergence and divergence with student perceptions." **Comment 23 Reviewer comment:** Replace "Author, Year" and clarify the comparison between the present teachers and the students in the earlier study. **Response:** All placeholders have been replaced with the complete citation to Braha (2026). We also revised the surrounding text so that the source of the student evidence and the basis of the comparison are explicit. **Location:** Introduction; Discussion; limitations and future research; reference list. **Comment 24 Reviewer comment:** Consider removing Table 8 and discussing its content more clearly in prose. **Response:** We carefully considered this suggestion. We substantially expanded and clarified the preceding prose, but retained a revised Table 8 because it provides a transparent side by side synthesis across the same dimensions: tools, purposes, benefits, concerns, trust, and the perceived role of AI. The table is intended to support rather than replace the analytical discussion. If the reviewer or editor strongly prefers a prose only presentation, we would be willing to remove it. **Location:** Discussion, "Alignments and gaps in teacher student perceptions," Table 8. **Comment 25 Reviewer comment:** Clarify the meaning of the claim that confidence, usefulness, resources, institutional support, and guidelines interact. **Response:** We revised the sentence to state that teacher readiness is shaped by several connected conditions rather than confidence alone. The revised paragraph explains that perceived usefulness and personal confidence support adoption, while access to resources, institutional support, and clear guidance influence whether adoption becomes responsible and pedagogically meaningful practice. **Location:** Discussion, "Implications for professional development." **Comment 26 Reviewer comment:** Revise the phrase describing teachers who were already somewhat familiar with AI tools into a more academic form. **Response:** The sentence now reads: "Participants were self selected EFL teachers with prior familiarity with AI tools, likely overrepresenting early adopters and those interested in experimenting with new technologies." **Location:** Limitations and future research, first paragraph. **Comment 27 Reviewer comment:** Remove the statement contrasting analytical informativeness with statistical representativeness because the study makes no inferential statistical claims. **Response:** We removed this formulation. The revised text now states more directly that the convenience sample and small sample size require the findings to be interpreted as context specific. **Location:** Limitations and future research, first paragraph. **Comment 28 Reviewer comment:** Rephrase the description of Kosovo as a post conflict, under resourced context in a more academic tone. **Response:** We revised the sentence to read: "The study is situated

in Kosovo, an educational context shaped by post conflict reconstruction and limited resources, which is both a strength and a limitation." The following sentences explain the value of evidence from an underrepresented setting while acknowledging limits to transferability. **Location:** Limitations and future research, second paragraph. **Comment 29 Reviewer comment:** Avoid repeatedly mentioning the separate student project because the present article focuses on teachers. **Response:** We reduced repeated references to the student study and confined the comparison to a clearly identified part of the Discussion where it supports the conceptual analysis of trust. We retained one brief methodological limitation explaining that the teacher and student evidence came from separate projects, because this prevents readers from assuming that the two samples were drawn from the same institutions. The comparison is now presented as contextual interpretation rather than as part of the primary teacher data. **Location:** Discussion, "Convergence and divergence with student perceptions"; Limitations and future research. **Comment 30 Reviewer comment:** The manuscript contains substantial repetition across the Results, Discussion, and Conclusion, and the final paragraph of the Conclusion could be removed. **Response:** We revised these sections to distinguish their functions more clearly. The Results now report patterns, the Discussion interprets them through TAM and AI TPACK, and the Conclusion foregrounds the readiness gap, dual identity, and implications for professional development. Repetitive numerical reporting and repeated descriptions of the same themes were reduced. One short forward looking paragraph remains to identify the research designs needed to test and extend the present findings, but the wording has been condensed. **Location:** Results, Discussion, and Conclusion throughout.

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.