IJIET, e-ISSN 2548-8430, p-ISSN 2548-8422, Vol. 10, No. 1, January 2026, pp. 13-26

International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching
http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/IJIET
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

NEGOTIATING LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES AND ETHICAL BOUNDARIES: LECTURERS' NARRATIVES ON AI USE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

Tri Pujiani[1*], Lilia Istifani[2], and Muhammad Pandu Khoiron[3]
[1,2,3] Universitas Harapan Bangsa, Indonesia
tripujiani@uhb.ac.id[1], liliaistifani2004@gmail.com[2],
and pandukhoiron14@gmail.com[3]
*correspondence: tripujiani@uhb.ac.id
https://doi.org/10.24071/ijiet.v10i1.12946
received 1 July 2025; accepted 28 January 2026

Abstract
The rapid evolution of AI in education has triggered contentious debates over its ethical use and effects on language learning. This study investigated how English teachers negotiate and appeal to language ideologies and ethical boundaries as they respond to AI tools in English Language Teaching (ELT). Grounded on language ideology and pedagogical technology theories, the research employed narrative inquiry design in examining the Indonesian university lecturers' experiences of language, ethics, and AI-driven classroom practice. Preliminary screening questionnaires and narrative in-depth interviews were used in collecting the data. The findings demonstrate that while AI tools have become valued for efficiency in supplying grammatical correction, lecturers are worried that the reliance on AI might hinder critical thought and emergence of agency. Lecturers also note the inadequacy of AI at engaging the local diversity of languages and dialects, and AI often tends to construct a standardized version of English. The study indicates that AI can be a useful tool in ELT by offering feedback and improving language accuracy, but caution is necessary to maintain academic integrity and ensure meaningful learning. This research contributes to the conversation on AI in education, offering actionable insights on ethical and productive AI use in language teaching.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, English language teaching, ethical issue, language ideology, narrative inquiry

Introduction

The last couple of years, the world has witnessed the widespread application of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in institutions of learning, significantly transforming entrenched pedagogical practices, particularly in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT). Platforms such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, QuillBot, and Google Translate have become ubiquitous among students and teachers, rendering linguistic aid that was once difficult to access or even unattainable. These technologies not only changed instructional practices in the classroom but also ran

This work is licensed under CC BY-SA.
Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

counter to old assumptions about the use of language, precision, authorship, and what teaching is. In Indonesia, a nation with vastly diverse linguistic landscapes and rapidly evolving digital spaces, ELT applications of AI technologies are at once a seductive innovation and mediatized space of struggle for lecturers who need to mark off ethical, pedagogical, and linguistic practice.

The emergence of AI technology into ELT is not just about ease but also an indication of an even greater epistemological change in how language is understood and how it must be learned. In line with a world report by Dulundu (2024), the global market for AI in education would grow to $196.63 billion in 2025, indicating the widespread adoption of these technologies across all education levels. In Indonesia, there has been intense digital development with programs like Merdeka Belajar and Kampus Merdeka by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology (Kemendikbudristek), which further augmented the use of cutting-edge tools in higher education. But along with these innovations come challenges like plagiarism concerns, over-reliance on technology, loss of critical thinking, and downplaying the role of the teacher (Suello & Alda, 2025).

Recent empirical studies have started exploring the pedagogical value of AI technology in ELT. For instance, learners who used AI-based translation software showed improved fluency in writing activities (Ou et al., 2024). Similarly, Suhono (2023) reported that learner independence and confidence were enhanced using AI-based writing systems. There exists, however, an increasing body of literature cautioning against the uncritical adoption of AI into the classroom. Soumia (2025) had noted that without control, excessive reliance on tools such as ChatGPT may undermine the critical thinking and cognitive skills of students. Moreover, such tools are imbued with specific linguistic ideologies—i.e., promoting Standard English, which may be incommensurable to the local varieties and pedagogic values, particularly in postcolonial contexts such as Indonesia (Tankosić et al., 2024).

These tensions become particularly pronounced in the Indonesian higher education context. English language instructors, often at the intersection of global technological innovations and national language beliefs, must negotiate competing demands. On the one hand, they must graft technological innovation to remain pedagogically up-to-date; on the other, they must deal with ethical issues and conventionally grounded language routines. According to Munni and Rafique (2025), most Bangladeshi English teachers are undecided when it comes to tools like Google Translate, commenting on their utility while some question their reliability and pedagogical value. Similarly, Sutrisman et al. (2024) in one of his studies found that although many lecturers embrace AI tools because of their grammatical recommendations, at the same time they worry that students will shy away from the learning process and excessively rely upon machine-based correction.

Previous research in the areas of AI and ELT have very much tended toward the effectiveness or function paradigms—how the tools support grammar, vocabulary, or learner independence (Ali et al., 2024). They have largely stayed away from the ideologies behind the attitudes and ethics behind lecturers' practice. And fewer still have taken a narrative, qualitative agenda to position educators at center stage as they navigate and make sense of the tools in their work lives. This is significant as language ideologies, as Sah and Uysal (2022) define them, the

cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, are a part of the way teachers assess the authenticity of language produced through AI, especially in multilingual and postcolonial contexts where English adopts multi-faceted meanings.

While pedagogical technology theory is useful to illuminate tool integration and instructional design (Bizami et al., 2023), it dismisses the sociocultural and ideological influences that shape teacher selection. In response, a dual theoretical framework grounded in both language ideology theory and pedagogical technology theory is necessary to understand how teachers negotiate these technological and moral shifts. There has been little research trying to broach this intersection, and such research tends to focus on student voices at the expense of teacher accounts.

This study occupies this niche through the consideration of how Indonesian English lecturers navigate language ideology and moral boundaries as the use of AI tools in ELT is increasingly being implemented. Specifically, it seeks to ask the question: How do the lecturers interpret and respond to the language and moral aspects of the use of AI-enabled tools in English language teaching? Taking a narrative research stance, the study foregrounds the everyday lives and reflexive concerns through which the lecturers navigate the use of such technologies and thereby affords rich depth potentially lost in quantitative research.

Its value lies in its ability to elicit the various complexities in the resistance and take-up of AI tools used by the lecturers. Their testimonies highlight the intersection of pedagogic values, moral positioning and ideology of language in the case of pedagogic practice. This applies particularly to Indonesian higher education where the lecturers are guardians both of international educational standards and national cultural norms. The study not only contributes to imparting ethics in the use of AI in ELT alone but also serves to guide theoretical thinking towards the localization of educational technology in postmodern environments.

Ultimately, this paper centers on a prominent yet under-researched issue of ELT: the way English teachers manage linguistic, ethical, and ideological issues that emerge from AI technology. By centering on Indonesian lecturers' narratives, it aspires to offer grounded knowledge on the ways global technological shifts are negotiated within the local context. The study aims to contribute empirically and practically to discussions at the relationship between language, technology, and ethics of English language teaching.

Literature Review

Theoretical framework

This research is based on two main theories: Language Ideology Theory and Pedagogical Technology Theory. These frameworks will allow for an integrated view of how English lecturers in Indonesia are responding to the complex dynamics of AI tools in English Language Teaching (ELT).

Language ideologies are a cultural system of beliefs focuses on how languages are perceived and used in society. These ideologies link social relationships to linguistic practices. They dictate what is perceived to be 'correct', 'authentic', or 'worthwhile' use of language while simultaneously masking socially constructed historical influences. The concept of ideology are more than thoughts, abstract or concrete; they are socially rooted, and generally hierarchically positioned. Language ideologies similarly articulate, at least in varying degrees of

directness, moral and power associations, reflecting the goals and aspirations of dominant forms in society (Irvine & Gal, 2000; Kroskrity, 2004; Woolard, 2021).

In English Language Teaching (ELT) contexts, especially those with histories of colonialism, the English language is not only viewed as a communicative resource but as an index of prestige, of modernity, and for different actors, an acknowledgement of imperialist histories (Sah & Uysal, 2022). Standard English, based on AI, provided by tools such as Grammarly and ChatGPT are often framed using ideological beliefs about what is 'good' English and used to justify and determine who has the authority to determine 'correct' English - and how these decisions align or conflict with local ELT pedagogical norms.

As such, language ideologies not only establish linguistic norms but also reinforce the social structures that these ideologies both carry and often produce, which includes: power dynamics, national identity, and global-local relationships (Cavanaugh, 2020). In the current study we examine the ways in which Indonesian English lecturers' attitudes toward AI tools represent language ideologies in relation to social ideology.

In addition to exploring language ideologies, this study utilizes Pedagogical Technology Theory, which examines the ways instructors incorporated conceptually based technology into their practices. An important aspect of Pedagogical Technology Theory is the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) model. TPACK identifies the interconnectedness of Content Knowledge (CK), Pedagogical Knowledge (PK), and Technological Knowledge (TK) (Koehler et al., 2013). TPACK identifies that ultimately, technology requires insightful knowledge of the relationship between CK, PK, and TK, along with how technology can promote and/or limit both pedagogical and learning objectives.

Although TPACK has been widely adopted in educational research, Celik's (2023) article claims TPACK framework has been critiqued for its omission of ethical considerations and sociolinguistic ideologies, particularly with regards to use of AI tools. To address these gaps, this study highlights the ethical nature attached to integrating AI tools and language ideologies pertaining to decision-making activities used in various forms of English teaching practices.

Together, Language Ideology Theory and Pedagogical Technology Theory provide a dual focus for this study. Language Ideology Theory challenges lecturers' assumptions about linguistic norms, authenticity, and standardization, while Pedagogical Technology Theory offers insight into how these assumptions manifest in pedagogical decision-making when integrating AI tools into language teaching. This combined framework helps uncover the complex relationship between AI technologies, teaching practices, and ideological beliefs about language in Indonesian ELT (Kurbanova et al., 2020).

Reviews on previous studies

The implementation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in English Language Teaching (ELT) contexts has received increased attention. Tools like ChatGPT, Grammarly, QuillBot, and Google Translate are now commonplace in educational contexts, providing benefits such as instant feedback, grammar checks, vocabulary improvement, and writing support (Pack & Maloney, 2023). Research has indicated that AI tools can improve writers' writing skills, reduce their anxieties, and foster learner agency (Wang et al., 2022). This trend is also evident in ELT classrooms in

Indonesia, where students and lecturers use AI tools for writing and translation tasks (Azima & Fithriani, 2024).

The question of benefits is complicated, although there are significant benefits of AI tools and technologies in ELT (English Language Teaching). Multiple issues arise in addition to the technological such as purely ideological or ethical issues. For example, critics have named things like plagiarism, dependence on technology, and decline of creativity and thinking (Wafa & Sulistyaningsih, 2025). These issues are interconnected and reflect broader social concerns about teachers and students being independent students, ambiguous (in a bad sense) technology in academic work. Regarding these concerns, there are not just questions about the functioning of the tools but also the moral and ideological aspects of their use and function in language education.

At the center of this debate is the notion that AI technologies are not language-neutral. Most AI tools are trained on corpora that have normalized, standardized varieties of English, often associated with native speakers, and more frequently a focus on American and British English. This issue raises many difficult questions about whose language norms are normalized and privileged. Research shows that AI models, such as ChatGPT, often unconsciously uphold hegemonic language ideologies, making assumptions about English use and ignoring non-native or localized different uses of English, which by extension ignore or exclude communicating in English as an additional language (Smith et al., 2018). Besides the context of this question/issue is the status of language in postcolonial contexts to like Indonesia, where English, as a medium of communication, has links with ideas of modernity, prestige, and coloniality (Sah & Uysal, 2022).

Again, in the case of lecturers in contexts of ELT in Indonesia, they negotiate the competing entanglements of global norms of language and local values and, in fact, make an effort to situate the global norms about language called Standard English, within their local contexts that situate multilingualism and linguistic diversity as valuable. The study by Mutanga et al. (2024) revealed that lecturers had – with hesitation – developed a passion for the AI tools they used for formative uses for the sake of writing improvement for their students but could see the hegemonic implications that the technologies had. These competing ideologies – the local versus global perspective – can help analysts with conflicting identities, views, motives, purposes, and agency in attitudes about technology as a tool we adopt into our educational practices and pedagogies.

In addition, ethical concerns of AI for learning and teaching contexts are complexities. For example, AI tools like Grammarly and QuillBot can provide engagement with the writing process and support learners with low-proficiency skill sets (Wiredu et al., 2024), but the downside is academic integrity and unachievable dependence on these tools. In high-stakes tasks like writing a thesis or writing a journal article, the delineation between academic assistance in the writing process and shortcuts towards unethical outcomes can become conspicuously vague. As Balalle et al. (2025) pointed out, there are formal ethical guidelines to be established to help regulate the application of AI in education in learning contexts particularly; especially since students' digital literacies and technology abilities are so exceptionally diverse, and operate across multiple levels.

However, the teachers' perspectives are typically viewed as guardians of this process, where the theoretical ideologies and ethical perspectives of teachers on AI

have largely been overlooked. Although literature has emerged on AI in education, the focus has tended to be on learner outcomes or the affordability of technology. There has been a general neglect of what teachers can do with technologies—particularly, the ways in which teachers' beliefs and identities shape, disrupt, or reinforce their beliefs and practices related to technology in their classrooms. A number of studies acknowledge that the components of teacher identity determines if a teacher adopts (or resists) technology in their language teaching (Mali, 2025; Su, 2023). Unfortunately, much of the AI pedagogy research has been explicitly techno-centric, looking at the effectiveness of the tools but not on whether/how teachers will address the ethical issues in the application of technology.

This research seeks to fill these gaps by foregrounding the voices of lecturers through narrative inquiry since this takes a look at how they understand, form moral boundaries, and negotiate positions about AI tools. Additionally, it reflects a larger trend in literature centering teachers' perspectives in their technology integration in language education (Izlin & Widiyati, 2023; Tondeur et al., 2019). Importantly, by examining the narratives of Indonesian English lecturers, this research looks at how they use or distance themselves from AI tools and creates moral boundaries while continuing to negotiate the language ideologies that travel with their pedagogy.

Despite the growing literature on AI in ELT, gaps remain. Research examines language ideologies and ethical choice-making related to the adoption and use of AI tools. The majority of studies examined either learner outcomes or affordances from the perspective of a technological purpose, with most not providing a rich lecturers' viewpoints. The literature is also very new to examine language ideologies with AI for ELT that offers the use of Language Ideology Theory and Pedagogical Technology Theory. This study targets these gaps by consolidating the two aforementioned theories to better understand how Indonesian lecturers negotiate the moral and ideological limits in using AI tools, rather than framing the use of AI tools as a binary decision.

Method

This study employed qualitative research design and narrative inquiry methodology. Narrative inquiry is useful when examining the process by which individuals make sense of their messy experiences, including, but not limited to, changes in ideology or ethical decision making (Savin-Baden & Van Niekerk, 2007). The method allowed for an adequate and descriptive investigation of the lived experiences of English lecturers in the unique situation in Indonesia and the role of AI tools in ELT. Personal narratives are useful for exploring the ethical dilemmas and ideological positions involved with the use of AI in language education.

The participants in this research study were English lecturers in Indonesia. To ensure that the participants were pertinent to the area of research, we implemented the following inclusion criteria: 1) current practice in English language teaching at the time of the study; 2) familiarity with AI tools such as ChatGPT, Grammarly, Quillbot, or Google translate for use in their pedagogy; 3) willingness to talk about their personal experiences with regards to ethical issues and ideologies around the use of AI tools in their teaching.

In order to ascertain a general outline of potential participants, a questionnaire was sent to a larger pool of English lecturers. In general, the questionnaire aimed

to establish their experience with AI tools and the initial attitudes towards the use of such tools in ELT. After the questionnaire results were analyzed, four participants were selected from the pool of responses using purposive sampling, as this sampling technique allows for purposeful selection of participants across demographics such as gender, institutions, and years of teaching experience. The aim was to get a diverse section of opinions and experiences around the use of AI tools in the classroom.

Once the consents had been obtained, participants were asked to take part in semi-structured interviews. The interviews were conducted face-to-face or in Zoom, in accordance with the wishes and availability of the participants. Each interview took about 60–90 minutes and were recorded with consent about their confidentiality.

Data were collected mainly using in-depth semi-structured interviews through a protocol. The questions examined participants' experiences in using AI tools, knowledge of language conventions and correctness, ethical questions arising, and decision-making strategies when faced with ELT situations. With follow-up questions there were opportunities for clarification and to pursue more detail in notable stories.

Thematic narrative analysis was employed to explore the interview data. The transcripts were closely read to look for narrative passages that reflected participants' negotiation of language ideologies and ethical boundaries. Coding was both deductive, drawing on the theoretical lenses (pedagogical technology, language ideologies), and inductive, allowing identification of new themes from the data.

Following the thematic analysis, the themes were interpreted within the socio-cultural and institutional context of Indonesian higher education. The analysis sought to understand the way that lecturers constructed meaning, situated themselves and the degree of agency they had around AI technologies. In order to ensure that our work was credible and reliable, data source triangulation was employed by cross-checking field notes and interviews.

Findings and Discussion

Findings

This section presents the findings from the in-depth interviews, beginning with individual narratives from each respondent, which highlight their perspectives on AI in English Language Teaching. The data is then analyzed thematically, focusing on key areas such as language accuracy, language variety, ethical boundaries, and teachers' agency.

Mrs. R: Embracing AI with caution and context

Mrs. R is an experienced lecturer in English for Specific Purposes and Linguistics with 5-10 years of teaching experience. She regards AI tools such as Grammarly, ChatGPT, and Google Translate as a useful tool. She states these tools, assist with correcting grammatical problems, improving fluency in writing and language, and improving accuracy in language, notably for students who struggle with writing, especially technical writing. R sees AI as a tool for support, something that aids students in confirming errors, and speeds up how fast students receive feedback on their writing.

However, R is deeply aware of the limitations of AI in teaching. She does not view AI as a replacement for active learning or critical thinking. In her perspective, AI tools reinforce standardized English, which may unintentionally undermine the linguistic diversity that her students experience in their own contexts. R stresses that linguistic authenticity matters and that the Indonesian English dialect, with its combination of local dialects and the Indonesian cultural context, is oftentimes not upheld by AI tools.

In her classroom, R sets firm limits on the use of the AI tools while encouraging students to use them for improved language acquisition, but not as the means for completing an entire assignment or task. R insists on her students experience engagement with the material, then after responding to the AI feedback, the students will revise their work, reflecting on what they have chosen and the rationale behind it. She designs assessments so that AI-created content is prohibited, and the students must submit drafts for R's feedback to help ensure the students are learning and demonstrating growth independently. For her, AI should be used as a tool for enhancement, not possibly a shortcut to potential limitations.

Mr. S: AI as a tool for personalized learning

Mr. S, a dedicated lecturer with 5-10 years of experience in grammar, writing, and speaking, views AI tools as a powerful resource for enhancing language learning, particularly in providing instant feedback. He appreciates that AI can help students spot grammar mistakes and offer structural suggestions, particularly for those who may not have the confidence to correct their own work. S recognizes immediate access to feedback as a major advantage for students working to improve their accuracy and to build confidence in their writing.

However, S remains wary of the potential of AI to take away from the learning process. He thinks AI's functionality is certainly useful for correcting grammar, but he has doubts that AI has the capacity for developing students' critical thinking or thinking for themselves. He is particularly willing to intervene if he suspects students will rely more on AI to complete their assignments. S prefers students to be very clear in their use of AI. He will allow students to use AI tools only as a source of feedback and to help them revise their works. He prefers that students do not use AI as a means to generate content for essays and papers.

Mr. S's teaching practice includes students submitting drafts and explaining their rationale for changes AI suggested. He makes it clear that AI is a supplement to classroom teachers practice that is grounded on critical thinking and student engagement. He also has students reflect for themselves on what they learn while justifying modifications on their own without technology. For S, AI will become an important part of ELT when it is used responsibly and in a responsible way.

Mrs. F: Maintaining autonomy and ethical use of AI

Mrs. F, a lecturer with 11-15 years of experience, is a strong advocate for using AI tools as aiding students' learning in grammar, structure, and language accuracy. She appreciates the efficiency and immediacy that AI tools offer, particularly when it comes to feedback on writing. F feels that AI tools support students in becoming more independent and able to self-correct, allowing them to find and amend language issues on their own.

However, F remains cautious of AI that serves as a support for students, potentially hindering the learning process. She has witnessed a few examples of students utilizing AI too much for content generation and also doing grammar checks and correcting errors, which breaks down the academic honesty component of learning. F has received assignments that are far beyond the leaned abilities of a student, and she found himself wondering if learners were using AI to complete their assignments.

With this in mind, F has established rules for the use of AI. Students can use AI tools to provide feedback and for language improvement, but they must still do the content and writing themselves. F also uses draft submissions to be able to provide checkpoints and better track (and be able to provide guidance) on student writing to avoid the potential issue of students using AI to substitute for the learning process. F is attempting to establish boundaries in order to provide a balance between the use of technology and the necessary development of independent writing and critical thinking skills.

Mr. A: Strategic AI use to enhance, not replace learning

Mr. A is an instructor who has taught for 11-15 years to teach grammar, listening, and TEFL methodology. He thinks that AI tools are a support mechanism to promote students' language learning, and he will accept AI tools for that role because they offer a range of support that can enhance or teach language. He sees that AI tools can provide a quick and easy correction, allowing students to catch grammar errors and improve their writing mechanics in real-time. A likes AI tools for refinements of language, but he is cautious not to substitute the active process of learning with an AI tool.

In contrast to some of his peers, A does not see overreliance on AI as an important concern. With the right boundaries regarding AI, he thinks that it is possible to incorporate AI within the learning process without losing academic integrity. A has indeed set up specific boundaries when it comes to AI use in his classroom. He will let students use AI to provide feedback and then to revise when it comes to their drafts and work, but makes sure they continue to own the content. He asks students to submit drafts, reflect on the revisions, and to engage critically with the AI feedback, so that the AI tool complements their own learning.

A has created graded assignments in which students cannot use AI tools, so that they are writing from a process that requires original thinking and academic work. He reinforces that AI is one tool in their tool belt to improve their language accuracy and not take the language learning process away from them. This balanced perspective provides students with an effective learning path, and provides students with the choice and responsibility of their educational path.

Discussion

Language accuracy

According to the lecturers, the accuracy of AI-generated language was generally accepted, with many accepting that AI tools offer assistance for correcting grammar and developing a wide variety of vocabulary as well. They concluded that Grammarly and ChatGPT, for example, are most helpful for checking and improving the technical aspects of writing, particularly students struggling for accuracy and fluency with their grammar. Nevertheless, half of the respondents

raised concerns about AI's approaches to contextual appropriateness and nuances. For example, Mr. S commented, "AI tools are excellent for performing quick grammar checks, but rarely capture the nuances of language known only to a human."

This aligns with the idea of language ideologies proposed by Irvine and Gal (2000) when they claim your everyday tools like AI are framed through language ideologies. The analysis revealed that the AI tools identified in the majority of the studies were those that perpetuated standard language ideologies, and gave preference to Standard English, while disregarding some local dialects or informal aspects of language used in real world communication. Kroskrity (2004) drew together this notion of a language ideology of AI mirroring linguistic norms that were standardized, and with all the iterations of AI or AI-enabled tools identified in the Indonesian ELT context were not fully equivalent and mapped against the multilingual, local language practices in Indonesia.

The lecturers' apprehensions regarding a reliance on AI can be seen as part of a larger debate in the literature around whether AI has the potential to support student independence or lead them away from critical language learning altogether. AI resources allow students to short-cut their engagement with the language without deeper learning of the grammar and syntax as Wafa and Sulistyaningsih (2025) note.

Language variety

Regarding the question of whether AI tools accommodate different varieties of language, such as tone, formality, or register, all respondents were largely in agreement that AI works to propagate a standardization of English. However, many lecturers indicated that the English generated by AI is very formal or textbook English. In contrast, the varieties of informal, regional English that students actually use in real life is not accommodated by the fields of study. Mrs. R stated, "English written by AI is very formal, very textbook English. It cannot accommodate the more informal, regional varieties of English that my students use."

This observation echoes Woolard (2021), who noted that language ideologies often take certain ways of speaking as better, ultimately demoting local dialects or other varieties of language altogether. Cavanaugh (2020) has also pointed to how AI tools seek and prioritize uniformity in language, mimicking global language standards, which again removes local linguistic flexibility that is present when using the language in local contexts. For example, the students may be using Indonesian English, but they are also still using local dialects, while most of the AI norms exist in a global context.

An (2021) also argues that AI tools generally reproduce native-speaker English norms, while non-native varieties (e.g., Indonesian English) go unsupported, which suggests modern-day postcolonial issues in the tension between global language standards and local language practices (Sah & Uysal, 2022). The students' lives exist within this struggle for identity as they confront global language norms with their local contexts in Indonesian ELT classrooms.

Ethical boundaries

Ethical issues arising from AI's role in academic dishonesty and students' potential overreliance on AI were a central topic throughout the interviews. Several

of the lecturers noted that students may use these tools to create content without engaging with it first, which could lead to some form of dishonesty or plagiarism. Mrs. F eludes to this when she stated, "I do feel that AI can help students with their grammar, but I worry that if they rely too much on AI, they will miss the learning opportunity."

This concern resonates with Balalle et al. (2025) who place the need for ethical frameworks in the use of AI in education. The lecturers wanted to impose limits on AI use to promote responsible tools usage in environments where academic integrity was paramount. Draft submission periods and requiring students to articulate their changes to AI output were suggestions that echoed Koehler's (2013) framework of Pedagogical Technology Knowledge (TPACK) in that ethical decisions and being ethical were part of the pedagogical knowledge of technology integration. In line, Wafa and Sulistyaningsih (2025) offered a concern about reliance on AI and suggested that AI-based tools might promote limited, shallow engagement that obscured critical thought because fast, easy solutions replaced deep engagement with a content area.

Teachers' agency and reflection

Another major theme was the teacher's role in managing AI tools. The lecturers discussed that they have the way as to how and when specific AI tools will be used in their classrooms. While AI tools support student learning, the teacher needs to be in control of the learning experience to ensure students are still learning and actively engaging with the content.

Mr. A shared, "I view my role as a facilitator. I use AI tools to guide students, but I always try to ensure they do not become too reliant on them." This perspective is consistent with Tondeur et al. (2019), who argue that teachers' narratives and agency are critical in determining how technology is integrated into the curriculum. The lecturers in this study have an active role in shaping how AI tools are used and they followed the use of AI tools in an effort to support, not take the place of, human teaching.

To sum up, the lecturers were optimistic about the possibilities of AI in ELT but insisted it should be used in a considered manner. Mr. S said, "AI has the ability to transform teaching but only if we use it wisely and balance it with human support." This seems fitting with wider literature on AI in education, which calls for ethically balanced integration, ensuring AI became an adjunct to human teaching and respected our pedagogical principles (Tondeur et al., 2019).

Conclusion

The study examined English lecturers' views of AI tools in English Language Teaching (ELT) in Indonesia. Findings showed that while AI tools like Grammarly and ChatGPT contribute to language accuracy (grammar correction in particular), they maintain standardized English and fail to appreciate the diversity of linguistic variances exhibited in Indonesian English. The lecturers were concerned that students could abuse AI tools, and may depend on them to produce content without engaging in any learning process thereby compromising academic integrity.

To use AI tools in their teaching effectively, lecturers should develop explicit guidelines that make the role of AI as an assistive tool and not a replacement for (or means of avoiding) critical thinking and independent work. Teachers can support

the use of AI tools in the feedback and revision processes. They should also remain vigilant about students substituting genuine engagement with the subject matter with any AI tool. Active reflection about the suggestions made by AI should be promoted to help students to internalize the learning and prevent an overreliance on AI. AI should be used to enhance the learning experience, but not replace doing the assignment on the students' behalf. Identifying some limits on the use of AI can give students a bit of autonomy and help with academic integrity.

The sample size of this study was small, with a small number of Indonesian lecturers participating, so it was less able to say generalizable things. Future studies should look at more educators in more locations and institutions to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the impact AI is taking on ELT in many contexts. Further studies might also look at the long-term effect of AI on students' language development, and the impact of teacher education in moving forward. Also, investigating AI's impact on fostering critical thinking and creativity in the students should also be investigated.

References

Ali, L. F., Siraj, J., & Ali, M. F. (2024). AI-driven vocabulary development in ESL context: Advancing autonomous learning through technology. *Journal of Asian Development Studies*, *13*(4), 1067–1082. https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2024.13.4.86

An, K. (2021). A brief analysis of the application of English Language in British and American literature based on artificial intelligence. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1915,* 022060. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1915/2/022060

Azima, R., & Fithriani, R. (2024). Indonesian EFL students' perception of Google translate utilization as a translingual tool in writing class. *Academic Journal Perspective : Education, Language, and Literature*, *12*(1), 45–53. https://doi.org/10.33603/ef8wqz06

Balalle, H., & Pannilage, S. (2025). Reassessing academic integrity in the age of AI: A systematic literature review on AI and academic integrity. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *11,* 101299. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101299

Bizami, N. A., Tasir, Z., & Kew, S. N. (2023). Innovative pedagogical principles and technological tools capabilities for immersive blended learning: A systematic literature review. *Education and Information Technologies*, *28*, 1373–1425. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11243-w

Cavanaugh, J. R. (2020). Language ideology revisited. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *2020*(263), 51–57. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2020-2082

Celik, I. (2023). Towards intelligent-TPACK: An empirical study on teachers' professional knowledge to ethically integrate artificial intelligence (AI)-based tools into education. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *138*(August 2022), 107468. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107468

Dulundu, A. (2024). AI in education: Benefits and concerns. *Next Generation Journal for The Young Researchers*, *8*(1), 81. https://doi.org/10.62802/3fr4f412

Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities* (pp. 35–84). Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Izlin, R., & Widiyati, E. (2023). Teachers' perspective on using multimedia technology for teaching English. *IJIET (International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching)*, *7*(2), 172–182. https://doi.org/10.24071/ijiet.v7i2.6048

Koehler, M. J., Mishra, P., & Cain, W. (2013). What is technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK)? *Journal of Education*, *193*(3), 13–19. https://doi.org/10.1177/002205741319300303

Kroskrity, P. V. (2004). Language ideologies. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 496–517). Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Kurbanova, S. M., Madrahimova, M. B., & Abdullayeva, N. K. (2020). In terms of understanding and effective application of pedagogical technologies. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, *5*(85), 866–869. https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2020.05.85.161

Mali, Y. C. G. (2025). Factors hindering the integration and potential of technology in EFL classrooms. *IJIET (International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching)*, *9*(1), 171–185. https://doi.org/10.24071/ijiet.v9i1.9553

Munni, B. E., & Rafique, R. (2025). Teachers' experiences of using AI-powered technologies in Bangladeshi English language classrooms. *Spectrum*, *18*(1), 89–100. https://doi.org/10.3329/spectrum.v18i1.76362

Mutanga, B., Jugoo, V., & Adefemi, K. O. (2024). Lecturers' perceptions on the integration of artificial intelligence tools into teaching practice. *Trends in Higher Education*, *3*(4), 1121–1133. https://doi.org/10.3390/higheredu3040066

Ou, A. W., Stöhr, C., & Malmström, H. (2024). Academic communication with AI-powered language tools in higher education: From a post-humanist perspective. *System*, *121,* 103225. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103225

Pack, A., & Maloney, J. (2023). Potential affordances of generative AI in language education: Demonstrations and an evaluative framework. *Teaching English with Technology*, *23*(2), 4–24. https://doi.org/10.56297/BUKA4060/VRRO1747

Sah, P. K., & Uysal, H. (2022). Unbiased but ideologically unclear: Teacher beliefs about language practices of emergent bilingual students in the U.S. *Linguistics and Education*, *72*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101126

Savin-Baden, M., & Van Niekerk, L. (2007). Narrative inquiry: Theory and practice. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, *31*(3), 459–472. https://doi.org/10.1080/03098260601071324

Smith, G., Fleisig, E., Bossi, M., Rustagi, I., & Yin, X. (2018). Standard language ideology in AI-generated language. *ACM/IMS Journal of Data Science*, *37*(4). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.08726

Soumia, B. (2025). Students' reliance on AI-based tools in written expression course: Challenges and solutions. *The Barcelona Conference on Education 2024: Official Conference Proceedings*, 33–42. https://doi.org/10.22492/issn.2435-9467.2024.5

Su, Y. (2023). Delving into EFL teachers' digital literacy and professional identity in the pandemic era: Technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) framework. *Heliyon*, *9*(6). https://doi.org/0.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e16361

Suello, A.O., & Alda, R.C. (2025). English teachers' ethical considerations in AI integration: A narrative inquiry. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, *12*(3), 769–781. https://doi.org/10.22190/jtesap241016057s

Suhono, S. (2023). An assistance of islamic university EFL students through artificial intelligence (AI) machine translation and writing tools. *International Journal of Community Engagement Payungi*, *3*(2), 74-90. https://doi.org/10.58879/ijcep.v3i2.36

Sutrisman, H., Simanjuntak, R., Prihartanto, A., & Kusumo, B. (2024). The impact of using AI in learning on understanding of material by young students. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *1*(3), 24–32. https://doi.org/10.62951/ijer.v1i3.43

Tankosić, A., Milak, E., Steele, C., & Dobinson, T. (2024). Meeting standards: (Re)colonial and subversive potential of AI modification. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, *47*(3), 366–382. https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.24099.tan

Tondeur, J., Scherer, R., Baran, E., Siddiq, F., Valtonen, T., & Sointu, E. (2019). Teacher educators as gatekeepers: Preparing the next generation of teachers for technology integration in education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *50*(3), 1189–1209. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12748

Wafa, Z., & Sulistyaningsih, E. F. (2025). Exploring the integration of artificial intelligence in English language teaching: Trends, challenges, and pedagogical implications. *English Education and Literature Journal*, *5*(01), 119–128. https://doi.org/10.53863/e-jou.v5i01.1509

Wang, L., Chen, H. C., Lee, J. C., Yu, E. K., & Tian, J. X. (2022). Investigation of technology-enhanced language learning and teaching e-resources/tools in the online context. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching (IJCALLT)*, *12*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJCALLT.307150

Wiredu, J. K., Abuba, N. S., & Zakaria, H. (2024). Impact of generative AI in academic integrity and learning outcomes: A case study in the upper east region. *Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science*, *17*(8), 70–88. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajrcos/2024/v17i7491

Woolard, K. A. (2021). Language ideology. In *The international encyclopedia of linguistic anthropology* (pp. 1–21). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786093.iela0217