

# PERCEPTIONS AND EXPERIENCES OF SENIOR ENGLISH TEACHERS INTEGRATING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE INTO ELT PRACTICES

<sup>1</sup>Tsabitha Asfarina Putri\*, <sup>2</sup>Yeny Prastiwi  
<sup>1,2</sup> Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Indonesia

**\*Corresponding Author**

Email: [a320210114@student.ums.ac.id](mailto:a320210114@student.ums.ac.id)

Received:  
2 March 2026

Revised:  
30 June 2026

Accepted:  
1 July 2026

Published:  
9 July 2026

## How to cite (APA 7<sup>th</sup> style):

Putri, T. A., & Prastiwi, Y. (2026). Perceptions and experiences of senior English teachers integrating Artificial Intelligence into ELT practices. *FRASA: English Education and Literature Journal*, 7(2), 243–251. <https://doi.org/10.47701/frasa.v7i2i1.6036>

## Abstract

*The world of English Language Teaching (ELT) is being transformed by Artificial Intelligence (AI) through the creation of language materials, automated feedback, and skills enhancement; however, the use of AI by senior educators has been under-researched. This qualitative descriptive case study, based on the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), investigates senior English teachers' perceptions of AI integration, especially with applications like ChatGPT and Grammarly, in secondary school English Language Teaching (ELT) practices. Four experienced English teachers were given open-ended questionnaires online, and the data were analyzed through theme analysis. The findings show five major themes: positive perceptions of AI as an adjunct tool; concerns over cheating, student reliance, and data security; average institutional readiness for AI-infused English Language Teaching (ELT), between 30% and 60% due to lack of digital literacy and infrastructure; needs for transparent, ELT-specific usage guidelines; and aspirations for the ethical and creative deployment of AI in educational contexts. The study concludes that focused professional development and policy support are key to addressing digital literacy disparities and fostering ethical AI adoption among senior teachers.*

**Keywords:** Artificial Intelligence, English Language Teaching, senior teachers, Technology Acceptance Model, qualitative descriptive study

## INTRODUCTION

English Language Teaching (ELT) has been revolutionized by Artificial Intelligence (AI) which has developed into sophisticated systems offering adaptive learning experiences. The design of ELT curricula and language assessment are now being impacted by the use of platforms such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, Claude and Perplexity, and visual prompts in writing and speaking tasks are being used ever more frequently with tools such as Midjourney.

The World Economic Forum (WEF) predicts that by 2025, approximately 60% of teachers will use AI-assisted tools to personalize teaching and automate some administrative tasks and thus allow teachers to spend more time on teaching-related activities (World Economic Forum, 2024). This prediction highlights the growing role of AI as a practical tool for enhancing teaching effectiveness rather than replacing teachers. Therefore, it provides a strong rationale for examining how AI can be integrated into ELT to improve instructional quality while supporting teachers in addressing diverse learners' needs.

There are two opposing positions in the global ELT discourse. Techno-optimists claim that AI increases efficiency and differentiation. For instance, Crompton (2023) notes that the use of chatbots improves fluency in speaking and learners' confidence. On the other hand, critics have cautioned of ethical and pedagogical risks. Kessler (2023) finds a 35% rise in plagiarism in general higher education AI-assisted essays and Ouyang et al. (2022) in a wider educational technology review caution that over-dependence on automated feedback may diminish learners' critical thinking. There is, however, still a lack of consensus as to the specific ways in which these dualities are manifested in secondary-school language classrooms.

The policy of *Merdeka Belajar* in Indonesia (Kemendikbudristek, 2023). promotes the use of technology to support student-centered learning. But classroom realities are often far behind policy expectations. Local studies suggest that AI adoption is sporadic and highly dependent on individual teacher initiative, creating unique barriers for senior English teachers (defined as those with 15 years of experience or more). Kemendikbudristek (2024) stated that the English teaching workforce at the secondary level consists of around 62% senior teachers. Although structurally dominant, recent Indonesian scholarship (Budiyanto et al., 2025; Sabaruddin et al., 2024) continues to be largely centered on pre-service teachers, novice educators, or generic technological frameworks, thus underrepresenting the lived experiences, pedagogical beliefs, and technostress of senior educators.

The Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) (Davis, 1989) and the Diffusion of Innovation Theory (Rogers, 2003) are relevant frameworks to understand this phenomenon. TAM focuses on Perceived Usefulness (PU) and Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU) whereas DOI is based on the user's position on the innovation adoption curve. However, the applicability of these classic frameworks to senior teachers must be critically examined. Conventional TAM and DOI often view technology acceptance as a linear cognitive choice, ignoring age-related professional identities, ingrained pedagogical convictions, and institutional technostress (Suryani & Santosa, 2024). High PU may be experienced by senior teachers due to institutional pressure but low PEOU because of the gaps in digital literacy as "late adopters" or "laggards" not from resistance but from the lack of collaborative support networks (Nguyen & Tran, 2023).

While the global ELT research is still polarized, the Indonesian scholarship has marginalized the voices of veteran educators who are the custodians of the institutional practices. Failing to consider their perspectives, one risks creating decontextualized policies. Hence, this study seeks to fill the empirical gap by investigating the senior English teachers' management of AI integration in secondary schools. To guide this inquiry, this study seeks to

answer the following questions: How do senior secondary school English teachers in Indonesia perceive the usefulness and ease of use of AI tools in their ELT practices, and what pedagogical challenges and adaptation strategies do they encounter when interacting with generative AI applications. The answers to these questions provide a solid basis for designing context-sensitive professional development programs and assist the education authorities in developing ELT-specific AI guidelines.

Theoretically, this study extends the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and the Diffusion of Innovation (DOI) theory within the ecosystem of developing ELT contexts. Traditional formulations of TAM and DOI frequently treat technology adoption as a linear, cognitive choice. This study enriches these frameworks by demonstrating that for senior educators, technology acceptance is a socially-embedded, non-linear negotiation where deeply-rooted pedagogical beliefs, professional identities, and peer-support structures act as critical boundary conditions. Senior teachers do not occupy the role of "laggards" due to ideological opposition; rather, their adoption trajectory is contingent upon the domestication of technology to preserve communicative authenticity and humanistic values in language learning.

To facilitate sustainable AI integration, national education authorities (such as Kemendikbudristek) and school administrators must move away from generic, decontextualized technological mandates. Policies should be translated into ELT-specific frameworks that offer concrete classroom guidelines, such as standardized syllabus language distinguishing acceptable AI brainstorming from plagiarism, and the promotion of alternative assessments (e.g., viva voces, process portfolios, and in-class writing tasks) that are resilient to automated generation.

Correspondingly, these policy directives must be directly synchronized with tailored professional development programs. Rather than attending generic "AI awareness" seminars, senior teachers require longitudinal, hands-on workshops delivered within collaborative teacher learning communities (*Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran* or MGMP). Training initiatives should focus on practical ELT tasks—such as using Claude or Perplexity for multi-level dialogue scripting and utilizing Midjourney for visual prompt generation—while integrating peer-mentoring networks to alleviate technostress and bolster teachers' diagnostic troubleshooting confidence.

## METHOD

### Research Design

This study adopted a qualitative descriptive research design to explore the genuine views and lived experiences of senior English teachers in relation to Artificial Intelligence (AI) integration in the context of Indonesian secondary school English Language Teaching (ELT). This method was chosen because the present study aims to understand senior English teachers' perceptions, pedagogical challenges, and adaptation strategies in integrating AI into ELT. By allowing participants to describe their experiences in their own words, this approach provides a comprehensive understanding of how AI integration is perceived and enacted in real classroom contexts. It enables the researcher to provide a rich, detailed description of participants' perspectives, while staying close to their own words and meanings, rather than

imposing data into pre-existing theoretical categories (Nowell et al., 2022). Qualitative description is particularly suitable when the aim of the research is to provide a detailed account of what participants say about a current educational phenomenon with low-inference interpretation so that the findings are accessible and of practical relevance to practitioners and policy-makers (Sandelowski, 2000).

## Respondents

Four senior English teachers were selected purposively as information-rich cases relevant to this study (Palinkas et al., 2015; (Patton, n.d.). The sample size of four ( $n=4$ ) is relatively small, but is consistent with qualitative case-oriented inquiries in which the analytic focus is on vertical depth, nuance, and idiographic detail rather than horizontal statistical generalizability (Merriam & Tisdell, n.d.). Inclusion criteria were: (1) more than 45 years old, (2) more than 15 years teaching experience and (3) basic knowledge of AI or previous participation in AI-related discussions in education. To preserve confidentiality, participants were given codes G1–G4. Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the participants.

Table 1. Demographic Profiles of the Participants

| Participant Code | Age | Teaching Experience (Years) | School Type                  | Region / Location       | Subject Taught               |
|------------------|-----|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| G1               | 48  | 18                          | Senior High School (SMA)     | Central Java, Indonesia | General English              |
| G2               | 52  | 24                          | Vocational High School (SMK) | Central Java, Indonesia | Technical/Vocational English |
| G3               | 55  | 29                          | Junior High School (SMP)     | Central Java, Indonesia | General English              |
| G4               | 50  | 21                          | Senior High School (SMA)     | Central Java, Indonesia | General English              |

## Data Collected

Data were collected using an open-ended online questionnaire with eight items through Google Forms. The instrument was carefully designed to elicit rich written responses across several ELT-specific dimensions of AI, including (a) existing knowledge of teachers, (b) the role of AI in the classroom, (c) perceived benefits and risks, (d) institutional readiness, (e) guidelines for student use, and (f) future ethical expectations.

Researcher chose an online written format for both pragmatic and methodological reasons. In practice, senior teachers have heavy teaching and administrative responsibilities, making synchronous interviews logistically difficult. Written open-ended qualitative questionnaires, often referred to as "qualitative surveys," methodologically allow for more in-depth self-paced reflection, where positions can be expressed as complex and ambivalent without the time pressure of real-time oral interviews (Braun & Clarke, 2021). Before being formally disseminated, the questionnaire was subject to expert validation by two senior ELT lecturers and pilot tested by two English teachers who were not participants to check the instrument for validity and readability. Researcher used the feedback to improve the wording of the prompts and remove ambiguities.

## Data Analysis

Data were analyzed with Braun & Clarke's (2021) six-phase thematic analysis. Coding was inductive, with labels generated directly from participants' responses to facilitate cross-case comparison. Inter-coder reliability indices or statistical consensus rates were not sought after following Braun & Clarke's (2021) guidelines for reflexive thematic analysis. Reflexive thematic analysis views coding as a reflexive, interpretative, subjective and collaborative process in which the researcher's subjectivity is an analytical resource rather than a bias to be controlled. Instead, security in coding and rigor in interpretation were achieved through ongoing peer debriefing and joint reflective sessions with an external qualitative research peer.

To ensure trustworthiness, analysis was conducted according to established qualitative criteria of credibility, dependability and confirmability (Nowell et al., 2017) Member checking, an important step for respondent validation, was conducted; preliminary analyzed themes and translated data excerpts were sent to the four participants (G1-G4) via email and all participants confirmed that the interpretations accurately reflected their lived experiences.

Ethical clearance for this study was obtained formally from the Institutional Review Board (IRB)/Research Ethics Committee of the researcher's home university. The local school authorities and principals also gave their assent to conduct the study. All the participants gave their digital informed consent. Anonymity was rigorously maintained in all data handling following the guidelines of (UNESCO, 2023).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Thematic analysis of the data gathered from four senior English teachers revealed five primary themes. To present a transparent overview of the data and avoid artificial consensus, Table 1 details the themes, code frequency counts, specific participant sources, and the contextual boundaries of each finding.

Table 2. Thematic Findings: Senior English Teachers' Perceptions of AI in ELT

| Theme                                   | Key Target Keywords & Code Frequency                    | Data Sources                      | ELT Contextual Dimension                                   |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. AI as a Supportive ELT Tool          | "Lesson plan", "creative", "prompt" (Coded: 9 times)    | G1, G2, G3, G4                    | Lesson planning, speaking materials, vocabulary generation |
| 2. Pedagogical & Ethical Concerns       | "Plagiarism", "dependence", "privacy" (Coded: 11 times) | G1, G2, G3 ( <i>G4 diverged</i> ) | Writing tasks, automated grading, data safety              |
| 3. Moderate Institutional Readiness     | "IT difficulties", "infrastructure" (Coded: 6 times)    | G1, G2, G3, G4                    | Digital literacy gaps in secondary schools                 |
| 4. Demand for ELT-Specific Rules        | "Guidelines", "teacher aid" (Coded: 8 times)            | G1, G2, G3, G4                    | Regulation of language assignments                         |
| 5. Aspirations for Creative Integration | "Future", "innovation", "ethics" (Coded: 5 times)       | G1, G2, G3, G4                    | Long-term professional development                         |

## AI as a Supportive ELT Tool

All participants viewed AI as a practical assistant that simplifies aspects of their heavy ELT workload. G1 emphasized that AI offers distinct "benefits in making lesson plans easier," particularly when scripting listening prompts or communicative tasks. In practice, teachers used generative tools to design sample dialogues and vocabulary lists. G2 highlighted that students became "more creative making prompts for digital posters" in vocabulary tasks, utilizing AI to test wording and find synonyms before finalizing their project designs.

This finding aligns with techno-optimist frameworks but offers a distinct contextual nuance compared to global literature. Unlike Crompton's (2023) study, which quantified AI integration as reducing material preparation time by a specific 35%, the senior teachers in this study did not provide numerical parameters for their efficiency gains. Instead, they framed the usefulness of AI qualitatively viewing it as an cognitive "idea generator" and emergency scaffold to cope with localized structural pressures, such as large class sizes and rigid curriculum deadlines within the Indonesian secondary school ecosystem.

## Concerns over Plagiarism, Dependence, and Privacy

This theme centers on three interrelated risks: plagiarism (explicitly coded 5 times), learner dependence (coded 4 times), and data privacy (coded 2 times). G1, G2, and G3 expressed deep anxiety about AI-assisted plagiarism in writing tasks. G2 specifically raised a structural safety concern: "AI knows personal data if students input it wrongly," highlighting the danger of learners inadvertently exposing personal details during conversational practices with chatbots.

Divergent Case Analysis (Negative Case): Interestingly, the data did not yield a completely uniform consensus. A notable divergence was observed in G4's transcript. Unlike G1, G2, and G3 who viewed AI essay generation as a threat to academic integrity, G4 argued that traditional plagiarism frameworks are outdated. G4 stated that student reliance on AI should not be labeled as "cheating," but rather as a baseline for advanced editing, suggesting that the primary focus should shift toward prompt evaluation rather than enforcing strict anti-plagiarism boundaries.

The anxieties of G1, G2, and G3 support Kessler's (2023) warnings regarding a 35% spike in automated plagiarism within higher education. However, our findings show that in a secondary ELT setting, this fear is intertwined with developmental pedagogy. Teachers worry that bypassing the cognitive struggle of initial drafting will stunt fundamental syntactic growth. Meanwhile, G4's divergent viewpoint suggests that some veteran educators are beginning to critically re-evaluate classic definitions of authorship, moving away from Kessler's defensive posture toward a more radical adaptation of language assessment methods.

## Moderate Readiness for AI-Enhanced ELT

Participants estimated their institutional and personal readiness levels to be between 30% and 60%. G1's self-assessment of being "60% ready" and G2's evaluation of "50% due to IT difficulties" illustrate this transitional state. The primary barriers cited were unreliable school Wi-Fi, limited access to dedicated computer labs, and a personal lack of technical troubleshooting skills.

From the perspective of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM; Davis, 1989), these results illustrate a critical misalignment between Perceived Usefulness (PU) and Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU). While the high PU documented in Theme 1 drives initial curiosity, the low PEOU caused by infrastructure deficits and technostress (Suryani & Santosa, 2024) significantly slows down active behavioral intention to fully adopt these systems. This confirms that for senior language teachers, technology adoption is not a simple linear decision but a compromised negotiation bounded by institutional limitations.

### **Need for ELT-Specific Guidelines**

All participants advocated for structured, localized regulations. G1 proposed an original pedagogical principle of "observe-imitate-modify" for student interactions with AI text. Under this framework, students observe AI language patterns, imitate structural models, and then modify the output to fit their own voice. Teachers unanimously insisted that AI must remain a "teacher aid only," reserving nuanced formative feedback and emotional classroom scaffolding strictly for human educators.

Rather than issuing generic educational prohibitions like "do not use AI," these senior teachers formulated practical, discipline-specific strategies. This active "domestication" of technology demonstrates that veteran educators utilize their extensive pedagogical experience to protect communicative authenticity. Their strategies align with international policy frameworks (UNESCO, 2023) but add tactical classroom value by treating AI outputs as raw, comparative texts rather than absolute answers.

### **Hopes for Ethical, Creative ELT Integration**

The final theme captures a sense of cautious optimism. G3 summarized that AI can ultimately help "teachers and students be more creative." The participants expressed hope that future AI integration would move beyond mechanical spell-checking to facilitate imaginative language simulations, provided that ethical frameworks are implemented to protect student data and critical thinking skills.

This trajectory fits well with the Diffusion of Innovation Theory (Rogers, 2003). As late adopters, senior teachers do not reject technology due to ideological resistance; rather, they demand clear proof of contextual fit and pedagogical safety. Once these conditions are envisioned or met, their stance transitions from defensive skepticism to a balanced, constructive advocacy for ethical classroom innovation.

## **CONCLUSION**

This study provides a nuanced understanding of how senior secondary school English teachers in Indonesia navigate the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in their pedagogical practices. In response to the first research question regarding perceptions, the findings demonstrate a state of cautious openness driven by a stark decoupling between Perceived Usefulness (PU) and Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU). While senior educators exhibit high PU, recognizing applications like ChatGPT and Grammarly as vital scaffolds for streamlining lesson planning and inspiring student creativity, their PEOU is significantly constrained by personal digital literacy gaps, institutional technostress, and infrastructural deficits.

Regarding the second research question concerning challenges and adaptation strategies, this study reveals that veteran teachers actively negotiate critical pedagogical threats, including AI-mediated plagiarism, student over-dependence, and data privacy risks. Rather than defaulting to defensive resistance or uncritical techno-optimism, these educators employ sophisticated, experience-driven mitigation tactics. These include the implementation of the "observe-imitate-modify" framework to contextualize AI outputs and a collective insistence on positioning AI strictly as a supportive "teacher aid" rather than an authoritative replacement for human-centered communicative interaction. Furthermore, a key divergence in the data indicates an emerging critical shift among some senior educators who are beginning to fundamentally re-evaluate traditional boundaries of authorship and classroom assessment.

### Limitations and Future Directions

The primary limitation of this study is its compact sample size ( $n = 4$ ) and localized qualitative descriptive focus, which limits the statistical generalizability of the findings across the highly diverse educational landscapes of Indonesia. Future research should expand this inquiry by utilizing mixed-methods or longitudinal designs with a larger, cross-regional cohort of veteran educators. Additionally, comparative studies exploring the generational divide between novice and senior teachers' interaction with generative AI would provide deeper insights into the evolving landscape of digital language pedagogy.

### REFERENCES

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. *SAGE Publications*.
- Budiyanto, D., Tridinanti, G., Saputri, K., Apriani, E., & Sartika, D. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in ELT: Advancing Adaptive and Personalized Language Learning. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 13(4), 2151–2161. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v13i4.16713>
- Crompton, H. (2023). Artificial intelligence in education: Risks and opportunities for language classrooms. *Journal of Educational Technology*, 28(2), 112–125.
- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3), 319–340. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Kemendikbudristek. (2024). Profil guru dan tenaga kependidikan Indonesia 2024. *Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, Dan Teknologi*.
- Kemendikbudristek. (2023). Implementation guide for artificial intelligence technology in learning. *Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, Dan Teknologi*.
- Kessler, G. (2023). Academic integrity and generative AI in language education. *Language Learning & Technology*, 27(1), 1–12. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/73701>
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (n.d.). Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation (4th ed.). *Jossey-Bass*.
- Nguyen, T. M., & Tran, T. T. (2023). Peer support and AI adoption among veteran teachers in Southeast Asia. *Southeast Asian Journal of Educational Studies*, 11(1), 145–159.
- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to

- meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>
- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2022). Thematic analysis in qualitative research: Striving to meet trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 21, 1–13. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069221093847>
- Ouyang, F., Zheng, L., & Jiao, P. (2022). Artificial intelligence in education: The three paradigms. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 3(100064). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100064>
- Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed method implementation research. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 42(5), 533–544. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y>
- Patton, M. Q. (n.d.). Qualitative research and evaluation methods (4th ed.). *SAGE Publications*.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of innovations (5th ed.). *Free Press*.
- Sabaruddin, S., Purnama, A. D., Harmilawati, H., Aminah, S., Irmayani, I., Takdir, T., & AR, A. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in English Language Teaching: A Study of English Teachers' TPACK. *Globish: An English-Indonesian Journal for English, Education, and Culture*, 13(2), 125–132. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31000/globish.v13i2.11250>
- Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing & Health*, 23(4), 334–340. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240x\(200008\)23:4<334::aid-nur9>3.0.co;2-g](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240x(200008)23:4<334::aid-nur9>3.0.co;2-g)
- Suryani, A., & Santosa, M. (2024). Technostress and digital literacy among senior teachers in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 88–102.
- UNESCO. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. *UNESCO Publishing*.
- World Economic Forum. (2024). Shaping the future of learning: AI and the workforce. *World Economic Forum*.