BILINGUAL PUBLISHING GROUP

Forum for Linguistic Studies

https://journals.bilpubgroup.com/index.php/fls

ARTICLE

Teachers' Use of Generative AI in Jordanian Universities: Practices and Perceptions

Saja Wardat [1*] ***, Mohammed Akour*** [2]

[1] *Department of English Language and Literature, Irbid University College, Al-Balqa Applied University, Irbid 1293, Jordan*

[2] *College of Computer and Information Sciences, Prince Sultan University, Riyadh 12435, Saudi Arabia*

ABSTRACT

The rapid rise of generative AI tools, such as ChatGPT and ChatPDF, presents new opportunities and challenges for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction. These tools can significantly enhance materials development, personalize learning tasks, and support instructor efficiency. Despite increasing global interest, little empirical research has explored how instructors in the Middle East, particularly Jordan, are adapting to these technologies. This study examines the perceptions and practices of EFL instructors at Jordanian universities regarding the integration of generative AI in the development of reading and writing materials. Using a mixed-methods approach, data were collected from 87 instructors via structured surveys and 15 via in-depth interviews. Quantitative findings highlight both optimism and caution: while AI is appreciated for its ability to save preparation time and improve material quality, concerns persist about ethical misuse, content reliability, and overreliance among students. Thematic analysis of interviews revealed pressing needs for institutional support, professional development, and clear policy frameworks. Findings suggest that, although instructors are open to adopting AI, significant barriers related to training and pedagogical alignment remain. This study contributes to the growing literature on AI in language education by providing context-specific insights for enhancing digital literacy, informing policy design, and promoting responsible AI integration in EFL teaching across the region.

Keywords: Generative AI; EFL Teaching; Reading Materials; Writing Instruction; Jordanian Universities; Middle East

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Saja Wardat, Department of English Language and Literature, Irbid University College, Al-Balqa Applied University, Irbid 1293, Jordan; Email: saja.wardat@bau.edu.jo

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 22 April 2025 | Revised: 16 May 2025 | Accepted: 23 May 2025 | Published Online: 27 May 2025
DOI: https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i6.9644

CITATION

Wardat, S., Akour, M., 2025. Teachers' Use of Generative AI in Jordanian Universities: Practices and Perceptions. Forum for Linguistic Studies. 7(6): 90–102. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i6.9644

Education; AI Literacy; Teacher Perceptions

1. Introduction

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI), particularly in the form of generative AI technologies, is transforming the educational landscape. These tools enable human-like responses, automate instructional content, and provide real-time assistance to learners across each subject domain. In second-language education, such tools are increasingly viewed as supporting reading comprehension, vocabulary development, writing fluency, and learner engagement[1, 2].

The potency of generative AI in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom is particularly enticing. Such tools can assist instructors in the prompt drafting of reading passages at various ability levels, providing scaffolding in grammar and sentence structure, and aiding writing development through systems of immediate feedback. Furthermore, they can be coupled with a differentiated instruction model that endorses learner autonomy and personalized learning pathways[3, 4]. These relevant capabilities are now particularly valued within teaching paradigms, increasingly more so in tertiary contexts that are adjusting to greater diversity among learners and growing curricular pressure.

AI is therefore being embedded within the framework of a more general transformation toward future-oriented schooling, where creativity, adaptability, and digital fluency form the core of 21st-century skills. International policy bodies such as UNESCO[5] and the OECD[6] have put forward frameworks requiring AI's responsible integration into education at all levels. The recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence issued by UNESCO urges the adoption of AI strategies that are inclusive, equitable, and adhere to the principles of human rights and academic integrity. Correspondingly, the "AI and the Future of Skills" report, authored in 2023 by the OECD, emphasizes that any institution must further develop the potential of AI while also addressing risks such as bias, misinformation, and surveillance.

Many of these global trends are being implemented with increasing demands on teachers, who themselves have varied approaches to begin with. Whether an instructional strategy will define the integration of AI in the curriculum and culture depends on the teacher's agency. More often, the divide is guided by the teacher's motivation, digital or computer literacy, and ethical consciousness. Teachers, therefore, aside from being implementers, are themselves critical stakeholders with the power to decide when and how AI should be adopted in the learning settings; hence, studying their perceptions and experiences would inform the development of sustainable strategies for adoption.

Concomitant to that expansion in the use of AI in education are a number of pressing pedagogical, ethical, and structural issues. Among the issues raised have been overreliance on these tools, diminished critical thinking skills among students, breaches of data privacy, and culturally inappropriate content produced by AI systems[7, 8]. Without clear instructional guidelines and ethical frameworks, the integration of AI into language education may risk fostering surface-level learning and academic dishonesty. Scholars argue that while AI holds the promise of reducing instructor workload and supporting students, its benefits can only be realized through informed and critical usage[9, 10].

The global research community has addressed these concerns by examining the implementation of AI in various educational settings. In the Gulf region, national initiatives—such as Saudi Arabia's AI literacy programs—have spurred rapid adoption and experimentation in universities[11]. Studies from Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates have shown that both faculty and students exhibit cautious optimism toward AI tools but stress the need for structured digital literacy training and ethical usage protocols[12, 13]. In contrast, countries like Jordan are still in the nascent stages of AI integration in higher education, with few institutional policies or professional development opportunities available for instructors[14].

In the Jordanian context, English language instruction plays a central role in higher education. Most universities require English proficiency and offer multiple EFL courses across disciplines. Even then, instructors often mention problems with outdated curricula, poor technological infrastructure, and a lack of time for content customization. Generative AI might very well solve most of these issues if it were just utilized, but little is known about how instructors currently

think about or use such tools. Furthermore, with AI ethics issues being scrutinized worldwide, as well as the credibility of materials produced by AI, it becomes even more important to understand how Jordanian instructors balance the risks against the benefits of these technologies in their classrooms.

Most of the AI-in-education research in Jordan is relatively novel and scarce in nature, with most of it focusing on students' attitudes toward AI and the technological capabilities of their institutions. There is a significant lack of empirical studies that examine the day-to-day instructional experiences of teachers, especially within the EFL domain, who are increasingly told to innovate but without sufficient guidance or resources [15, 16]. To address this gap in the literature, it remains unclear how instructors within this context construe the pedagogical, ethical, and institutional differences that arise from the use of AI.

This study aims to bridge this gap by shining a light on the perceptions, experiences, and practices of EFL teachers in Jordanian universities with regard to the usage of generative AI tools. In particular, the research endeavours to:

1. Investigate the perceptions of EFL teachers in Jordanian universities about the use of generative AI for the development of reading and writing materials.
2. Explore the advantages and disadvantages of implementing AI in language classrooms.
3. Identify training and digital literacy gaps that may hinder optimal AI adoption among the instructors.

By addressing these objectives, the study contributes to the growing international conversation about AI in education by providing situated knowledge that can benefit professional development, curriculum design, and policy in Jordan and similar educational settings. Furthermore, this study responds to calls from various international agencies to ensure that AI integration into education is not only technically competent but also pedagogically effective, ethically responsible, and culturally meaningful.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Generative AI and Language Education

Generative AI is the common name used to describe AI systems capable of generating new content, such as text, audio, images, or videos. In language education-dominated areas, text-based generative AI tools such as ChatGPT and Bard have gained popularity among learners and educators, as these systems can engage in human-like dialogues, pinpoint grammatical errors, suggest lexical choices, and generate content on demand [10, 17].

Numerous studies have discussed the various ways in which these tools aid the pedagogical process of establishing English as a foreign language. For instance, studies have found that environments enhanced with AI increase student engagement, confidence, and language output [4, 18]. On the other hand, ESL instructors use ChatGPT to create conversation prompts, vocabulary lists, and comprehension exercises to suit individual learner needs [3]. However, some of these materials, while grammatically sound, are said to lack cultural or contextual interpretation and may reinforce biases if used without moderation [7].

A study by Tapalova and Zhiyenbayeva [19] highlights the importance of teacher intervention in AI-assisted classrooms, suggesting that AI-generated instructional content requires an evaluative contextualization to remain pedagogically relevant. Moorhouse and Kohnke [1] echo this sentiment, expressing concern that initial language teacher education (ILTE) programs frequently fail to adequately prepare teachers in working with AI, therefore creating a severe skill gap in present classrooms. Turning to generative AI, it has also been observed to disrupt traditional teaching methods through interference in content creation and the presence of teachers in the classroom [20].

New research stresses the use of generative AI as a sociocultural practice embedded in teacher agency and institutional norms. Zaman et al. [21] mapped out how language teachers in South Asia negotiate their use of AI tools amidst a dearth in institutional support, remarking on how pedagogical innovation is often stifled by top-down mandates and infrastructure gaps. This type of work thus highlights the value of contextualizing AI integration beyond mere technical or abstract individualist frameworks.

Integration of AI in educational settings is by no means confined to technical fields. Indeed, a recent stream of studies has foregrounded its position within the social sciences and humanities. For example, Lavidas et al. [22] explored the factors that influence students' intentions to adopt AI applications for academic purposes within the humanities and social sciences, demonstrating that attitude toward AI

and digital readiness significantly sway adoption. The findings thus reinforce the necessity of understanding both the technological capability and user perspectives, as well as the contextual variables—an emphasis that directly connects to the present study.

2.2. Theoretical Frameworks: Technology Acceptance and Digital Literacy

Generally, introducing generative AI tools into educational settings has been considered through the lens of the Technology Acceptance Model, whereby perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use are posited as the most significant factors behind user acceptance [23]. The secondary perceptions of entertainment that the instructor has about AI may include whether it helps reduce the time spent on tasks in teaching or increases the quality of teaching materials; therefore, these form the basis of many secondary variables considered in the study to gain insight into whether instructors utilize these tools in their teaching practice.

In the EFL setting, studies have extended the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) to include factors such as ethical awareness, digital self-efficacy, and institutional support [15, 24]. The findings suggest that acceptance of AI tools is hindered by a lack of training or because of ethical risk considerations, even if teachers themselves see benefits from AI tools. Hence, digital literacy is, at least in part, both ethical and pedagogical. For Luckin et al. [9], it is imperative that training be provided to educators not just on how to use AI but also on how to use it responsibly and effectively.

The psychological readiness of the instructor should thus have been taken into account, including academic self-efficacy and motivation in technology adoption. Karakose et al. [25] bring forth this complex interplay in their study of prospective teachers of mathematics, where structural equation modeling revealed educators' attitudes, teacher anxiety, and intention to live and use instructional technologies after graduation . Although their study is set in the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) field, the motivational and psychological variables they talk about carry over to all other areas and reinforce the need for putting human-centered considerations in models for AI adoption.

Additionally, Balaskas [26] suggests an enhanced version of TAM, which includes the ethical risk perception, mostly in the settings where the AI-generated content might inadvertently breach academic integrity standards. Their research, based on Taiwanese university instructors, finds that ethical risk perception serves as a significant moderator between the perceived usefulness and the actual use of AI in their classrooms. The importance of ethical and institutional barriers to AI adoption forms the basis of the present study.

This study is based on an extended TAM that incorporates attitude, perceived benefit, perceived risk, and institutional readiness. By doing so, it follows the recent calls by Liang et al. [16] and Wang et al. [8] for more comprehensive models that can account for the complexity of AI adoption in education.

2.3. AI for Reading and Writing Instruction

The incorporation of generative AI in EFL reading and writing instruction has gained considerable momentum. Teachers are said to be using ChatGPT, ChatPDF, and similar tools to compose leveled reading passages, scaffold comprehension activities, and provide formative feedback to students on their writing [10, 27]. This ability to customize a product quickly becomes especially important in mixed-ability classrooms.

Several researchers have emphasized the role of AI in improving writing instruction. Nazli et al. [28] found that students who received AI-generated feedback demonstrated improved grammatical accuracy and organizational skills. Similarly, Alharbi [29] noted that AI-powered writing assistants can help reduce anxiety among EFL students by providing nonjudgmental, instant feedback, though overdependence remains a concern.

However, issues of plagiarism and originality persist. Feng [30] warns that students may begin to copy AI suggestions without engaging in metacognitive reflection, which could inhibit long-term skill development. Therefore, a hybrid model that combines teacher-guided instruction with AI support is widely recommended [4, 12].

Song [31] investigated AI writing assistants in undergraduate composition classes and concluded that scaffolded instruction around AI use was crucial. Students who received explicit guidance on how to evaluate and revise AI-generated text demonstrated higher writing gains than those who used AI independently. Their findings support the importance of embedding AI tools within structured pedagogical frameworks.

In the Jordanian context, research remains limited. Abuzaid[14] found that while instructors experiment with AI to develop supplementary reading and writing materials, they often lack confidence in evaluating the cultural and academic appropriateness of AI-generated content. Oweis[32] found similar concerns in their study of digital writing in Jordanian universities, where instructors expressed skepticism toward AI's relevance in Arabic-English bilingual classrooms. These findings reinforce the need for local training programs and culturally sensitive pedagogical approches.

2.4. Ethical Concerns and Institutional Readiness

One of the most pressing concerns surrounding the adoption of AI in education is ethics. Instructors across various studies have cited data privacy, content bias, authorship ambiguity, and student plagiarism as critical[7, 8]. These concerns are particularly acute in the language classroom, where originality and critical thinking are central learning objectives.

Shamsuddinova[33], in a large-scale survey of Gulf institutions, found that although awareness of ethical issues was high, most universities lacked clear guidelines or policies regarding the responsible use of AI. In contrast, Saudi Arabia has launched national frameworks to encourage AI literacy across academic institutions[11], whereas countries like Jordan are still in the early stages of formal policy development[14]. Teacher readiness is further constrained by the lack of professional development (PD). Moorhouse and Kohnke[1] report that most EFL instructors in their sample had never received formal AI training, relying instead on self-experimentation and peer support. Without structured training modules, even instructors who are enthusiastic about AI may struggle to integrate it effectively and ethically. Imran and Almusharraf[34] found that ongoing PD and community-based mentoring led to higher confidence and classroom adoption among Saudi EFL faculty.

2.5. Research Gap

Taken together, the existing literature reveals strong interest and potential for generative AI in language education, particularly in writing and reading instruction. However, significant gaps remain in training, institutional support, and region-specific research, particularly in the Jordanian context. Instructors in Jordanian universities face unique challenges: limited infrastructure, lack of formal policies, and absence of AI-focused PD programs. Despite this, their perspectives have remained underexplored. The study directly fills the gap by providing empirical data on Jordanian EFL instructors' perceptions and practices concerning generative AI tools. It also contributes to theory by extending the TAM framework to reflect ethical awareness and institutional readiness, thereby allowing for a more refined understanding of AI adoption within underrepresented educational contexts.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

A design based on mixed methods with a convergent perspective was employed, engaging both quantitative and qualitative approaches during one data collection and analysis phase. This design was chosen in order to yield EFL instructors' perceptions and views, as well as to gain a more comprehensive understanding of practice concerning the use of generative AI tools in Jordanian universities. Quantitative data provided statistical trends for the adoption of AI, whereas qualitative interviews furnished further insights into the contextual variables affecting beliefs and constraints. This approach was taken because it offsets the limitations of one method by the strengths of another, thereby increasing validity, triangulation, and explanatory depth of the findings[35]. Such a mixture of methods is best suited for educational technology adoption studies, where users' behavior and attitude must be contextualized by lived experiences. By infusing descriptive statistical patterns with a narrative account, the design ensured that the results would be both generalizable and contextually relevant.

3.2. Participants and Sampling

The method for selecting participants was purposive and criterion-based sampling, with the target being university-level EFL instructors who might have at least basic exposure to AI tools. The study focuses on instructors across ten Jordanian accredited universities, both public and private, touching institutions in Amman, Irbid, Zarqa, and the southern governorates. The inclusion criteria were: (1)

current involvement in EFL instruction, (2) teaching at the undergraduate or graduate level, and (3) familiarity with at least one generative AI tool, such as ChatGPT or Grammarly.

A total of **87 instructors** completed the survey, and **15 instructors** participated in follow-up semi-structured interviews. The sampling strategy ensured representation across gender, teaching experience, academic qualification, and institutional type.

Table 1 summarizes the participants' demographic information. Efforts were made to avoid overrepresentation from urban academic centers by allocating invitations proportionally based on university size and location. Snowball sampling via professional networks was also employed to supplement underrepresented institutions.

Table 1. Participant demographic information.

Category	Distribution
Gender	53% Female, 47% Male
Age Range	25–34 (28%), 35–44 (40%), 45+ (32%)
Teaching Experience	1–5 years (24%), 6–10 years (30%), 11+ years (46%)
Highest Degree Held	Master's (38%), Ph.D. (62%)
Previous AI Training	Yes (23%), No (77%)

3.3. Instrument Development, Reliability, and Validation

The survey instrument was constructed based on a review of existing AI-in-education frameworks and instruments[10, 16]. It comprised 20 closed-ended items across five domains: demographic information, AI familiarity, usage practices, perceived benefits, and perceived challenges.

Survey items were first drafted in English, then translated into Arabic using a back-translation process to ensure linguistic and cultural equivalence. Three bilingual scholars independently reviewed both versions to ensure that items retained conceptual clarity and relevance.

An expert panel of three researchers in EFL and educational technology reviewed the instrument for content validity, item relevance, and alignment with the research objectives. A pilot study with 10 instructors was conducted to test face validity, clarity, and usability. Minor revisions were made to item phrasing based on participant feedback.

The instrument's internal consistency was measured using Cronbach's alpha, yielding an overall alpha of 0.84, indicating high reliability. **Table 2** presents sample survey items.

Table 2. Sample survey questions.

Section	Sample Question	Scale
Demographics	What is your highest academic qualification?	Multiple choice
AI Familiarity	How familiar are you with AI tools like ChatGPT?	5-point Likert (Not familiar–Very familiar)
Usage Practices	How often do you use AI tools to develop reading materials?	5-point Likert (Never–Very Often)
Perceived Benefits	AI tools improve the efficiency of lesson preparation.	5-point Likert (Strongly Disagree–Strongly Agree)
Perceived Challenges	I worry about students over-relying on AI tools.	5-point Likert (Strongly Disagree–Strongly Agree)

The semi-structured interview protocol was developed in parallel and aligned with survey themes. Open-ended questions probed participants lived experiences with AI in reading and writing instruction, as well as their ethical concerns, student reactions, and institutional preparedness. Sample prompts included:

- "How have you used AI tools in your instructional planning or classroom teaching?"
- "What challenges have you encountered when integrating AI?"
- "Does your institution support AI usage through training or policy?"

Interviews were piloted with two instructors and refined based on duration, clarity, and sequencing logic. All interviews were conducted in either English or Arabic, depending on participant preference. Transcripts were translated as needed and verified for accuracy by bilingual coders.

3.4. Ethical Considerations

Participants were informed of the study's objectives, its voluntary nature, and data confidentiality provisions. Digital informed consent was collected at the start of the survey via a checkbox and again via email for interview participants.

Each respondent was assigned a coded identifier (e.g., P17 for the survey and I-08 for the interviews) to preserve anonymity. Data were stored on encrypted, password-

protected drives accessible only to the research team. No identifying data (e.g., university names or personal identifiers) were reported.

Participants were given the right to withdraw at any point without penalty, and interviewees were offered the chance to review and revise their transcripts. Ethical compliance was consistent with the Declaration of Helsinki's guidelines for social science research.

3.5. Data Collection Procedures

Data collection took place over a six-week period during Fall 2024. The survey was administered via Google Forms and distributed through official university mailing lists, EFL department heads, and academic networks.

The average survey completion time was 12–15 minutes. To encourage participation, respondents were informed that their input would contribute to the development of AI policy in Jordanian education.

Interviews were conducted via Zoom or Microsoft Teams, depending on participant availability. Each session lasted 30 to 45 minutes, and all were audio-recorded with explicit consent. Interviewers also maintained field notes on tone, pauses, and contextual cues to support subsequent thematic coding.

3.6. Data Analysis

Quantitative analysis was conducted using SPSS (v27). Descriptive statistics (e.g., frequencies, means, percentages) were computed for all items. To test the study's hypotheses, inferential statistics, including independent samples t-tests and Pearson correlation coefficients, were applied—these tested relationships between AI exposure, digital literacy, ethical concerns, and the likelihood of adoption.

Prior to analysis, data were screened for normality, missing values, and outliers. Reliability coefficients for each subscale were within acceptable thresholds ($\alpha > 0.75$).

Qualitative data were analyzed using Braun and Clarke's[36] six-phase thematic analysis framework: familiarization, initial coding, theme development, theme review, theme definition, and write-up. Transcripts were coded in NVivo, with two researchers independently coding 30% of the data. The inter-rater agreement was high (Cohen's Kappa = 0.82), indicating consistency in coding decisions.

Themes were then synthesized into conceptual categories such as "Efficiency and Engagement," "Pedagogical Concerns," and "Institutional Readiness." These themes were cross-referenced with survey patterns for triangulation.

3.7. Methodological Limitations

While the mixed-methods design enriched the study's explanatory power, several limitations exist:

1. **Self-report bias**: Participants may over- or under-reported their use of AI due to social desirability or conceptual misunderstandings.
2. **Volunteer bias**: Interviewees may represent instructors who are more interested or engaged in AI integration.
3. **Contextual generalizability**: Although data were collected across multiple institutions, the findings may not fully generalize to private colleges, vocational institutions, or secondary education settings.
4. **Rapidly evolving technology**: As generative AI tools evolve, the relevance of tools mentioned in this study (e.g., ChatGPT) may shift in future classroom contexts.

Despite these limitations, the study offers a rigorous and contextually grounded snapshot of generative AI adoption among university-level EFL instructors in Jordan.

4. Results and Analysis

4.1. Survey Findings

A total of 87 EFL instructors completed the survey (**Appendix A**). Descriptive and inferential analyses revealed meaningful insights into how generative AI tools are perceived and used in Jordanian EFL classrooms. The responses highlighted varying levels of digital readiness, institutional support, and perceived pedagogical value. **Table 3** shows the AI Familiarity and Usage percentages.

While 74% of respondents are familiar with tools such as ChatGPT and Grammarly, only 41% report using them frequently in their teaching practice. The relatively low confidence level (32%) in applying AI tools is closely linked to the fact that just 23% of instructors had received any form of formal AI training. These figures reflect a readiness gap that limits the translation of awareness into action.

Interestingly, instructors from private institutions

showed marginally higher usage rates, possibly due to more flexible adoption policies or newer infrastructures. However, no significant gender differences were found in usage frequency or training exposure, suggesting that the gaps are institutional rather than demographic. **Table 4** summarizes the perceived benefits of generative AI.

Table 3. AI familiarity and usage.

Question	Response	Percentage
Familiar with AI tools like ChatGPT	Yes	74%
Use AI tools regularly for material preparation	Often / Very Often	41%
Received AI training	Yes	23%
Confident using AI in teaching	Confident / Very Confident	32%

Table 4. Perceived benefits of generative AI.

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
AI improves material quality	45%	36%	14%	5%	0%
AI saves preparation time	52%	30%	12%	6%	0%
AI enhances student engagement	38%	38%	18%	6%	0%
AI enables differentiated instruction	40%	34%	20%	6%	0%

> "I can create three reading comprehension tasks in an hour using ChatGPT. Before, that would take half a day." — *Instructor I-08*

Overall, instructors expressed strong optimism regarding the pedagogical utility of generative AI. The most endorsed benefits were time efficiency, followed by material quality and support for differentiated instruction. These findings align with studies from other EFL settings[31] where instructors appreciate AI's ability to streamline lesson planning and increase productivity. **Table 5** reveals the perceived challenges and concerns found.

Table 5. Perceived challenges and concerns.

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Concern about overreliance on AI	40%	29%	20%	8%	3%
Doubts about AI content accuracy	28%	32%	22%	15%	3%
Difficulty in integrating AI into curriculum	25%	35%	30%	7%	3%
Lack of clear guidelines for ethical use	48%	33%	14%	5%	0%

> "My students now treat AI like a final authority. They don't question what they read." — *Instructor I-11*

Ethical concerns were a recurring theme. Nearly half of the instructors strongly agreed that there is a lack of guidance on ethical usage, while 69% acknowledged concerns about overreliance on AI. The data show that despite enthusiasm for efficiency, instructors remain wary of the risks associated with uncritical or excessive use of AI.

4.2. Ethical and Training Gaps

Only 32% of respondents reported feeling ethically confident when using AI tools in class. Additionally, 68% indicated their institution had not provided any training or formal communication regarding academic integrity and AI-generated content.

> "We urgently need workshops and institutional policy. Right now, everyone is experimenting on their own, which is risky." — *Instructor I-03*

This unstructured approach to AI integration suggests that institutions are lagging behind the pace of technological change, leaving instructors vulnerable to missteps or inconsistent application of AI.

4.3. Correlation and Hypothesis Testing

The hypotheses tested revealed statistically significant relationships: instructors who were digitally literate or had formal training in AI were more likely to adopt these tools. At the same time, higher levels of ethical concern predicted lower adoption rates. These findings reinforce the theoretical validity of TAM extensions[26]. **Table 6** summarizes the results of the addressed hypotheses.

Table 6. Hypotheses results.

Hypothesis	Test	Result
H1: Digital literacy → Positive perception of AI	Pearson correlation	r = 0.46, p = 0.004 (Supported)
H2: Prior AI training → Higher usage rate	Independent t-test	t(85) = 3.25, p = 0.002 (Supported)
H3: Ethical concerns → Lower AI adoption	Pearson correlation	r = -0.38, p = 0.006 (Supported)

4.4. Thematic Analysis of Interviews

> "I see the potential, but without training and policy, it feels like we're flying blind." — *Instructor I-14*

Interviewees brought a more nuanced understanding of institutional inaction and pedagogical uncertainty with their unanimous mandate for training. Instructors often expressed a willingness to innovate, but a lack of structural support left them in frustration. See **Table 7** for the summary of Emerging Themes. Also included some positive student outcomes associated with responsible use of AI; that is, improvement in writing confidence and engagement with reading materials, especially when students were being asked to reflect critically on AI-generated content.

Table 7. Emerging themes from interview data.

Theme	Description
Efficiency and Engagement	Instructors cited time-saving and improved student motivation as major benefits
Pedagogical Concerns	Concerns included overreliance, lack of critical thinking, and passive learning
Institutional Readiness	Most instructors noted a lack of policy and training frameworks

4.5. Interpretation and Broader Implications

Instructors thus consider generative AI as a productivity tool, but may hesitate to use it because of the ambiguity surrounding the best usage, ethical issues, and systemic support. This is a good reflection of that institutional adoption of AI, representing those days of enthusiasm before readiness. The study goes well with previous literature, revealing that AI adoption in Jordanian EFL classrooms is mostly driven by instructors and lacks alignment across departments or institutions. This increases inconsistency and may prevent long-term innovation. Similar conclusions were drawn by Hoke[37], who emphasized the importance of emotional intelligence and sustainability in AI-integrated education, and by Wardat and Akour[38], who identified the impact of AI tools on reducing speaking anxiety among EFL students in Jordan, highlighting both potential and systemic gaps. Hence, findings call for immediate attention to:

- Professional development programs in AI literacy.
- Ethical guidelines and curriculum alignment for classroom use.
- Ongoing support structures, such as communities of practice, where facilitators can share best practices and collaboratively resolve challenges.

In terms of global AI adoption in education, this study contributes to placing an emphasis on localized educator voices from relatively under-researched regions, such asJordan. The findings are a call for moving toward a balanced and nurturing AI ecosystem, far beyond technology provision, that includes edicts on policies, pedagogy, and ethics.

5. Conclusion

The use of generative AI tools for preparing reading and writing materials has been the subject of study, as the opinions and practices of EFL instructors working at Jordanian universities have been examined. The research employed a mixed-methods approach, with a total of 87 survey participants and 15 interviewees. Findings of the study showed great excitement about AI's potential as a pedagogical tool, but also showed fear due to ethical, technical, and institutional constraints.

Teachers generally viewed generative AI as a powerful tool to support efficiency in areas related to lesson planning, differentiation, and the actual generation of materials. These tools were praised for their time-saving qualities, as well as for providing flexible outputs tailored to the learners and in accordance with the instructors' core focus. On the contrary, the results highlighted issues associated with halting excessive dependencies, content authenticity, diminished critical thinking on the student's part, and lack of formal

training and ethics. The study found that most educators were working without sufficient institutional support. Although some pioneers have taken the initiative to explore AI tools in isolation, good professional development programs, pedagogical frameworks, and clear policy directives are absent; thus, questions prevail. This gap between promise and preparedness risks relegating AI integration to superficial application instead of meaningful pedagogical innovation.

Theoretically, the findings uphold the TAM while broadening it to include ethical concerns and institutional readiness as crucial factors in the adoption procedure. Practically, this study underlines the need for structured support for instructors, which also includes relevant pedagogical and ethical preparation, beyond mere technical training.

Based on the outcomes, the following recommendations were suggested toward fostering the responsible use of generative AI in Jordanian English as a Foreign Language teaching:

1. Develop National and Institutional AI Policies:
   Establish clear guidelines on the ethical use of AI, academic integrity, and permissible classroom applications to address instructors' uncertainty and provide a legal and pedagogical framework.
2. Offer Targeted Professional Development:
   Universities should implement AI literacy training for instructors that includes hands-on workshops, curriculum integration strategies, and ethical use cases tailored to EFL teaching.
3. Create Supportive Infrastructure:
   Institutions should invest in digital infrastructure, centralized resource banks, and language-specific AI tools to ensure equitable access and reduce individual experimentation risks.
4. Encourage Blended AI-Human Pedagogies:
   Promote teaching models where AI tools supplement but do not replace the teacher's role in scaffolding learning and promoting critical thinking. For example, AI-generated writing can be used as a springboard for peer review and reflection exercises.
5. Include AI Literacy in Pre-Service Teacher Education:
   Teacher training programs should begin to embed AI-related competencies into their curricula to ensure that future instructors enter the profession with foundational knowledge and ethical awareness.
6. Facilitate Cross-Institutional Collaboration:
   Establish communities of practice across Jordanian universities to share resources, case studies, and implementation models to support AI-informed teaching.
7. Support Longitudinal Research:
   Encourage further studies that assess the long-term impacts of AI on student learning, academic integrity, and teacher efficacy in the Arab EFL context.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, S.W.; methodology, S.W.; software, M.A.; validation, S.W. and M.A.; formal analysis, S.W.; investigation, M.A.; resources, S.W.; data curation, M.A.; writing—original draft preparation, S.W.; writing—review and editing, M.A. and S.W.; visualization, M.A.; supervision, S.W. and M.A.; project administration, S.W. and M.A. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

This approach ensured that participants' rights and privacy were fully protected, adhering to ethical research standards. Given the anonymized nature of the data and the explicit consent obtained, no Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was required under the relevant guidelines.

Informed Consent Statement

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

section*Data Availability Statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article; further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge the support of Prince Sultan University for paying the Article Processing

Charges (APC) of this publication.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declared no conflicts of interest.

Appendix A

Section 1: Demographics

1. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female
   - Prefer not to say
2. What is your age range?
   - 25–34
   - 35–44
   - 45 and above
3. What is your highest academic qualification?
   - Bachelor's
   - Master's
   - Ph.D.
4. How many years have you been teaching English?
   - 1–5 years
   - 6–10 years
   - 11+ years
5. Have you attended any AI-related professional development programs?
   - Yes
   - No

Section 2: Familiarity with AI Tools

6. How familiar are you with AI tools such as ChatGPT, ChatPDF, or similar?
   (5-point Likert scale: Not familiar – Very familiar)
7. How confident are you in using AI tools for educational purposes?
   (5-point Likert scale: Not confident – Very confident)
8. Which AI tools have you used in your teaching practices?
   - ChatGPT
   - ChatPDF
   - Other (please specify)

Section 3: Usage Practices

9. How often do you use AI tools to develop reading materials for your students?
   (5-point Likert scale: Never – Very often)
10. How often do you use AI tools to assist in student writing activities?
    (5-point Likert scale: Never – Very often)
11. For what purposes do you primarily use AI tools in your teaching?
    (Multiple choice; check all that apply)
    - Material development
    - Writing support
    - Assessment feedback
    - Other (please specify)
12. Do you provide your students with guidance on how to responsibly use AI tools?
    - Yes
    - No

Section 4: Perceived Benefits

13. AI tools help me save time when preparing reading and writing materials.
    (5-point Likert scale: Strongly disagree – Strongly agree)
14. AI tools improve the quality of reading passages and writing prompts I create.
    (5-point Likert scale: Strongly disagree – Strongly agree)
15. AI-generated materials are helpful in customizing tasks for different proficiency levels.
    (5-point Likert scale: Strongly disagree – Strongly agree)
16. AI tools enhance student engagement and motivation in the classroom.
    (5-point Likert scale: Strongly disagree – Strongly agree)

Section 5: Perceived Challenges

17. I am concerned about the accuracy and appropriateness of AI-generated content.
    (5-point Likert scale: Strongly disagree – Strongly agree)
18. I worry that students may become overly reliant on AI tools for assignments.
    (5-point Likert scale: Strongly disagree – Strongly agree)
19. Integrating AI tools into existing curriculum structures is challenging.
    (5-point Likert scale: Strongly disagree – Strongly

agree)

20. I feel confident in guiding students on ethical and responsible use of AI tools.
    (5-point Likert scale: Strongly disagree – Strongly agree)

References

[1] Moorhouse, B.L., Kohnke, L., 2024. The effects of generative AI on initial language teacher education: the perceptions of teacher educators. System. 122, 103290. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103290

[2] Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V.I., Bond, M., et al., 2019. Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education - where are the educators? International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education. 16(1), 1-27. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0

[3] Xin, J.J., 2024. Investigating EFL teachers' use of generative AI to develop reading materials: a practice and perception study. Language Teaching Research. 23, 13621688241303321. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688241303321

[4] Vera, F., 2023. Integrating artificial intelligence (AI) in the EFL classroom: benefits and challenges. Transformar. 4(2), 66-77.

[5] UNESCO, 2021. Vancouver declaration: the memory of the world in the digital age - digitization and preservation. Available from: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381137 (cited 20 February 2025).

[6] OECD, 2023. AI and the future of skills, volume 2: methods for evaluating AI capabilities. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1787/a9fe53cb-en (cited 18 February 2025).

[7] Selwyn, N., 2019. Should Robots Replace Teachers? AI and the Future of Education. John Wiley & Sons: Hoboken, NJ, USA. pp. 1-160.

[8] Wang, S., Wang, F., Zhu, Z., et al., 2024. Artificial intelligence in education: a systematic literature review. Expert Systems with Applications. 252, 124167. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2024.124167

[9] Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., et al., 2016. Intelligence unleashed: an argument for AI in education. UCL Knowledge Lab: London, UK. pp. 1-61.

[10] Huang, W., Hew, K.F., Fryer, L.K., 2022. Chatbots for language learning - are they really useful? A systematic review of chatbot-supported language learning. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning. 38(1), 237-257. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12610

[11] Alotaibi, N.S., Alshehri, A.H., 2023. Prospers and obstacles in using artificial intelligence in Saudi Arabia higher education institutions - the potential of AI-based learning outcomes. Sustainability. 15(13), 10723. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/su151310723

[12] Alqahtani, N., 2024. Benefits, challenges, and attitudes toward ChatGPT in English writing courses at Saudi universities. International Journal of Language and Literary Studies. 6(2), 396-413. DOI: https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v6i2.1739

[13] Alnasib, B.N., 2023. Factors affecting faculty members' readiness to integrate artificial intelligence into their teaching practices: a study from the Saudi higher education context. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research. 22(8), 465-491. DOI: https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.8.24

[14] Abuzaid, N., 2024. The reality of using artificial intelligence among university students. Intercontinental Journal of Social Sciences. 1(6), 408-426. DOI: https://doi.org/10.62583/cgfvb694

[15] Chukhno, O., 2024. Teachers and learners' perspectives on the use of generative AI in foreign language education. Modern Information Technologies and Innovation Methodologies of Education in Professional Training Methodology Theory Experience Problems. (73), 53-60. DOI: 10.31652/2412-1142-2024-73-53-60

[16] Liang, T., Duarte, N., Yue, G., 2023. An evolutionary study of the impact of artificial intelligence technology on foreign language education. International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (IJET). 18(19), 190-204. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v18i19.43821

[17] Goldberg, D., Sobo, E., Frazee, J., et al., 2024. Generative AI in higher education: Insights from a campus-wide student survey at a large public university. Proceedings of The Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education; March 25, 2024; Waynesville, NC, USA. pp. 757-766.

[18] Holmes, W., Bialik, M., Fadel, C., 2022. Artificial Intelligence in Education: Promises and Implications for Teaching and Learning. Center for Curriculum Redesign: Boston, MA, USA.

[19] Tapalova, O., Zhiyenbayeva, N., 2022. Artificial intelligence in education: AIEd for personalised learning pathways. Electronic Journal of e-Learning. 20(5), 639-653.

[20] Murgatroyd, S., 2023. Rethinking teaching in the age of Artificial Intelligence. Revista Paraguaya De Educación A Distancia (REPED). 4(2), 4-10. DOI: https://doi.org/10.56152/reped2023-vol4num2-art1

[21] Zaman, S., Hussain, M.S., Tabassam, M., 2024. Use of artificial intelligence in education: english language teachers' identity negotiation in higher education. Journal of Asian Development Studies. 13(3), 861-869. DOI: https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2024.13.3.70

[22] Lavidas, K., Voulgari, I., Papadakis, S., et al., 2024. Determinants of humanities and social sciences students' intentions to use artificial intelligence applications for academic purposes. Information. 15(6), 314. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/info15060314

[23] Davis, F.D., 1989. Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly. 13(3), 319-340. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

[24] Alasmari, T., 2025. Artificial intelligence and M-learning in Arabic countries: innovations, trends, and regional perspectives. International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies. 19(5), 170. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v19i05.52735

[25] Karakose, T., Polat, H., Yirci, R., et al., 2023. Assessment of the relationships between prospective mathematics teachers' classroom management anxiety, academic self-efficacy beliefs, academic amotivation and attitudes toward the teaching profession using structural equation modelling. Mathematics. 11(2), 449. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/math11020449

[26] Balaskas, S., Tsiantos, V., Chatzifotiou, S., et al., 2025. Determinants of ChatGPT adoption intention in higher education: expanding on TAM with the mediating roles of trust and risk. Information. 16(2), 82. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/info16020082

[27] Hossain, M.K., Al Younus, M.A., 2025. Teachers' perspectives on integrating ChatGPT into EFL writing instruction. TESOL Communications. 4(1), 41-60. DOI: https://doi.org/10.58304/tc.20250103

[28] Nazli, K., Jumani, S., Masum, R., 2025. The effectiveness of AI-powered corrective feedback on students' writing performance. Pakistan Social Sciences Review. 9(1), 391-403. DOI: https://doi.org/10.35484/pssr.2025(9-I)31

[29] Alharbi, W., 2023. AI in the foreign language classroom: a pedagogical overview of automated writing assistance tools. Education Research International. 2023(1), 4253331. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/4253331

[30] Teng, M.F., 2024. A systematic review of ChatGPT for English as a foreign language writing: opportunities, challenges, and recommendations. International Journal of TESOL Studies. 6(3), 36-57. DOI: https://doi.org/10.58304/ijts.20240304

[31] Song, C., Song, Y., 2023. Enhancing academic writing skills and motivation: assessing the efficacy of ChatGPT in AI-assisted language learning for EFL students. Frontiers in Psychology. 14, 1260843. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1260843

[32] Oweis, T., 2024. English education in a globalized world: uncovering new themes and research gaps for the 21st century. English Teaching: Practice & Critique. 24(1), 51-74. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/ETPC-09-2024-0135

[33] Shamsuddinova, S., Heryani, P., Naval, M.A., 2024. Evolution to revolution: critical exploration of educators' perceptions of the impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on the teaching and learning process in the GCC region. International Journal of Educational Research. 125, 102326. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2024.102326

[34] Imran, M., Almusharraf, N., 2024. Google Gemini as a next generation AI educational tool: a review of emerging educational technology. Smart Learning Environments. 11(1), 22. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00310-z

[35] Creswell, J.W., Clark, V.L., 2017. Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research. SAGE Publications, Inc.: Thousand Oaks, California, USA. pp. 1-520.

[36] Braun, V., Clarke, V., 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology. 3, 77-101.

[37] Hoke, T., 2024. AI with a Heart: Integrating Emotional Intelligence and Sustainability in Smart Education for 21st Century Learners. Proceedings of The International Conference on Sustainability: Developments and Innovations; October 27, 2024; Singapore. pp. 458-465.

[38] Wardat, S., Akour, M., 2025. AI-powered language learning tools and their impact on EFL students' speaking anxiety in Jordanian Universities. Journal of Posthumanism. 5(3), 756-772.