International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

The Evolving Role of English Teachers: Experiences on Determining AI-Generated Language Output

Deliza E. Dumandan[1], Dhan Timothy M. Ibojo[2]

[1]Teacher I, Pasian National High School, Monkayo
[2]Professor, Assumption College of Nabunturan

ABSTRACT

The widespread adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools significantly impacts language education, raising concerns about academic integrity and student work authenticity. English teachers struggle to distinguish human from AI-generated content, affecting assessment. This study explores teachers' experiences, challenges, coping mechanisms, insights, and guidelines into AI output to inform pedagogical and policy responses. This qualitative-phenomenological study examined the experiences of ten (10) English language teachers in Monkayo, Davao de Oro, Philippines. The informants, purposively sampled with at least two years of experience and documented AI encounters (2024-2025), were interviewed semi-structurally. Data, collected in preferred languages, were transcribed, translated, and analyzed thematically to identify experiences, challenges, coping mechanisms, insights, and guidelines on AI output. Ethical considerations, including consent and confidentiality, were strictly followed. Teachers frequently suspected AI in essays and creative pieces due to unnatural phrasing, sophisticated vocabulary, and lack of personal insights. An AI-generated entire essay output was common. AI tools made assessing student work tedious and complex, with unreliable AI detection tools and perfect AI output as key problems. Teachers reported a substantial emotional and mental toll and a need for AI literacy. Teachers adopted more in-class writing tasks and manual reading to cope with this, and taught responsible use of AI. They designed specific questions and divided big writing tasks. The study's findings revealed that experiences, challenges, coping mechanisms, insights, and guidelines on AI-generated text impeded critical thinking and made assessment harder to assess, leading to over-reliance on accuracy. Long-term implications include balancing AI use, shifting to oral exam and portfolio assessment, and schools investing in teacher training with clear policies and challenging assessments. Findings highlight AI's transformative impact on language education, shifting teachers' roles to critical thinking facilitators. A significant gap exists between sophisticated AI output and detection. This necessitates a multi-faceted approach: adaptive pedagogical strategies, continuous professional development, and robust institutional policies. Fostering academic integrity, promoting AI literacy, and diversifying assessment are crucial for genuine language proficiency in an AI-integrated environment. The study advocates for collaborative navigation of AI complexities.

Keywords: English language teaching, AI-generated language content, English teachers, academic integrity, AI literacy, assessment methods, pedagogical strategies, challenges, coping mechanisms, language education, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

The Problem and Its Background

The widespread use of Artificial Intelligence has gained attention as a paradigm shift in content creation and knowledge representation. Teachers with expertise in determining student writing are adept at spotting common errors when using AI generative content, such as typical mistakes or inadequate vocabulary use by learners Fleckenstein et al., 2024).

In a study by Najjar et al. (2025) at the Arab American University in Palestine, it was found that AI gets better at writing, making it harder to detect, like Turnitin, to spot when students are using AI to cheat, resulting in worry about academic honesty. The study results show that short content is usually much more difficult to identify as AI-generated output than long content for classification. In this, it was found that human-written content tends to adopt more practical language than an AI-generated text, which leans more towards abstract and formal words. Thus, one must identify the difference between what a human writes and what an AI writes.

Moreover, a study by Eslit (2025) in Iligan City, Philippines, identifies the unaddressed causes of false positives in academic output, where the original student work is misidentified as AI-generated, and the lack of AI models that can fully grasp contextual and linguistic nuances to minimize errors. The study reveals that AI detection tools have substantial limitations, leading to false positives and negative student impacts. Thus, high-grade AI detection software must be deployed against AI-assisted cheating and policy-making that supports ethical use of AI in institutions. Also, an extremely comprehensive framework will help educators and administrators develop practical strategies for preserving academic standards while reaping the potential benefits from AI to ensure the assessment validity in the AI-assisted educational environment.

With the advent of technology, Pasian National High School English teachers perceived drawbacks in determining students' submitted output, whether AI-generated or not, posing questions on the potential for AI to facilitate plagiarism and academic dishonesty that compromises the principles of originality and authenticity. Therefore, the researcher opted to focus on this study as it is relevant not only in our country but also to every school throughout the locality, which calls for social concern and immediate action.

Purpose of the Study

This qualitative-phenomenological study probes the role of 10 English teachers in the Municipality of Monkayo who would undergo in-depth interviews on their experiences in their roles and how they determine AI-generated output. It will also highlight their challenges and coping strategies and provide more information to generate further insights into the role of English teachers in determining AI-generated language output.

Review of Related Literature and Studies

This section encompasses pertinent literature from multiple scholars, as discussed in prior studies. This study is categorized into six domains: AI-generated Language Output, Role of English Teachers, Experiences in AI-generated Language Content, Challenges in AI Tools for Language Learning, Coping Mechanisms of Language Teachers on AI-generated Language Content, and Insights on Academic Integrity on AI-generated Language Content.

AI-Generated Language Output. AI tools such as ChatGPT have pluses in personalized learning does not mean that problems like interface and connectivity no longer surface; these are often considered misalignments to the curriculum within the current models. This presents an opportunity to investigate the

presence of ChatGPT among the barriers while emphasizing the need for more teacher support and broader institution-based AI training to work with it (Aryal, 2024).

Nevertheless, the one missed area in the EFL education program in Japan has been learning grammar and reading, but not developing communicative competence, and AI could fill this gap. It covers personalization and engagement while eliminating speech anxiety and enhancing creativity. Ethics like data privacy and academic integrity seem to be addressed for the best possible engagement of learners in global contexts (Busso & Sanchez, 2024).

On the other hand, the impact of AI on student writing and language production as studied by Zheldibayeva et al. (2025) illustrates the beneficial effects of AI-driven tools, particularly CGScholar AI Helper, on student writing proficiency by offering customized, instantaneous feedback consistent with rubrics and curriculum, resulting in refined drafts and a deeper comprehension of language, students perceived the AI feedback as advantageous and motivating, yet appropriate calibration and integration are essential to avert over-dependence and promote autonomous writing skills in K-12 English Language Arts.

Moreover, research conducted at Niğde Ömer Halisdemir University revealed that AI tools such as ChatGPT and You.com markedly enhanced the writing skills of EFL students (grammar, coherence, vocabulary) via AI-generated feedback and training sessions, with You.com exhibiting superior grading consistency. Students appreciated the prompt, personalized AI assistance, underscoring AI's capacity to improve language production and tackle challenges associated with AI-generated content in education (Özdere, 2025).

Furthermore, AI feedback systems markedly improve student writing by offering immediate, tailored corrections that enhance grammar and vocabulary, thereby increasing confidence and fostering self-assessment; however, these systems are limited in their ability to address nuanced elements such as tone and creativity, requiring a balanced approach with human oversight to comprehensively support students' language development (S, 2024).

In addition, those tools for generative AIs such as ChatGPT are used to prepare students' writing by better brainstorming and being useful while exposing the knowledge gap students have to integrate AI efficiently-The students view AI as assistive and not replacing; hence the need for AI literacy and critical engagement, the key to using such technologies ethically in academia (Gabriel, 2024).

Moreover, a certain research experiment conducted in Hong Kong the students said that the generative AI feedback using ChatGPT would ideally improve the undergraduate students ' essay writing qualitatively in comparison to conventional feedback and increase students' engagement with the writing task as well. Reports also mentioned enhancing motivation, and those who accept AI feedback value its specificity on learning gains from AI, thus being useful in learning and alleviating the instructor's burden (Chan et al., 2024).

Consequently, Artificial intelligence would affect student writing. Even if GAI assists in feeding material into a student's writing, the challenge for them will be whether such writing fosters an attitude that becomes less active towards writing, whether the student abandons what is left of an individual style-or various ethical concerns. In this line, institutions must produce a college-university setting that appropriately leverages GAI to develop writing skills (Sahli et al., 2024)

Meanwhile, an equally grave issue complicating the predicament for AI text is false positives that, to the detriment of the students' psyche, falsely mark real student work as plagiarism. The study advocates for advanced AI detection tools that combine human judgment and technology. A human-centered orientation to AI in education promotes learning rather than impeding it (Eslit, 2025).

Nevertheless, since this GAI tool can significantly enhance writing as a cognitive procedure highly delegated to others, the swift and rampant emergence of GAI to facilitate student writing also elevates a plethora of considerations regarding authentic student assessment in the first place. The correctional feedforward mechanism gives an indication of various modes of student-GAI interaction, in which continuous edits towards an AI input led to an enhanced outcome. There is a potential for GAI to lessen linguistic biases; however, it can also unwarily internalize such biases without student-interference, especially amongst unfamiliar English language users. Yang et al (2024).

Role of English Teachers in Checking AI-Generated Language Output. Transformation of the English teacher's role and the new emergence of generative AI into language teaching have their benefits but also due challenges. Generative AI contributes to personalizing and interactive conversations with automatic assessments/feedback in this subject arena. The other challenge that teachers need to deal with is the issues posed by the technical aspects, integration, and ethics around the AI-generated content. With all these, it emphasizes understanding dynamics in handling competently the effects brought about by AI in the classroom for either the teacher's or the student's benefit (Wang, 2024).

Despite revolutionary advancements in GenAI for ELT applications, these ultimately boil down to ethics and wise practice. Educators should develop the real, true educational values that AI has improved, but not replaced, human connections and critical thought. It would be possible to provide the very specific guidelines on how AI is included in an ethical educational experience by the authors.

Moreover, integration of AI and ChatGPT into ELT now personalizes it for one-to-one contact, yet it can spell cheating, skill loss, results from biased language teaching, and even more so, a potential fruitless digital divide toward equitable access. Thus, educators must incorporate solidly planned AI integration and training techniques that mitigate these effects and yet are effective uses of AI in language learning (Al-thresher, 2024).

Furthermore, Nguyen (2024) mentions a way AI tools-including ChatGPT, strategic competence in English Language Teaching (ELT) through prodigious numbers of communication strategies (CSs) prompted mainly through good structures. Certainly, it is beyond texts per se. At least, it admits no apparent linguistic diversity in the transcripts generated by AI, stressing human supervision and more training. Educators should now direct attention toward speedy teacher engineering and AI collaboration for maximum effective AI utilization in language learning.

In addition, the optimism concerning the integration of GenAI instruments in English Language Teaching provides another institution for measurement in effort, while LLMS can generate content, give feedback, and grade, the ethical dilemmas and potential misuse cause concerns among educators. In the text, the authors invite evaluations of GenAI uses and the educational value; they encourage human-centered designs and continuous investigations in mapping the roles human experts have played, calling for stakeholder consideration of strategic ethical and pedagogical implications of GenAI integration Giannakos et al., 2024).

On this note, Ironsi (2024) goes a step further to elaborate on positive effects in the enhancement of language learning and engagement in English Language Teaching vis-a-vis damaging effects on data privacy, algorithmic bias, and displacing teachers altogether. Therefore, it makes a great case for the need for balance: the onus is on AI to train students from a personal perspective, with teacher supervision to ensure maximum learning outcome. It pushes educators to fairly analyze what AI means in real terms for their teaching.

Thus, generative AI does preserve personalized learning avenues in English Language Teaching, but it conversely threatens that very standardization of the language by negating cultural nuances and violating critical thinking avenues, prompting shallow understanding and student interest. For teachers to successfully domesticate AI, it would serve as an accessory tool besides the conventional means, where human interaction and cultural engagement take the front seat in creating spaces that facilitate rather than obstruct real language acquisition and critical-skills development (Creely 2024).

Furthermore, educational content on pedagogical content knowledge for one under "D-R-E-A-M" of reading materials by EFL teachers on the use of ChatPDF, AI works well in the modification of texts and does assignment making; still, its downsides are critical concerns to be heard from teachers. This report again hastens the necessity for those professional development programs to empower those teachers with 'scrutinizing and modifying' AI tools and practices towards a better English Language Teaching (Xin, 2024).

In general, Huang et al. (2024) study generative AI with effects on listening instruction in English Language teaching, particularly interactive personal learning assistance with AI, differentiated feedback for motivating engagement in other types of instruction, improved student engagement, and listening comprehension. The study highlights, however, the twin impediments of very limited teacher training and misaligned curricula as the Achilles' heel of AI's proper implementation. On top of all these concerns, maximizing the benefits of AI while minimizing its disadvantages is a vital issue to classroom and policy stakeholders seeking improvements in listening instruction through AI.

As a comparison, it begins with a discussion of conventional teacher-centered instructional methods as opposed to the more techno-aided instructional methods. As a rule, traditional methodologies follow standardized information methodology that AI does not support by providing some flexibility to the learning process through instant feedback and adaptive material. The report discusses certain issues, such as shallow learning, that need to be dealt with soon concerning the ethical and accountable integration of AI. It is further posited that AI should supplement traditional methods so that the scales are kept balanced (Ferreira, 2024).

Furthermore, traditional teaching methods and AI indices in higher education enhance the spirit of independence and critical thinking in students. Alternatives overly relying on AI can switch on undesirable conditions of hypo-constructive affective-social learning. Recommendations by teachers in the report are beneficial but require stronger provisions regarding ethics education and emotional-social support now more than ever. The study advocates for a mixed-methods approach- Traditional teaching methods alongside AI tools, thus improving AI's contribution to quality learning and the development of students (Zhang, 2025).

Such an AI-supportive learning environment is thus perceived to provide personalized on-demand learning in real time, using methods extremely different from conventional lectures, textbooks, etc. These new approaches will be based on intelligent learning theory, natural language processing, and machine learning for individualized experiences. They provide real-time feedback and customized learning paths through adaptive learning, intelligent coaching, and gamification, while VR/AR may be used to enhance engagement. The adoption of AI-enhanced solutions presents the best apprehension for addressing the challenges and seizing the opportunities in the AI-generated content realm while, at the same time, cementing the transformation of the next generation of learners more than ever (Wasswa, 2024).

In addition, proposed would be this AI training toward modifying and reorganizing for a new teaching environment with the full normal of advanced functions. In another way, the world would observe a

difference in the basic requirements imposed in front of all kinds of distractions, different problems of discipline through any and every distraction being worked upon, where every student-related issue is attended to, if not on time. No doubt, some good things here favor the need to interrupt teacher-centered education into a more engaged learning environment, with AI being made to come into the system. Therefore, given these developments, there should be a rethinking of teacher training and resource endowment so that teachers can traverse, as best as they can, the new educational landscape as such changes occur (van den Ham, 2024).

Generative AI, Liu (2024) argues, is transforming educational paradigms from conventions and the usual content to a one-dimensional standardized model, creating opportunities for forging personalized learning experiences, exciting engagement types, and outcomes. Challenges include cheating from the unethical use of AI-generated content and changes for the teachers who now must somehow introduce AI into their teaching while keeping some power to teach in the same traditional way in class. This leads to some strategic policy proposals to be adopted to ensure that whatever AI stands for will greatly promote learning while molding the contraries of academia and integrity.

Traditionally, teacher-centered approaches allow for various learning experiences to develop critical skills that cannot be mimicked quite fully by AI. AI-enhanced approaches jointly facilitate the greatest objectification of human work objects, Hammer, and ChatGPT, by practitioners with appropriate individualized support for their students. Ethical aspects of privacy, bias, and plagiarism are hotly contested regarding the acceptability and quality of AI-generated content and how learning standards apply in such cases. AI, then, will facilitate the conventional teaching supervised and guided by a teacher to keep the vital human heart in learning (Rane, 2024).

Experiences in AI-generated Language Content. The context of English teaching found that GAI, or Generative Artificial Intelligence, stands a decent chance of personalizing learning resources, acting as a virtual tutor, and impartially assessing learners through natural language processing and machine learning. Barring some of the pitfalls of the former approach, concern therefore hovers around data privacy and learner well-being, stressing the need for immediate enrollment of teachers in extensive professional development programs to use AI-driven solutions productively within their teaching (Rajak et al., 2024).

In addition, even if GenAI would serve to professionalize routine tasks and assist in academic ones, teachers fear that overreliance will unduly diminish the need for human facilitators in teaching. The paper further discusses several serious shortcomings concerning GAI-related developments, curriculum support, and ethical issues, asserting a time-critical necessity for mass training of educators in GenAI to deal with ethical dilemmas and understand the implications of AI for students' learning inputs and outcomes (Embracing Generative Artificial Intelligence: The Perspectives of English Instructors in Thai Higher Education Institutions, 2024).

Not only that, BUT the AI epoch has also made a bold assertion-to intervene and transform English writing education all the ways to the integration of AI-and intelligent writing assistance tools-in establishing personalized learning pathways and maximizing teaching effectiveness-to the problems the traditional pedagogical anthropologies have unveiled in engaging students in their writing and writing competently (Liu, 2024).

Advancements in LLMs and Capabilities. LLMs make strides in natural language processing, such as human-level text generation, translation, and question answering, and show emergent capabilities for reasoning and arithmetic, which are highly beneficial for solving problems across a variety of sectors.

They also focus on scaling and architectural strategies to enhance these capabilities, while acknowledging inevitable trade-offs in their development and applications (Matarazzo & Torlone, 2025).

Additionally, a true game-changer in the field of AI, GPT-type Large Language Models are marked by their unsurpassed grasp and generation of coherent text almost indistinguishable from human writing, and their equally powerful applications in fields ranging from agriculture and medicine to information security. This technology may increasingly find itself at an intersection, from having been an instrumental force to further human advancement to perhaps just being one of the leading technologies fundamentally changing our existing modus operandi with computers. Without a doubt, the future of AI and responsible innovation will surely carve out its milestones along this technology. (Ji, 2025)

Furthermore, personalized LLM learning with the potential to recognize and generate human language-somewhat caveat, with accuracy, bias, and privacy. Teacher-researcher-policy-maker partnership for responsibly assisting students using these models in learning Beckford (2024) and according to Al-Badarneh et al. (2024), they thoroughly analyze the integration of LLMs in EFL teacher education in the Arabian context, noting that pre-service teachers mainly use chatting and questioning models, whereas applications of other models might incorporate a different spectrum of uses. The study explores the potential use of LLMs for the promotion of teaching styles, material design, and student assessment, recommending the inclusion of these systems into EFL programs while recognizing a few challenges regarding biases and adaptability that need further discussion and possible mitigation.

Additionally, emphasizing education brought the Large Language Models (LLMs) very proximate to the ideas of what they might perform as backwater shift agents or types of history of development or training. They could then be perceived as powerful means in their application to improving language processing or language generation in both digital and higher educational institutions. This new conceptual framework on the integration of LLMs now allows orientation on personalization, even ethics, and flexibility, while giving practical ways to tackle data privacy and bias or end-use-transformational values. The value of teaching-learning communication would therefore need to be altered in transformation (Shahzad et al., 2025).

Moreover, Goswami et al. (2024) argue that LLMs, almost childish themselves in a sense, have barely minimal capacities of producing anything that could be said to resemble human writing. It alerts the world to information deception and academic misconduct. Thus, the demand is raised to develop robust AI text-detection models using many types of word embeddings and pre-trained models like BERT and DeBERT to distinguish between human and AI-generated content at an accuracy rate of over 95%.

Thus, and in this regard, large language models (LLMs), such as the one under consideration, seem to find themselves in the very same predicament as Occidental France: a bundle of obligations toward text generation, translation, and so on, all without any provision of reasoning or even a modicum of planning. It raises the suspicion that the traditional parameters of complexity may not truly be getting to grips with their inner workings. Tuning helps with the task of following instructions but does not teach LLMs anything new, as anything worth learning would have been learned at pretraining. When they extrapolate training data, LLMs cannot perform any reasoning for taking such applications into account in real-life situations (Bigoulaeva et al., 2025).

Moreover, interactive and personalized learning situations and automation of certain tasks to various stakeholders this case, the teachers and students-are revitalizing ELT with chatbots, intelligent tutoring systems, and speech recognition software, including Duolingo and Grammarly, to name a few. However,

an important factor determining the success of such integration would be access to the technology, teacher readiness, and expertise on ethical issues surrounding the privacy of the data used (Kristiawan et al., 2024). Furthermore, Erdogan and Kitson (2025) mention that an immersive, interactive environment that can take account of implicature and speech acts would be an interesting development for the pragmatic competence of young learners of English concerning AI technologies. Such research acknowledges how far the entire contradiction reverberates through the sponsor of those, calling further to expand research on aiding the AI in cultivating the abilities of pragmatics.

Moreover, the tools find usage in assessment types that concern self-regulated learning and collaborative projects, while simultaneously establishing a vibrant and stimulating learning environment (Pitychoutis & Rawahi, 2024).

Furthermore, the development of artificial intelligence aids in the acquisition of a target language and improvement in language abilities through applications such as Duolingo or Grammarly; thus, this very much instills the sense of autonomy and motivation into the learner via instant feedback. With this being the case, teachers should guard against the dangers of overprovision of AI support with independent learning, such that learners do not become too dependent but rather create a wholesome language-learning experience (Huynh, 2024).

Similarly, research from Hail University is concentrating on ChatGPT and its possible effects on English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, concerning becoming much more proficient in reading, writing, grammar, spelling, and other necessary research skills, thanks to individualized assistance and independent learning. But such technologies have other implications like over-dependence and even inexactness, hence the necessity of AI training in making EFL classrooms (Alshammari, 2024).

Challenges in AI Tools for Language Learning. Educational settings are reaching a threshold with the ramifications that AI brings to bear, especially regarding language work produced by AI. This needs an entire ethical system governing the best practices in AI development and use. A bibliometric study bears witness to the growing concern among scholars about AI ethics in education, which signifies an evolution in discourse and an urgent need to resolve ethical questions regarding securing a safe and equitable learning environment (Alioğulları et al., 2025).

Furthermore, the major ethical concerns about AI applications in education are laid out among these are: trust requires transparency and explainability; privacy and data protection require confidentiality concerning student information; accountability and responsibility demand clear oversight; and equity is required to eliminate bias and ensure fair access-an elaborate approach to consider in appropriately implementing AI in education (Contreras & Jaimes, 2024).

In addition, technological systems in AI like ChatGPT have ethical implications for education. It opens the doors to various applications, such as the systematic approach based on RRR, that is, risk-reward-resilience. Above all, privacy and confidentiality are emphasized, with resilience in ethical principles and reasoning faculties built into students and thereby relying on the AHP framework on ethics for the AI-driven education sector so that policymakers can better understand it (Bukar et al., 2024).

Furthermore, ethical challenges that seem to relate very closely to AI in education, in the context as elaborated by Mohamed in (2024) on issues would also include AI-generated material bias, with algorithmic, demographic, cultural, ideological, privacy, and data security issues in schools, all of which seem to take the dependency form from such technologies disturbing the autonomy of learners engaging in it. Fortifying the need for ethical frameworks and a balanced approach that can protect responsible and fair use of AI in consideration of student welfare.

Significantly, extensive exploration about the ethics of AI language education has unearthed many undiscovered topics on data privacy, unjustified bias, and academic dishonesty. Hence, it has intended frameworks, ethical teaching for teachers, and further research tracks for inclusive AI solutions to ensure technology is used responsibly and creates an equitable learning environment (Zainuddin et al., 2024).

Thus, the ethical considerations of education issues like originality, accuracy, and, in some cases, unintentional plagiarism through dependence on AI-would consider the role that ethical programs on the use of AI hope to play in preserving integrity and real learning in programs. Therefore, balance means using AI to build integrity rather than destroy it (Kotsis, 2024).

Furthermore, Mubofu and Kitali (2024) raised very pertinent issues of ethical AI in education with its inherent bias against certain races, genders, or social classes, privacy considerations of aggregated data, and job-related issues with teachers. Institutions should then draw up regulations and encourage the development of skill-based workshops on responsible and ethical AI integration to put it into practice and for continuous monitoring.

Therefore, further ethical dilemmas that generative AI raises concerning early childhood education include privacy issues, implicit bias, and emancipation. Some of the authors point out their framework for establishing privacy-protecting protocols and mechanisms for bias mitigation toward ethical A.I. Fair use. They identify gaps through rigorous literature reviews and multiple stakeholder interviews, presenting their framework as a solution to the reading development occurring through the responsible integration of AI in learning experiences (Alawneh et al., 2024).

Coping Mechanisms of Language Teachers on AI-generated Language Content. A study conducted by Mozelius et al. (2024) is linking it very finely by giving the teachers chances of thorough learning with ground opportunities for GenAI projects has brought about a great and improved understanding of AI and technology skills among the staff. To the knowledge that teachers require skills to apply GenAI as an adjunct to their pedagogy, they now all confront visiting prospects of enhanced quality of learning and a few challenges, such as faculty reluctance. There are very highly organized professional development plans that have addressed very complex areas of AI, including ethical ramifications, enabling teachers to engage successfully with AI tools to elevate student learning.

Moreover, teachers would easily address some challenges to AI, such as language structure. In that GenAI adds on to the PD provision, teachers can adopt a self-directed and flexible approach to learning as they keep up with trends and encourage creativity. Teachers can also use GenAI for sourcing resources, sharing ideas on training, and collecting ideas for collaborative strategizing. An example is that GenAI for teacher preparation teaches the evaluation of the quality of works generated by AI but also prepares future teachers for investigating AI applications in their classrooms by modeling the use of GenAI while still in their pre-service phase. Therefore, developing the GenAI pathway guarantees optimum training for teachers and pre-service teachers to equip them for effective teaching (Nyaaba, 2024).

The individualization that is offered via generative AI in teacher professional development is individualized learning as well as increased efficiency in learning through coaching, assessment, and generation of content. But more than the above, it also comes to the access to the ethical dimension and the education of teachers towards tackling the challenges of AI concerning AI-generated content. All this would go into changing the professional development and mobility of teachers using new vicissitudes in education through ethical AI learning. (Baule & O'Connell, 2024).

Furthermore, generative AI in education requires comprehensive teacher professional development (TPD) to tackle the ethical dilemmas associated with AI-generated linguistic material. Developing AI literacy is

essential, allowing educators to comprehend AI's potential and limitations and, therefore, guiding pupils in the ethical and safe use of tools. Practical, experiential exercises during training are essential, enhancing instructors' confidence and enabling them to create AI-integrated lesson plans. By concentrating on these elements, TPD markedly improves educators' readiness to traverse the AI-influenced educational environment, benefiting both instructors and learners (Pedro, 2024).

Thus, Raza (2024) states that a teacher's readiness towards the use of GenAI in education is dependent on specialized professional development to counter the various opportunities and challenges of GenAI. In conjunction, any professional development needs to prepare teachers to use GenAI, assess its impact, and suggest mitigation measures. From that angle, even for faculty development programs that can promote AI's opportunities while minimizing its quandaries for the teachers, one can conceptualize such modes along the five domains proposed by UNESCO.

Furthermore, teacher training in AI literacy is crucial for educators facing challenges integrating AI tools, as many harbor concerns about AI-generated content's accuracy and lack the necessary skills to address ethical implications and leverage AI's potential for enhancing creativity and critical thinking; teachers with higher AI literacy effectively integrate AI into lesson plans, fostering independent learning, while those with lower literacy focus on ethical concerns, limiting their use; therefore, comprehensive training programs are needed to cover technical aspects and ethical considerations, empowering teachers to confidently and responsibly guide students in navigating AI technologies, ultimately improving student learning outcomes (Li et al., 2024).

However, actual placement in AI literacy is teacher training, merging into realities of all kinds that AI-generated contents advocate. Indeed, AI makes learning experiences adaptable to their individual needs. Still, faith in its accuracy takes off that very burden of teaching from a teacher's shoulder. Thus, training will focus on critical evaluation of AI resources, data privacy, and lifelong professional development as far as learning by teachers is concerned to use AI appropriately while remaining agents in engendering autonomy of a learner (Yao, 2024).

In addition, AI literacy training should become a precondition for teacher educators so that they can face the challenges from AI-generated material. They have a "transformative" view based on GenAI, but they deem it also very important to educate pre-service educators in the ethical, cultural, and democratic use of AI. Professional development is to include working with GenAI experiences that create motivation and confidence, which are important conditions for the integration of AI itself. This training is, at the same time, launching the future educator into AI ethics and evaluation.

Moreover, AI emergency teacher training covers active, current and futuristic challenges stemming from AIG-generated materials while also providing solid groundwork for AIGC-based services that come with ethics-based usage tied in with the digital literacy of teachers and students. Therefore, a holistic approach is vital for such maximized applicability toward personalized learning and cognitive skilling while minimizing application toward cognitive biases and ethical dilemmas to ensure and assure responsible and effective use of AIGC in educational contexts (Li et al., 2024).

In addition, the need for AI literacy training for educators can never be emphasized enough in enabling teachers to grab opportunities and ward off threats posed by AI-generated language content over literacy instruction. Such training should enable teachers to engage and even innovate with natural language processing or adaptive learning, as AI tools lean toward the ability to individualize instruction and improve it for each student. At the same time, ethical ramifications should also be considered in such training to better prepare faculty for understanding AI-made literacy instruction (Vashishth et al., 2024).

Thus, Phalaguna et al. (2024) further supplement the need for such training in AI literacy for teachers, like special education teachers, to avail of the AI-generated lesson plan. Teachers appreciate the AI system for the time saved and a certain flair for creativity; however, they face challenges such as multimedia not supporting some of its formats or inconsistency in the formats used. Professional development of this type has to equip these teachers with the ability to make sense of that particular barrier that is posed by the AI, so they can start working beyond that obstacle to the advantage of children with intellectual disabilities.

Similarly, the relevance of TPACK to the incorporation of AI in language classrooms is practically oriented towards supporting language teachers' self-efficacy and performance expectations, which are critical during the processing of AI-generated content. With this model, AI self-efficacy, performance expectancy, and effort expectancy are enhanced. Support and resources become significant for educators to further strengthen the AI-TPACK in integrating AI into methods of language instruction (Tram, 2024).

In similar explorations of the TPACK framework, AI opens avenues for application in special education. It states that induction programs for teachers should entrench AI technology and TPACK in such a manner that the teachers can employ AI in their pedagogy competently. The current quasi-experimental study provides teacher-educators and pre-service instructors with implements and guiding questions that will assist in elucidating how AI enriches TPACK. Furthermore, the authors outline TPACK-based activities promoting AI use toward concretely impacting learning outcomes for children with special needs (Goldman et al., 2024).

Thus, following such an approach, Giannakos et al. (2024) analyzed the integration of generative AI into TPACK, with its possible uses and limitations in application. Whereas generative AIs, such LLMs, could situate pedagogy with learning design, content creation, and feedback from TPACK's lens on technology integration, ethical considerations, constraints, and possible perversion of use call for a scrutiny of these tools by teachers for pedagogical acceptability even before their use in TPACK; hence a human-centered design approach to AI should be a must. From what we have found, AI does show promise, but a lot more deliberation is needed for it to be well and sustainably integrated within frameworks like TPACK.

Furthermore, TPACK (technological pedagogical content knowledge) became the all-important framework under which all pre-service teachers would accept or reject AI in lesson design. The plan of the AI TPACK curriculum was implemented through structured lesson planning to make pre-service teachers who may not have much experience and knowledge with AI and curriculum-preparatory students ready for challenges when it comes to AI-generated content and developing engaging learning activities (Kim, 2024).

Similarly, TPACK serves as the need for teachers in the construction of AI instruction, where AI-generated content is concerned. It does benefit learning and communication, although it raises ethical, integrity, and training issues. Not leaving TPACK then allows teachers to maneuver in and out of some of these dilemmas it creates so that the entry of AI into classroom practice may yield learning benefits and may not run into ethical norms or academic integrity (Mishra et al., 2023).

Moreover, TPACK emerged as an important requirement that will form an important part of the practice of teachers willing to incorporate AI like ChatGPT in their teaching. AI enables highly individualized learning along with promoting professional communication but at the same time has raised concerns about ethics and training. Thus, with TPACK, any educator adopting AI will have to witness transformations in education. However, provisions would be made at the structural level regarding these changes, so that AI use becomes ethical and fruitful in striking a balance of technology in education.

Furthermore, Kohnke (2024) noted that these teachers faced technostress, anxiety, and burnout beyond measure, given that GenAI tools such as ChatGPT were thrust upon them in short order. Misplaced anticipations without corresponding training bring enormous stress to their application of AI. This points toward the emergence of a need for targeted training and support to help reduce fear and resistance in assisting teachers with purposeful AI use in their classroom endeavors.

Moreover, rapid assignment preparation and a considerably reduced burden on them, AI has given hope to professors in higher education by overcoming resistance to the introduction of teaching technologies. Normally, teachers will have anxiety brought about by administrative demands and constructive assignment design; the AI-facilitated conduct of such mundane tasks will enable teachers to invest more time in pedagogy and student engagement. In that sense, one can deduce that the teachers' perceptions of the AI-adaptive assignment have considerable significance to this research study on whether they will motivate the adoption of such instructional methods. Thus, by maintaining an honest dialogue and addressing teachers' worries, institutions will maximize their chances for embedding AI into education and realizing its teaching potential while minimizing the resistance toward AI technologies (Dhamija & Dhamija, 2024).

With the launch of ChatGPT in late 2022, teacher worries and resistance concerning AI skyrocketed; somehow, students tried their hands on it already. They prefer regarding it more as a peer than as an enemy based on experiences talking to it to set challenges for themselves within the computer science domain. ChatGPT displayed humanlike strengths as well as weaknesses with all fine-grained issues that teachers are going to face as they integrate AI into their practice. Research outlines the need for both measuring the pros and cons of generated content for effective integration with pedagogy (Bird, 2024).

Consequently, while educators are in a new frame of mind toward AI in education appreciation of AI as a collaborator, rather than a competitor, there may still be lurking fears about plagiarism and deadened relationships. With the advent of AI into the learning sphere, however, it could usher in new dimensions in teaching and improvement in delivery and learning outcomes. A proactive, upfront approach of AI integration that allows humans and AI teachers to work together would alleviate fears and then enrich the educational landscape (Koh et al., 2023).

Furthermore, the analysis speaks on teacher fears and resistance generation of AI in education. Here again is gradually underlined that insufficient understanding is propelling such resistance observed by teachers; thus, the subsequent study of the four teacher roles: Observer, Adopter, Collaborator, Innovator, presents a framework for such understanding of the issue. This statement reiterates the need for a sustained professional development program for teachers with institutional support to mitigate their fears and encourage adoption. These can be used by teachers to transform into AI partners for emerging challenges through AI-generated content, thus improving instructional methods (Zhai, 2024).

On the whole, the concern here is that teacher fears and objections regarding generative AI in education need to be addressed relevantly, since already the understanding of issues like plagiarism, accountability in ethics, and data privacy influences teacher reluctance toward it, and then it must be understood through practical strategies using ethical and pedagogical principles to combat these concerns positively toward a much better AI-eased perception and progress in safe and sustainable learning experiences for their students (Wali Khan Monib et al., 2024).

Therefore, the other side of the coin with AI in education is dealing with professors' anxieties and opposition, amounting to issues about the independence or engagement of students. AI is providing personalized feedback and support but lacks knowledge about whether this provision indeed goes too far

in the going. Professional development and support networks have become fundamental to this strategy because they highly emphasize the balance between the supplementary work of AI and traditional teaching methods, instead of teaching being an alternative or replacement. This, therefore, reduces anxiety and brings pedagogical practice (Talgatov et al., 2024).

On the other hand, educators who will hold trainings will also need to discuss the issues of academic integrity and plagiarism regarding these tools and impart knowledge on AI literacy regarding the ethical issues that may come up. At the same time, given that GAIs have possibilities of aiding personalized learning, teachers are expected to be empowered further to incorporate AI in classrooms to enhance teaching methods and student learning of languages in a dime-AI-supported context (Bran & Grosseck, 2024).

Moreover, Fan (2023) study centered on AI applications, suggesting that AI and, more importantly, LLMs greatly enhance English Language Teaching (ELT) by creating interactive scenarios, the auto-completion of conversations, and knowledge transfer. On the flip side, the article also presents many challenges during the processes of educational data and conversation, calling for a strong, coherent framework and professional development models equipping the teachers with skills for integrating AI curriculum and evaluating AI-generated language instruction resources.

On the contrary, Faruqe et al. (2021) hold that AI literacy sustained by teachers becomes a consideration for introducing AI in ELT, which has effectively informed the proposed detailed competency model for professional development to systematize the mastering of skills and knowledge necessary to cope with AI-generated content for improving teaching methods and student learning in AI-facilitated settings.

In addition, teachers of ELT need to focus on effective professional development in using AI tools such as ChatGPT in their teaching. This involves changes that are almost real but subtle for blended, collaborative, and project-based learning; otherwise, teachers are found in all the clutches of AI in education, requiring a very solid justification for comprehensive frameworks that would better give them the skills and knowledge to move on in teacher-student relationships, hence towards better educational outcomes (Baskara, 2023).

Similarly, it would not only be on this basis that such an AI would cohere with conditions under 21st century workplace multiculturalism in the wonderful Interactional Competence but also within microcosm; that of teaching and assessing across various cultural contexts casts problems for teachers but AI-mediated assessment instruments are being recorded to have added so much toward professional communication education, so much more studies are required on how AI affect the field of intercultural communication and the complexities that AI-generated content adds to language education (Dai et al., 2024).

Moreover, successful incorporation of AI, therefore, would be defined as a partnership of collaboration between humans in the teaching profession and AI systems whereby teachers give context and direction to create a learning experience which is not only educationally sound but individualized to the specific needs of the students whereas AI scaffolds development of the curriculum; such integration involves therefore educators, institutions as well as policy makers to create the enabling and inclusive educational environment that makes best use of human insight as well as AI with Singha and Singha (2024).

Insights on Academic Integrity on AI-generated Language Content. AI has now become more advanced than before. Consequently, the very powers of detection that traditional tools like Turnitin have possessed to catch plagiarism have, to a certain extent, been lessened, meaning that this has led to an unprecedented increase in cases of cheating through AI-generated content eluding conventional detection

systems in the future. ChatGPT and others not only offer AI-written content, but they also bring forth fundamental concerns concerning academic integrity and the question of how to build an AI-ML and XAI-driven detection model, using the CyberHumanAI dataset to differentiate human from AI-generated language. The study proves that while traditional machine learning algorithms have some accuracy, explainable AI algorithms through something like LIME are encumbered by the very problem of explainability, which has now emerged as a critical point in adopting the technology from ethical and good educational outcomes, especially as this is increasingly being ruled by AI (Najjar et al., 2025).

In addition, how to engage AI-generated content matters in academic integrity and plagiarism through the ethical dilemmas around authorship and responsibility in academic publishing that GenAI has brought about? Nowadays, that progress has increased the degree of anxiety surrounding real incidences of plagiarism or originality, demonstrating the need for substantial guidelines with hand-monitoring in block-protecting academic integrity and fairness across scholarly circles (Dwivedi et al., 2024).

Furthermore, this research contends that the generative AI tools, ChatGPT and Bard, with their assumed positives for student understanding (72%), weigh less with the growing concerns of academic integrity (75%). Therefore, it calls for some ethical regulations from universities and an advanced means of detecting future plagiarism among AI-generated projects.

In addition, the parallel discussion of Costa et al. (2024) offer maintains that the very implementation of generative AI tools like ChatGPT violates ethical realms of correctness and plagiarism-interfering in other words-with academic integrity-in favor of open disclosure and due attribution, as well as the OTHA (Open, Transparent, Honest, and Accountable) Framework-on that account allowing for responsible integration of A1 vis-a-vis A1 integrity.

Similarly, just as the student has become reliant on AI-enabled plagiarism, so now the advent of LLMs such as ChatGPT and Gemini has punctured the integrity of academia; close to one-third of students admit they relied on ChatGPT for their assignments. These disturbing trends imply that examination processes are now under scrutiny, and traditional plagiarism tests have less relevance to outputs produced by sophisticated LLMs. The rising instances of AI-related academic misconduct thus require the establishment of effective deterrence and pedagogical mechanisms that Foster ethical AI usage- such a holistic approach would integrate technical AI solutions with programs dedicated to upholding academic integrity (Pudasaini et al., 2024).

Furthermore, where there are integrity and plagiarism issues with AI, it can be said, there would increasingly be cases of plagiarism and academic dishonesty developing in higher education by the AI brush. Therefore, immediate steps should be taken to formulate and set regulations concerning AI use, as, without a formal framework, many gray areas do exist concerning this issue; furthermore, this implies an urgency surrounding AI literacy and the necessity for educative programs covering the principles of ethical AI use (Song, 2024).

The questions that generative AI tools like ChatGPT and DALL-E raise are themselves issues stemming from an interplay of psychological and sociological concerns internal and external to AI concerning the task of coping with AI-mediated language challenges. Hence, it is very critical to probe the flow of this generated content into social processes and media representation (Risi et al., 2024).

Generative LMs have raised legitimate concerns in K-20 educational systems, as elaborated by Vassel et al. (2024) synthesized narratives had been put through the scrutiny of an LM, reviewed by 152,000 authors. Some of their concerns included stereotypes, erasure, and worst of all, violence suppression of marginalized identities. Hence, the psychosocial implications for the different tools on varying users seem

good for deductions on appropriate use, and joint features are then discussed that make generative AI work in synergy with the engine of human creativity, throwing the spotlight, of course, on CDA as a psychosocial effect of technostress and impostor syndrome. These stand in need of intervention to help promote adjustment for individuals being confronted with AI-enhanced creativity (Caporusso, 2023).

Furthermore, Partadiredja et al. (2020) investigate vagueness, having evolved within the distorted boundaries between human-generated media and artificial, thus raising serious socio-ethical implications regarding authenticity and trust, while creating new avenues for potential miscommunication across digital channels that deserve serious contemplations on those two levels. In addition, Kenthapadi et al. (2023) explain that generative AI is giving rise to rapid ethical and social challenges, including prejudice, lack of interpretability, and misleading content, and is calling for responsible AI adoption standards that would guide stakeholders in the design and deployment of these applications.

Moreover, the acceptance of AIGC-mediated news varies notably by age, and algorithmic literacy explains the study of audience ethical and moral perceptions of AIGC-generated news findings. The results showed that youth, who tend to be technology-savvy, accept such news more than the older audience, who, in general, are skeptical of it. This kind of pattern creates an ethical framework to combat misinformation, privacy violations, and a newfound appreciation for journalism as a profession (Da, 2024).

Furthermore, ethical risks from the perspective of generation and perception of AI data, especially regarding sensitive contexts like school shooting cases that may elicit morally negative narratives and place the victims in psychological distress. Implied in this narrative are proposals for raising the ethical bar through stakeholder engagement and undertaking ethical distribution to mitigate possible adverse consequences and protect vulnerable groups from the shortcomings of existing ethical frameworks and communication transformations are created through AIGC, and while the AIGC supports much in terms of message generation, it brings attention to potential issues in security, privacy, and ethics; thus, the massive requirements for social implications and legal frameworks considerations to block misinformation in such cases. (Osipov 2024; Wang et al., 2023).

Certainly, self-determination that Ryan and Deci would work on in the mid-1970s pertains to how GenAI triggers student involvement across some form of interdisciplinary learning due to three primary needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness. ChatGPT and Dall-E encourage collaboration, critical thinking, and creativity in preparing students for real-world challenges faced by them in learning as it elaborates on these specific intrinsic motivators: autonomy, competence, and relatedness, all important in using generative AI technologies in fashion and as a broader idea, triggering new, exciting issues engendering synergy between human creativity and AI (Choi et al.; Chui, 2024).

Furthermore, asserting that such new developments in generative AI, be it on languages or content development, along with any knowledge-based AI systems, put the autonomy and competence of decision-making sectors at the risk of subverting constructs of personal agency and otherness, Ernst says, awareness campaigns on effects accompanying artificial intelligence and strategies to strengthen critical engagement should come up in a manner allowing users to re-attempt gaining the self-determination and independent judgment in an increasingly automated world.

Similarly, Yang and Aurisicchio (2021) contend that user satisfaction is achieved when three basic human needs are satisfied: competence-understanding CA capabilities; autonomy-flexible personalized interaction modes; and relatedness-social features. This, in turn, opens the door for the enhancement of CAs through enlightened designs, engaging conversations, and deployable customization for ideal user activation.

Consequently, SDT provides a foundational theory on how users interact with language text generated by AI. It reveals that intrinsic motivational forces, along with satisfaction in terms of autonomy and competence, drive a good experience for AI systems. Thus, by fulfilling these psychological needs, the designers can create AI systems that provide AI-generated content along with sustainable engagement and well-being for the user. This thereby demonstrates how the theory of self-determination may benefit human-AI interaction (Tyack & Mekler, 2020).

Moreover, the transformation that AI brings to education is significantly changing the role and identity of teachers, requiring teachers to change their pedagogy and confront issues of data privacy and quality. Such changes in teacher identity mean that continuous and collaborative professional development is needed to integrate AI properly and keep teachers current (Zhao & Chang, 2024).

In addition, the arguments from Lu et al. (2024) narrate the role of AIGC to bring evolution in higher education pedagogy; acknowledging that AIGC has to play a positive role when teachers speak about pedagogical practices and engagement; such a standpoint as there are many barriers to application however; for the graduates with higher proficiency in AIGC, the impact probably looks more positive and the barriers even less so.

Moreover, Jochim and Lenz-Kesekamp (2024) also show that teachers' and students' opinions on generative AI are mixed and will, therefore, require some modifications in pedagogy and assessment. Thus, great importance needs to be attached to training in AI and protocols to infuse AI into the future learning context of education.

Furthermore, AI, as mentioned in the paper, has applications like ChatGPT, and therefore, is modernizing teacher identities from traditional teacher-to-mentee relationships to partnering for better learning in this age of AI (Gou et al., 2024).

Moreover, Alasgarova and Rzayev (2024) have discussed how AI will change the roles and identities of teachers. Even though AI could enable personalized learning systems, teacher burnout and ethical matters arise, pointing to the need for creating strong value-oriented professional development programs to prepare teachers for handling these changes. Philology holds that the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework is an important mediating tool through which technology, pedagogy, and subject matter knowledge can be interpreted at the intersection of teaching-learning activities.

Furthermore, Vashishth et al. (2025) emphasize that AI in education is changing the nature of work and the identity of teachers. AI can help facilitate many education-related processes, but the authors insist on the irreplaceability of humanistic attributes of empathy and creativity in teaching. Hence, the study expresses the need for teachers to adapt to the changes and learn how to work collaboratively with AI tools so they can keep validating their relevance in creating engaging learning environments.

Therefore, Zhao (2024) contends that bringing AI to education bears an enormous weight on teachers, particularly on the way they retain their professional identity while being given new responsibilities. The authors argue for the need for a shift in teaching, redefining teachers as facilitators and innovators in language instruction as they engage AI technologies to enrich pedagogy in a sphere of humanistic concern. This shift will empower teachers to respond to the dilemmas presented by AI-generated content and to optimize such innovations for improved learning.

Theoretical Lens

This present study is based on the Theory of Sociocultural Development, that is propounded in the year 2018 by Vygotsky. One of the principal constructs of this view is the Zone of Proximal Development, or ZPD. It defines the gap between the limits under which a learner can perform by himself or by herself and

the capabilities reachable under conditions in which assistance is provided by a More Knowledgeable Other (MKO), someone more adept, more exact, a teacher or peer, with considerable and basic intent to help the learner. Even under this kind of scientific collaboration with adults, knowledge and skills are internalized, which is what Vygotsky means by scaffolding, whereby the tools of the culture-language and culture materials serve as the facilitator of bridging the social and individual mental.

Also, this theory provides a robust theoretical framework through which to examine the evolving role of English teachers as they navigate the complexities of AI-generated language output. At its core, Vygotsky's theory posits that human cognitive development is deeply embedded within social and cultural context, mediated by interactions and the use of cultural tools. Cultural tools/mediation, referring to the instruments and symbols like language technology or writing systems that shape through an interaction. Moreover the Zone of Proximal Development or (ZPD), which represents a space between a learner can achieve independently and what they can achieve with guidance and the More Knowledgeable Others (MKO), individuals or entities with a greater understanding or skill to facilitate learning this study will utilize these indicators to understand teachers experiences challenges coping mechanisms and insights as they adapt to AI's influence on student language production.

Cultural tools/meditation are crucial for understanding the experiences of English teachers and determining AI-generated language output. AI-generated text and the dictation software used to identify it represent new and complex cultural tools that teachers must now engage with. Their experiences are shaped by how these tools mediate the traditional processes of writing, learning, and assessment. Teachers are not just observing AI capabilities but are actively interacting with this technology, which influences their perception of student work, their assessment methods, and their overall pedagogical approach, fundamentally altering the existing classroom dynamic.

The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) serves to eliminate both the challenges and the coping mechanisms of English teachers in determining AI-generated language output. The inherent difficulty teachers face in consistently and accurately distinguishing AI-generated text from genuine student work, places them squarely within a ZPD. Independently, many teachers may struggle to perform these tasks effectively due to the sophistication of AI. The challenges arise from this gap between the current dictation abilities and the required proficiency. Consequently, their coping mechanisms involve actively seeking and utilizing support, such as engaging in professional development, collaborating with colleagues who have more experience, or learning to use new detection technologies, all of which are efforts to bridge this gap within their ZPD.

Furthermore, the concept of More Knowledgeable Others (MKO) provides a framework for interpreting the insights of English teachers and determining AI-generated language output. Teachers have traditionally functioned as MKOs in the domain of language and writing assessment, possessing expert knowledge to evaluate students' proficiency and identify common errors. However, the advent of AI, which could produce highly coherent and grammatically correct text, challenges this traditional MKO status. Teachers' insights often reflect their evolving understanding of their expertise concerning AI capabilities, recognizing areas where AI acts as a new kind of MKO in text generation, and prompting a deeper reflection on what constitutes genuine human language proficiency in a technologically advanced era.

Ultimately, integrating Vygotsky's Sociocultural Development Theory can significantly aid in crafting practical guidelines based on the study's results. Concrete recommendations can be developed by understanding how new cultural tools AI are mediating learning, how teachers are navigating their ZPD in detection, and how their role as MKOs is evolving. These guidelines might focus on fostering new

forms of social interaction and collaborative learning among teachers and students to collectively develop AI literacy, design assessments that require human-specific cognitive processes beyond AI's current capabilities, and establish new MKO roles, whether in educational institutions, to support the effective and ethical integration of AI language education.

Research Questions

This study explores the teachers' role with AI-generated language content. The following research questions are:

1. What are the experiences of language teachers in determining AI-generated language output?
2. What are the challenges of language teachers in determining AI-generated language output?
3. How do language teachers cope with the challenges they experience in determining AI-generated language output?
4. What are the insights of language teachers in determining AI-generated language output in the study?
5. What guidelines can be crafted based on the findings of the study?

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

This qualitative-phenomenological study explores the evolving role of English teachers in AI-generated language content in Monkayo, Davao de Oro, Philippines. It would cover the experiences, challenges, coping mechanisms, and insights of 10 English-language teachers from Pasian National High School, Olaycon Integrated School, Babag National High School, Ulip National High School, Union National High School- Mt. Diwata Annex, Monkayo National High School, Tubo-Tubo National High School, Union National High School, Assumption Academy of Monkayo, and Monkayo College of Arts, Sciences and Technology who have only been exposed to the profession for two years and who find themselves in situations where AI-generated text is being used in the classroom during the school year 2024-2025. The phenomenological approach in qualitative research design would be utilized through in-depth interviews with ten teachers to capture their voices and lived experiences.

This study is that it is limited to only ten English teachers in Monkayo District, including college instructors. The study is concerned with the impact of the teachers' practices and professional duties on learning content development, ethical considerations, and pedagogical adjustments when using AI tools to produce language content.

Significance of the Study

The findings of this study would influence the changing role of English teachers in determining AI-generated language output. Thus, the following will benefit from this study.

Learners. The study findings would help students better understand the increasing integration of AI with their curricular activities. AI will provide students with insights and allow them to use it for efficient learning, enriching their holistic learning experience with energy and engagement levels.

Teachers. The findings of the study would be a nuanced view of the discontents and possibilities that AI engenders by using AI-generated language, thereby feeding directly into the hands of the English teachers. This turn of events would provide insights into more intensely useful mechanisms of dealing with such problems, hone their adaptability techniques in teaching, and eventually allow them to make a living. The project will, by implication, focus on the requirement for strengthening professional development and built-in support systems that empower teachers to navigate competently and confidently through the pathway of changing education in the context of the Philippine setting.

School Heads. The findings of the study would offer insight into how AI has affected and is affecting English teachers in their institutions. The purpose of this research is to find information-based suggestions

to help teachers adapt to the changes by providing resources, policies, and professional development opportunities. Such information will empower school heads to facilitate the transformation of both teachers and students into a vibrant teaching-learning environment within the Philippine educational system.

Department of Education. The findings of this study would be used as evidence to the Department of Education is as its findings have implications for an understanding of the larger repercussions of AI entering English learning in the Philippines. The results would be useful in formulating a national policy, curriculum, and modalities for teacher training concerning using AI in the classroom, so the technology can be responsibly and effectively integrated into English language education.

Future Researchers. The findings of the study would serve as an authenticating inquiry for future researchers across all fields relevant to AI and English, particularly within the country's confines and other developing nations in a similar situation. It will also give information on emerging problems, coping mechanisms, and trends likely to need further investigation. This would enable subsequent studies, using the results of this research, to broaden the current knowledge base about AI's effects on language education and enable them to build consensus regarding the best practices for using this technology.

Methods

This chapter outlines the methodology and procedures that are followed in conducting this research. This includes research design, location where research will be conducted, role of the researcher in research, research participants, data collection methods, data analysis, trustworthiness and credibility, and ethical considerations.

Research Design

This study utilized a qualitative phenomenological research design on the roles of English teachers ushered by AI-generated language output. This research design was predicated in such a way that it is taken to be reality, being a socially constructed phenomenon, seeking an understanding of teachers' complex experiences and perspectives in adapting to the present technological paradigm shift.

Furthermore, Creswell (2003) highlighted that qualitative research pertains to the collection of data without regard to any numerical qualifications; phenomenological research deals with the actual human experience as narrated by the very subjects of the study. The researcher viewed that the experiences of the phenomenon investigated should also be interpreted by the researchers themselves in respect of their feelings. Other qualitative tools involved conducting in-depth interviews with English teachers on the usage of AI tools in the academic community, which this study descriptively analyzed the experiences, challenges, coping mechanisms, and insights of the English teachers in the paradigm shift of AI tools usage.

Research Locale

This study was conducted in the Municipality of Monkayo, a first-class municipality in Davao de Oro, Philippines, known for its diverse educational institutions spread across rural barangays. With 21 barangays and a mix of public and private secondary schools, Monkayo provides a rich setting for exploring English teachers' experiences using AI tools for language instruction. Monkayo National High School, Babag National High School, Depot Ancestral Domain National High School, and Olaycon Integrated School are key research locales, offering various academic and technical-vocational tracks. These schools, alongside institutions like Assumption Academy of Monkayo and Monkayo College of Arts, Sciences, and Technology, reflect the educational diversity and contextual depth essential to

understanding the integration of AI in language teaching across different community settings in the municipality.

Role of the Researcher

In this qualitative phenomenological study, the researcher realized the importance of letting the unheard voices of language teachers be heard so that study conduct can be improved; thus, in the process, the researcher applied the steps as set out by Fink (2000): thematizing, designing, interviewing, transcribing, analyzing, verifying, and reporting.

In thematizing the study, the researcher wanted to penetrate what might be termed as socially elaborated knowledge of English teachers and their experiences, challenges, strategies, insights, and guidelines relative to AI-generated language content. Again, it wanted to narrate the teachers' suggestions on their predicaments in AI-generated language output during teaching and learning and document the individual experiences of the teachers. At the same time, they willingly share unheard stories of the participants during interviews.

Designing. The researcher required that the exploration of the shared experience of the participants be suitably designed for phenomenological inquiry to benefit from purposive sampling in retrieving and recording the rich and thick data that would contribute to understanding how individuals come to make sense of the social phenomena, such as interventions and considerations, through the depth interviews.

Interviewing. The researcher used open-ended semi-structured interviews based on the guide questions, which allowed the researcher to remember the participants' experiences with AI-generated language content. The researcher will provide participant responses to the questions in the language of their preference, as the interview will be recorded through the recording device, saving the interview for crafting the study's thematic concerns.

Transcribing. The researcher in transcriptions or data transcriptions would be based on the participants' responses during the interviews, which would be used to interpret the participants' responses. The participants' answers were then analyzed through thematic analysis with the help of the data analyst. The researcher would ensure the proper application of coding to categorize the coding patterns in presenting the participants' responses during the entire data collection.

Thematizing. The researcher commenced by the initial process of identifying, conceptualizing, and defining the core subjects or areas of inquiry. The researcher pinpointed the central ideas, experiences, or phenomena that were explored, often drawing from initial observations, literature, or preliminary data. This stage set the foundational scope and direction for the research, ensuring that the investigation remained focused on relevant and meaningful aspects of the chosen topic.

Analyzing. The data by systematically broken-down raw data into smaller, understandable components to identify patterns, relationships, and insights. This involved applying various methods, such as thematic analysis, to interpret the collected information. The researcher critically examined the data, made connections, and uncovered underlying meanings that addressed the research questions, transforming raw information into coherent findings.

Verifying. During the study, the researcher engaged in verifying as a critical step to ensure the accuracy, credibility, and trustworthiness of the collected data and the interpretations derived from it. This involved cross-referencing information, checking for consistency, and potentially using triangulation methods to confirm findings. The researcher's responsibility was to minimize bias and error, thereby strengthening the validity and reliability of the study's results.

Reporting. The researcher was responsible for reporting the findings of the study, methodologies, and conclusions to a wider audience. This involved clearly and concisely presenting the research in a structured format, adhering to academic conventions. The researcher articulated the significance of the findings, discussed their implications, and acknowledged any limitations, ensuring the research was accessible and contributed to the broader academic discourse.

Research Participants

This qualitative study examined English teachers who encountered in determining AI-generated language output in students' submissions, and are willing to share their experiences, challenges, coping mechanisms, insights, and guidelines related to identifying such output. The researcher would employ a purposive sampling technique to select 10 participants, comprising eight females and two males, who had taught the subject area for at least two years and had been affiliated with the agency throughout the 2024-2025 academic year at Monkayo District.

On the other hand, English teachers who did not meet the inclusion criteria or do not have direct experience with student submissions, potentially AI-generated language output, would be excluded from the study. Additionally, participants with less than two years of teaching experience, those unwilling to participate and provide informed consent, may not participate, and qualified participants are free to discontinue participating in an in-depth interview when they do not make themselves available for the conduct of the interview.

Data Collection Procedure

In this study, the researcher would commence by asking permission for ethics review and endorsement from the Graduate School of Assumption College of Nabunturan. Then, the researcher would conduct in-depth interviews with identified English teachers on their experiences with AI-generated language content to gather data and information needed for the study. The participants would not be restricted to using English, Filipino, Vernacular, or a mixture of these three languages to answer the research question. The researcher would also prepare an interview guide for the conduct of the activity.

This research would provide such identified participants with written informed consent for their acceptance and participation in the interview. The participants and the researcher would observe minimum health protocols when conducting the interviews. Social distancing would still be observed. The researchers and the participants also wear face masks as part of the safety measures. After getting the consent of the research informants, the researcher commenced with an in-depth interview.

The interviews would then be saved as an audio recording, and notes would be taken for future reference. After all interviews are conducted, the researcher would transcribe and translate the non-English interviews. Next, the transcribed data would be coded and submitted to data analysts.

Data Analysis

This qualitative-phenomenological study discussed a framework for a comprehensive thematic analysis on determining AI-generated language output. The participants' responses would be analyzed through thematic analysis based on the data collected and gathered. To do this efficiently, the patterns representing the ideas of the participants during data collection were first identified by the researcher. Then, the data collected would be organized into meaningful, logical categories. Furthermore, specific codes would be allocated to the participants' responses and aggregated under specific themes, as they would identify emergent themes. Thematic analysis was highly feasible, and such an excellent tool would probably prove itself in producing a very important, complex, and rich account of data analysis.

Through the credibility of research analysis, researchers aim to interpret collected information while looking for significant patterns. In participatory research, such involvement also enriches findings from various perspectives. After data collection, qualitative data analysis methods, such as thematic analysis and coding, would be used to arrange and summarize non-numerical data to gain insights that inform theories and real-life applications. Data analysis converts raw data into valuable knowledge that increases understanding of the relevant research field and serves as a basis for solid conclusions and recommendations (Kordel & Gruber, 2024).

Trustworthiness and Credibility

Establishing truth and trustworthiness in qualitative research was relevant in ensuring that the resulting findings were reliable and valid. One of the ways that would be adopted to increase the trustworthiness of research is through triangulation, which means using multiple techniques in data collection. Data sources could be triangulated along with data collection methods, investigators, and theories. The list is long; in this way, bias was reduced, and gains were made towards the credibility of the research outcome. The types of triangulations and their applications in various research fields were highlighted in the literature review carried out in this study and offered significant insights to the researchers. It stressed the understanding of triangulation procedures since the know-how of such a great technique would improve credibility, transferability, confirmability, and dependability concerning qualitative research findings (Marlina et al., 2024).

While a credible concern, it also weighs heavily on how much this viewpoint of the participants corresponds with the description set out by the researcher. The participants would be given enough time to conduct interviews using interview questions as guides. For reassurance on the process and interpretation of data collected, the researcher enlisted peer debriefing with the thesis adviser, and someone experienced in qualitative research's intricacies. The researcher admitted personal biases about how the participants might be communicated with and how the findings would state facts. To verify the credibility of findings and interpretations, research must go back to the participants to determine whether they feel validated by what they conveyed in the interview.

To ensure confirmability or suitability for the study, the researcher would keep the audiotaped interviews, a personal journal/diary, transcripts, and notes. The choice of participants for the study would be justified to ensure that the English teachers of AI-generated language output in secondary schools in Monkayo who met the criteria for choosing the participants for the study. In this way, personal opinions, convictions, and conclusions would be kept at bay to guarantee that there are no biases and that there could be no misinterpretations of data in the study's findings.

For one's credibility in this study, the researcher had affirmatively stated that the qualitative-phenomenological approach was well-suitable for exploring the lived experiences of high school English teachers using AI tools for teaching and learning. Using the phenomenological approach, it explores a deeper understanding of how to conduct research effectively and accurately analyzes the data gathered through qualitative design. The researcher kept track of the documentation undertaken in the collection of data and analysis, its recorded interviews, and the usage of the exact transcript.

The researcher believed in the study's transferability and that the study's results and findings can be actual or learned under different contexts or with other participants. This study cited and quoted select parts of the thick and rich transcripts of interviews. The implication of this was that participants in possible future studies like this would be selected in a very reasonable manner. Transferability or fittingness of research

findings means that research findings fit outside the study and may even have another meaning in another group or apply in another context.

Ethical Consideration

Ethical considerations were an important part of qualitative research, which deals mostly with human experiences. According to Khan (2024)

Social Value. This research would be conducted extensively to readily address the local concern for endangered literature in some barangays of Monkayo concerning trust, accountability, transparency, and respect as guiding core ethical values for researchers and the research itself. These social values influence the decision-making process, the way researchers interact with participants, and other components of the dissemination of findings, thus creating an ethical climate and enhancing the social benefits of the research. In performing this study, local narratives would be elaborated and reported back to the community through the LGU Monkayo and Schools Division of Davao de Oro, and as an online journal for further reference by other related studies.

Informed Consent. The researcher would make sure that Informed consent would be required from all participants, meaning that before the consent, they would have been educated about the purposes, procedures, risks, and benefits of the study. The researcher was going to dispense Informed Consent Forms (ICF) for the recruited individuals as discussed above to cover some required contents, such as the name and affiliation of the researcher. The participation must mention that it's voluntary, and the participants must be informed that they can withdraw at any time without punishment. Again, the study would discuss the procedures to undertake. This validated the research participants as able to make a learned decision and free to withdraw from the given study at any time without facing any consequences.

Vulnerability of the Research Participants. The researcher, during the initial part of the would explain the entire interviewing process. If the researcher declared that the in-depth interviewing was really warranted and further stressed that the participants could withdraw from the interview at any time for reasons of discomfort, and it would not affect any aspect.

Risks, Benefits, and Safety. The researcher was taking the interests of research participants over the risks to individual research participants. It was therefore the responsibility of researchers to promise and assure that no harm would be done and disclose the possible risks to participants. Explain to the person who accepted participation the anticipated benefits. For any interviewed participant, there was a provision for holding it at the time and place most convenient for him/her at zero cost to the participant.

Privacy and Confidentiality of Information. The researcher would uphold the Privacy Act under Republic Act 10173 of 2012, which applies to this researcher regarding the protection of participants' personal data, identity, and information confidentiality and security. Based on this, adequate provision would be made to safeguard all unauthorized access to participant information, and proper exercise of this information, and confidentiality would be exercised concerning the identification of the participant. Such registration would be through mobile phones, uploaded on Google Drive, accessible to researchers, and disposed of at the end of the period of research. This, therefore, established a close link of trust between the researcher and the researched, while curbing the possibility of harm to individuals when confidentiality was breached.

Justice. The research participants were chosen based on the inclusion criteria of the study, which were language teachers and at least two years of teaching experience in determining with AI language output. Either in public or private schools in the municipality of Monkayo for the school year 2024-2025. In the conduct of the study, participants were informed of their participation in the study, about the entire process,

and the outcome of the study so that they would benefit from the knowledge in practices that were made accessible and meaningful by disseminating findings to stakeholders, participants, and communities.

Transparency. As far as the present study was concerned, the researcher would mention the affiliations and objectives of the study. Copies of the transcripts containing the participants' responses would also be given to the research participants for them to cross-check the reliability and validity of the data collected.

Qualification of the Researcher. The researcher had enough experience in conducting a study in graduate school at Assumption College of Nabunturan, including college and school-based research-related activities.

FINDINGS

This chapter presented the research findings related to language teachers' perceptions and attitudes toward their role in the highly contested area of language output mediated by artificial intelligence, primarily focusing on the language teachers' perspectives. It investigated English language teachers' perceptions about being in their role, the challenges they faced, and the strategies that could be deployed to uphold academic integrity and ethical practices in using AI in language learning.

The pool from which the participants for the research were preselected was obtained from in-depth interviews conducted with secondary-level English language teachers in Monkayo, Davao de Oro. Those interviewed were shortlisted to ten as the desired number of participants for the in-depth interviews. They were included based on having taught for at least two years and with some experience regarding AI in language inputs during their teaching practice in the academic year of 2024-2025.

What are the experiences of language teachers in determining AI-generated language output?

This section presents the findings to the first major research question: What are the experiences of language teachers in determining AI-generated language output? four specific research questions were used to gather data and information for this major research question. The questions were meant to find out what the participants thought about the instances where they suspected or confirmed AI-generated student work.

Specific Instances of Suspicion of AI-generated Student Work

The themes were coming from the specific research question: 1.1 What specific instances where you suspected of or confirmed to be AI-generated student work? The responses in this question generated four themes: Oftentimes in Essays, On Compositions, Reviews, Book Reviews and Literature Reviews, On Sentence Construction, and On Creative Piece.

Oftentimes in Essays. The participants have always insisted that essays stand out as the primary types of student work suspected of AI generation. The most exceptional differences can usually be noted by teachers in differences in quality, tone, or vocabulary use. Alternatively, papers seem to be struggling with such sophisticated concepts far beyond any premise of what a student could write. The situation is bleak if students openly declare that source text-editing tools have been used to facilitate the assignment. Such a reality makes it almost impossible to verify any true evidence of either student's writing skills or language competence. Informant 1 elaborated on the general observation of AI use in student tasks, specifically highlighting its prevalence and the suspicious shifts in quality seen in essays. He mentioned;

> *In my classroom mam, I have encountered several instances nga naga gamit jud ang mga bata ug AI murag halos man guro sa tanan task nila but I specifically observe it often times during essays where students submit an*

> *output that raise suspicions due to their sudden shift in writing quality, tone, or vocabulary use.*
>
> (In my classroom, ma'am, I have encountered several instances where students use AI, almost for all their tasks, but I specifically observe it often during essays where students submit an output that raises suspicions due to their sudden shift in writing quality, tone, or vocabulary use.)

Informant 2 shared a direct observation regarding the advanced nature and lack of typical grammatical errors in essay submissions. She shared;

> *Usahay, ilabi na sa paghatag nako og essay writing tasks, akong namatikdan nga ang ilang mga buhat sobra ka advance ug usahay wala na andan nga sayop sa grammar.*
> (There were instances, especially when I gave them tasks like essay writing, where I observed that their output was overly advanced and sometimes lacked the usual grammatical errors.)

Informant 6 provided an example of an essay that, despite being well-written, lacked natural flow and felt overly concise, raising doubts about its originality. She stated;

> *Gihatagan ko og essay nga maayo ang sulod, pero sobra ra ka concise, halos murag summary sa bullet-points nga gihimo lang og paragraph. Wala'y natural nga flow o pagpalambo sa ideya, diretso lang ang tubag. Murag ang AI naningkamot nga mahimong efficient imbes nga magpakita og kaugalingong estilo. Mao ni ang nakapahunahuna nako nga dili kini orihinal nga buhat. Mas gusto nako nga makita ang ilang kaugalingong proseso sa paghunahuna.*
>
> (I received an essay where the content was good, but it was too concise, almost like a bullet-point summary expanded into paragraphs. There was no natural flow or development of ideas, just direct answers. It seemed like the AI was trying to be efficient rather than expressive. This made me suspect it wasn't original work. I prefer to see their thought process.)

Informant 8 recounted an experience where an essay contained highly specific, un-discussed academic theories, which the student could not explain, indicating AI-generated content:

> *Naa koy na-experience diin ang essay sa usa ka estudyante nag-refer og very specific, obscure academic theories nga wala gyud namo ma-cover sa class. Pag-question nako, dili maka-explain ang estudyante aning mga theories o ang ilang relevance sa topic. Klaro kaayo nga gi-copy lang nila ang gihatag sa AI. Kining lack of understanding sa luyo sa mga complex terms usa ka dead giveaway. Kinahanglan gyud nato silang tudloan nga mag-truly comprehend.*

(I had an instance where a student's essay referenced very specific, obscure academic theories that we hadn't covered in class. When questioned, the student couldn't explain these theories or their relevance to the topic. It was clear they just copied what the AI provided. This lack of understanding behind the complex terms was a dead giveaway. We need to teach them to truly comprehend.)

On Compositions, Reviews, Book Reviews, and Literature Reviews. It has become one of the biggest challenges for educators these days to assess the authenticity of students. An example of this: Papers like essays, reviews, book reviews, and literature reviews mostly take recourse to the help of AI tools. For students, the more they get attracted to these tools, the more they consider their papers to be devoid of real personal handwriting and turn out to be perfectly grammatical, structured, or generic, repetitive, and contradictory to the known capabilities and mistakes of the student to suspect any assignment to be AI-generated. But this makes realizing the true sense of an object and then giving its nuanced feedback very difficult because students need to provide close to non-personal submissions, expected output, which varies greatly from what was produced. Informant 4 itemized the applications of AI in writing and stressed that it can be helpful in composition and reviewing, but machine-generated text is devoid of a personal touch and is usually very repetitive in writing patterns, she mentioned;

In my subject, in a survey of English and American literature, most of the works we are doing are compositions, reviews, book reviews, and literature reviews, and checking the output of the students is challenging…I think the specific instances where I suspected that their outputs or their works are actually generated when it comes to composition and reviews. Because I discussed literature, and then out of that literature I would let them to write their own work, say based from that literature.

(In my subject, Survey of English and American Literature, most of the work we do involves compositions, reviews, book reviews, and literature reviews, and checking the students' output is truly challenging… I think the specific instances where I suspect their outputs or works are AI-generated are when it comes to compositions and reviews. This is because I discuss literature, and then, based on that literature, I ask them to write their work.)

Informant 9 described how the absence of typical grammatical errors and an unusually clean writing style in a student's work led to suspicion of AI involvement:

Naa gyu'y writing ang usa ka estudyante nga walay bisan usa sa mga typical errors nga akong kanunay makita sa ila, pareho sa subject-verb agreement issues o mga common preposition mistakes. Too clean gyud, halos sterile. Kining kawala sa normal human error nakapa huna-huna nako nga basin AI ang nag-apil. Lisod maghatag og targeted feedback kung walay mga sayop nga ikorekta. Gusto gyud nako makita ang ilang tinuod nga struggles ug improvements.

(A student's writing showed no typical errors that I usually see from them, like subject-verb agreement issues or common preposition mistakes. It was too clean, almost sterile. This absence of normal human error made me think

AI was involved. It's hard to give targeted feedback when there are no mistakes to correct. I want to see their real struggles and improvements.)

Informant 10 shared an instance where a student's reflective writing lacked personal anecdotes and specific experiences, contrasting sharply with their usual style, suggesting AI generation. He mentioned;

Naka received ko og response sa usa ka reflective prompt nga very generic ug philosophical, pero completely lacking og personal anecdotes o specific experiences. Ang estudyante kasagaran sige man unta og share about sa ilang life sa ilang writing. Kining disconnect between sa ilang personality ug sa writing content nakap ahuna-huna nako nga basin AI ang naghimo. Importante gyud nga ang ilang writing mag-reflect sa ilang own thoughts.

(I once received a response to a reflective prompt that was very generic and philosophical but completely lacked any personal anecdotes or specific experiences. The student usually shares a lot about their life in their writing. This disconnects between their personality and the writing content made me suspect AI. It's important for their writing to reflect their thoughts.)

On Sentence Construction. Evidence for sentence and paragraph construction has been collected by teachers observing the output that seems AI-generated from the field. The participants mentioned that many times, a student would usually answer with simply "yes" or "no," which sounded as if it were an AI judgment. Very likely, it also hands in overly complicated sentences that, while not grammatically incorrect, do not sound natural, or as if they belonged to their general way of talking, leading the teachers to suspect some very advanced linguistic capabilities of the AI regarded to assist it into the creation. Informant 3 described how they often confirm or suspect AI-generated output when students are asked to write sentences or paragraphs, particularly noting the AI's influence in their explanations. She claimed that;

Big instances nga ma confirm nako or suspected nga AI-generated ilahang output kapag magpa sentence writing or paragraph writing or naay question, then let them have example. They're going to give their judgment in yes or no. Then ang mga why ng explanation kay seems like naay sagol or naay tendency nga gikuha sa AI.

(Big instances where I can confirm or suspect that their output is AI-generated are when I ask them to do sentence writing or paragraph writing, or if there is a question, and then I give them an example. They are going to give their judgment as yes or no. Then, their explanations for the "why" seem to have a mix or a tendency to be taken from AI.)

Informant 7 shared observations about students submitting work with unusually complex sentence structures that sound unnatural for their typical communication, indicating AI's linguistic capabilities. She explained;

Usahay, mag submit ang mga estudyante og agi nga naggamit og komplikado kaayo nga structure sa sentence nga dili gyud nila gigamit sa ilang adlaw-adlaw nga panag-istoryahanay o bisan sa mas simple nga mga

> *buluhaton sa pagsulat. Tama ang grammar sa mga sentence pero paminawon nga dili natural para sa usa ka tawo nga nagsulat. Murag gipakita sa AI ang iyang linguistic capabilitites. This kind of sophisticated impersonal nga pagsulat kanunay naghimo kanako nga magduda. Usa kini ka bag-ong hagit para kanato nga mga magtutudlo.*
> (Sometimes, students submit work that uses very complex sentence structures that they never attempt in their daily conversations or even in simpler writing tasks. The sentences are grammatically correct, but sound unnatural for a human writer. It's like the AI is showing off its linguistic capabilities. This kind of sophisticated but impersonal writing often makes me suspicious. It's a new challenge for us teachers.)

On Creative Piece. There became a point during this evolution of creative works where a teacher might look at an assignment made adeptly by a student, but one which had no feeling or human touch in it. Such creative artifacts, storytelling being one among them, complied with the entire scheme of things structurally but appeared very "hollow", like an assignment from a mechanized school that has never felt anything. When reminded of the feelings of the characters or the real impulse for the creation, students usually had nothing to say concerning that, which is another indicator of the confusion between AI mimicking creativity without actual comprehension of any kind whatsoever or human investment. Informant 5 described an instance where a student's creative writing piece was technically perfect but lacked genuine emotion or human depth, suggesting AI involvement. She claimed that;

> *Nagsulat ang students og creative piece nga perfect kaayo sa technical nga aspect, apan walay emosyon o tinuod nga pagkahimo. Ningsunod kini sa tanang rules sa paghimo og istorya pero hollow kaayo paminawon, murag istorya nga gihimo sa machine. Pagpangutana nako bahin sa gibati sa mga karakter, dili ka hatagan sa estudyante og klaro nga pag elaborate. Kini nga kawala sa pagbati sa tawo usa ka timailhan sa paggamit og AI. Usa kini ka hagit ang pagtudlo og pagka-mamugnaon kung kaya man sa AI nga sundogon kini.*
> (A student's creative writing piece was technically perfect but completely lacked emotion or genuine creativity. It followed all the narrative rules but felt hollow, like a story generated by a machine. When I asked about the feelings of the characters, the student couldn't elaborate meaningfully. This lack of human touch was a strong indicator of AI use. It's a challenge to teach creativity when AI can mimic it.)

Types of AI-generated Language Output Encountered

This section presents the results to the specific research question 1.2: "What types of AI-generated language output have you encountered in student submissions?" under the first major research question, "What are the experiences of language teachers in determining AI-generated language output?" The following themes served as results, which were: the Entire Essay Output and Creative Writing Pieces.

Entire Essay Output. The processes described by the participants give the impression that what is generated by AI tends to be an entire essay or lengthy discourse that is impeccably organized and free from mistakes typically found in reflections, reaction papers, and even research papers authored by students. When the students were truly confronted with the inability to organize their thoughts or fix up their grammar, they behaved in a typical manner and made use of AI facilities like ChatGPT; this naturally renders submitted work-also in print-almost devoid of anything truly students', and the quality went downhill and raises whether we are seeing the efforts and understandings of the students reflected in whatever is being done. Informant 1 detailed how the types of AI-generated content they encounter most often involve entire essays or large paragraphs that are overly structured and devoid of typical student errors. He mentioned;

> *Kasagaran ma'am, the types of AI-generated content I have come across mostly involve entire essays or large paragraphs that are overly structured and lack the common errors usually found in student reflections, reaction papers, different kinds of essays, and often in doing their research. Some use ChatGPT to write reflections, research introductions, or arguments in debate-style papers. Meanwhile, others heavily rely on Wikipedia to lift definitions or historical background sections word-for-word, with minimal rephrasing or understanding of the content.*
>
> (Mostly, ma'am, the types of AI-generated content I have come across involve entire essays or large paragraphs that are overly structured and lack the common errors usually found in student reflections, reaction papers, different kinds of essays, and often in their research. Some students use ChatGPT to write reflections, research introductions, or arguments in debate-style papers. Meanwhile, others heavily rely on Wikipedia to lift definitions or historical background sections word-for-word, with minimal rephrasing or understanding of the content.)

Informant 2 noted that they frequently observe essays that are perfectly structured with minimal spelling errors but conspicuously lack personal reflection. She explained;

> *Naa gyu'y mga essays nga akong makita nga perfectly structured, gamay ra kaayo ang spelling errors, ug kulang sa personal reflection.*
>
> (Most commonly, I see a perfectly structured essay, minimal spelling errors, and a lack of personal reflection.)

Informant 3 explained that students tend to rely on AI-generated answers for longer writing tasks like essays and paragraphs, often for convenience when they prefer not to engage in deeper thought. She highlighted;

> *Types of output just like nag explain ka sa ilaha using longer sentences like an essay, makaingon gyud ko nga there are students na mag-salig or mag-depend sa AI-generated na answers especially siguro pag dili na sila gustong maghuna-huna pa, naay tendency, na mag rumble ilahang thoughts at the same time grammar. So why not they use AI para lang for convenience*

> *and then makapasa lang sa output. Especially sa pa-essay or paragraph writing ba na siya. Those times maka-encounter ko of AI-generated language output.*
> (The types of output, ma'am, are just like when they explain something using longer sentences, like an essay. I can really say that there are students who will rely or depend on AI-generated answers, especially perhaps when they do not want to think anymore, when they tend to ramble in their thoughts, and at the same time, struggle with grammar. So, why would not they use AI just for convenience and then simply pass the output? Especially when you ask them to write, and it's an essay or paragraph writing. Those are the times I encounter AI-generated language output.)

Informant 4 expressed a profound sense of discouragement when reading student work now, particularly hard copy essays, because the emergence of AI makes it evident when content is not genuinely their own. She claimed that;

> *Lahi na gyud siya karon. Sauna, kung mobasa ko sa ilang work, I really loved reading their work. But with the emergence of AI, it's somehow maka discourage. I know when I read it, it's AI-generated. It's very discouraging. And to think that in the tool of AI, yes, you ask, okay, you make your own, but they submit it as a hard copy.*
> (It is very different now. Previously, when I read their work, I really loved reading it. But with the emergence of AI, it is somewhat discouraging. I know when I read it that it is AI-generated. It is very discouraging. And to think that with the AI tool, yes, you ask, "Okay, make your own," but they submit it as a hard copy.)

Creative Writing Pieces. A student's writing can be technically flawless but still sorely lack any feeling, personality, or originality. For participants, any mention of these poems or short stories is always felt to be rather overworked, too stiff, too dry, shallow, and reminds them of their rather exaggerated brief descriptions or accounts that lack vivid details and a natural flow, more like talking from a deep human grammatical sense. These factors notwithstanding, but with violent spikes in, say, grammar and voting style and bizarre repetitions, are some of the neatest signs of AI interventions, given that students usually find it hard to elaborate on emotional intensity or contextual nuance that pertain to truly authentic creative works.

Informant 5 described encountering creative writing pieces that were technically sound but lacked genuine emotion, indicating an AI-generated origin. She said that;

> *Naa ko'y nakita nga mga creative writing pieces, pareho sa mga poems o short stories, nga technically well-structured pero completely devoid of genuine emotion. Nagsunod sila sa mga rules sa genre pero murag lifeless. Walay tinuod nga passion o unique spark sa narrative. Kining emotionally flat pero technically correct nga writing usa ka klase sa AI output.*

(I have seen creative writing pieces, like poems or short stories, that are technically well-structured but completely devoid of genuine emotion. They follow the rules of the genre perfectly but feel lifeless. There is no real passion or unique spark in the narrative. This emotionally flat but technically correct writing is a type of AI output.)

Informant 6 observed incredibly concise content, almost like a summary, delivering information efficiently but without the natural elaboration or descriptive details typically found in human writing. She mentioned;

Naa pu'y content nga incredibly concise ug to the point, halos murag summary lang. Gi-deliver niya ang information efficiently pero walay bisan unsang elaboration o descriptive details. Murag ang AI naningkamot lang nga maka-save og words. Kining brevity, nga walay na andan nga human tendency sa pagdugang og extra details, usa ka common output. Too efficient ra gyud usahay.

(Another type is content that is incredibly concise and to the point, almost like a summary. It delivers the information efficiently but lacks any elaboration or descriptive details. It is as if the AI is trying to save words. This brevity, without the usual human tendency to add extra details, is a common output. It's too efficient sometimes.)

Informant 7 noted writing with overly complex and varied sentence structures that, despite being grammatically correct, did not flow naturally, suggesting an unnatural sophistication indicative of AI. She explained;

Naa ko'y na-encounter nga writing diin ang mga sentence structures overly complex ug varied, murag nagpakita og linguistic gymnastics. Bisag grammatically correct, ang mga sentences dili mo-flow naturally para sa usa ka human writer. Murag forced o unnatural sa iyang ka-sophisticated. Kini nga klase sa elaborate pero awkward phrasing usa ka strong indicator sa AI. Lahi ra gyud kaayo.

(I have encountered writing where the sentence structures are overly complex and varied, almost showing off linguistic gymnastics. While grammatically correct, the sentences do not flow naturally for a human writer. It feels forced or unnatural in its sophistication. This type of elaborate but awkward phrasing is a strong indicator of AI. It is very distinct.)

Informant 8 frequently observed writing that accurately answered prompts but completely ignored specific instructions, particularly regarding the use of local examples, highlighting AI's lack of contextual awareness. She expressed;

Kasagaran gyud, makita nako nga ang writing mo-answer sa prompt accurately pero completely ignores ang bisan unsang specific instructions nga gihatag sa class. For example, kung mangayo ko og local examples, ang AI output mogamit og generic global ones. Tama man unta, pero dili

> *specific sa atong context. Kining lack of contextual awareness usa ka frequent issue. Dili gyud siya kamao mosunod og directions og tarong.*
> (A common output is writing that answers the prompt accurately but completely ignores any specific instructions given in class. For example, if I asked for local examples, the AI output would use generic global ones. It is correct, but not specific to our context. This lack of contextual awareness is a frequent issue. It doesn't follow directions well.)

Informant 9 identified instances where student writing showed a sudden and significant improvement from previous submissions, with a struggling student producing a flawless paper overnight, which was a clear sign of AI involvement. She clarified that;

> *Naa gyud ko'y nakita nga mga instances nga ang writing nagpakita og kalit ug dako kaayong improvement gikan sa ilang miaging mga submissions. Ang usa ka estudyante nga kaniadto naglisud, makaturn-in og flawless paper overnight. Kining paspas ug dili tinud-anay nga improvement usa ka klaro ka ayong klase sa AI output. Dili gyud ingon ana ka paspas ang pag-improve sa usa ka estudyante. Makapangutana gyud ta sa ilang effort.*
> (There are instances where the writing shows a sudden and dramatic leap in quality from previous submissions. A student who previously struggled might turn in a flawless paper overnight. This rapid, unearned improvement is a very clear type of AI output. A student can't improve that quickly. It makes us question their effort.)

Informant 10 noticed a type of writing where phrasing was repetitive or sentence patterns were predictable throughout the text, indicating a formulaic approach and a lack of stylistic variation common in AI outputs. He discussed that;

> *Naa say klase sa writing nga sige'g balik-balik ang phrasing o predictable ra kaayo ang sentence patterns sa tibuok text. Dili siya outright copying, pero ang paagi sa pag-express sa mga ideya murag formulaic. Murag limitado ra ang set sa AI nga paagi para mosulti og mga butang. Kining lack of stylistic variation usa ka subtle pero mamatikdan nga sign. Makahimo ni sa writing nga boring.*
> (Another type is writing that uses repetitive phrasing or predictable sentence patterns throughout the text. It is not outright copying, but the way ideas are expressed feels formulaic. It is like the AI has a limited set of ways to say things. This lack of stylistic variation is a subtle but noticeable sign. It makes the writing boring.)

Change in Assessing Student Work as a Result of Accessibility to AI Writing Tools

This section also presents the results to the specific research question 1.3: "How has assessing student work changed since the increased accessibility of sophisticated AI writing tools?" under the first major research question, "What are the experiences of language teachers in determining AI-generated language output?" The following themes served as results, which were: Tedious and Complex, More Difficult,

Assessment Becoming Easier, Time Consuming in Checking Outputs, Change in Giving Feedback, Use Detection Tools for Accuracy, Changing Assessments to Oral, and More Time to Discuss Academic Integrity.

Tedious and Complex. The evaluation of student work has become lengthier and complicated with the increasing availability of widely available AI tools. Most of the respondents indicate that energy has greatly increased in otherwise comparing student writing for invoices on consistency with previous work, along with authenticating their work, perhaps through means like oral presentation, for students seem not to care about the instructions not to use AI. This additional scrutiny-along with redefinition and redefining for other concepts, such as originality-additionally burdens, wears down, and at times, even frustrates the tutor in preparing students in the authentic application of AI.

Informant 1 described the current assessment process as "tedious" and "complex," noting that despite warnings, students continue to use AI, forcing her to spend more time scrutinizing consistency and context. He shared that;

> *It is tedious this time mam for me because assessing student work has become more complex since AI tools became widely accessible and even when you tell them not to use AI dili jod gihapon sila maminaw. Tungod ani mam I now spend more time evaluating the consistency of a student's writing over time and comparing submissions to previous work to see pattern but most of the time kay ma exhaust ko mam largo zero na diritso then feedbacking dayon kay sakit sa mata ang agi ug kabalo ka that it isn't their work mam. I also consider whether the ideas are contextually appropriate and if the language matches the student's level kay mapuzzle nalang ta mam nga hawod na kaayo ang bata peru dili katubag. In some cases, I ask students to explain their writing in oral presentations or through follow-up questions, which helps determine if the work is truly theirs.*
>
> (It is tedious this time, ma'am, for me because assessing student work has become more complex since AI tools became widely accessible, and even when you tell them not to use AI, they still do not listen. Because of this, ma'am, I now spend more time evaluating the consistency of a student's writing over time and comparing submissions to previous work to see patterns, but most of the time I get exhausted, ma'am, and just give them a direct zero, then provide feedback, because the writing is painful to look at, and you know that it isn't their work, ma'am. I also consider whether the ideas are contextually appropriate and if the language matches the student's level, because we just get puzzled, ma'am, that the student seems very skilled but cannot answer. In some cases, I ask students to explain their writing in oral presentations or through follow-up questions, which helps determine if the work is truly theirs.)

Informant 10 highlighted the challenge of redefining originality in the classroom, emphasizing the need for nuanced discussions about responsible AI use for brainstorming while ensuring the final output reflects the student's unique thought. He explained that;

> *Kinahanglan gyud nako i-redefine ang buot ipasabot sa originality sa akong classroom. Karon, gi-emphasize nako nga okay ra ang paggamit og AI para sa brainstorming, pero ang final output kinahanglan gyud nga ilang own unique thought and expression. Usa ni ka nuanced discussion bahin sa unsaon paggamit sa AI responsibly. Kining kausaban sa definition challenging gyud para nako ug sa mga estudyante.*
> (I had to redefine what originality means in my classroom. I now emphasize that using AI for brainstorming is okay, but the final output must be their unique thought and expression. It is a nuanced discussion about how to use AI responsibly. This shift in definition is challenging for both me and the students.)

More Difficult. With the advent of AI-generated content, assessing a student's language ability has become almost impossible. The participants reported declining confidence in any attempt at verifying submitted work, along with added time for checking originality. This has a very direct bearing on a teacher's judgment as to what the student has learned, what areas of the student's learning require extra help to improve, and disturbs the whole learning situation.

Informant 2 articulated that assessing the authenticity of student outputs has become significantly more challenging, requiring a greater investment of time to verify originality. She mentioned that;

> *Ang mga outputs karon mas lisod na i-assess base sa ilang authenticity. Kinahanglan nako mogahin og mas daghang oras para ma-check ang originality.*
> (The outputs are now harder to assess based on their authenticity. I need to spend more time checking the originality.)

Informant 9 expressed a growing difficulty in trusting a student's true progress, as AI-generated written work hinders their ability to accurately identify learning gaps and provide targeted support. She explained that;

> *Mas lisod na gyud ko makasalig sa tinuod nga progress sa usa ka estudyante. Kung ang ilang written work AI-generated, dili gyud nako ma-identify sa husto ang ilang learning gaps. Nakapalisod ni sa paghatag og targeted support ug sa pagtabang nila nga mo-improve. Gusto nako makita ang ilang tinuod nga struggles aron matabangan nako sila nga mo-grow. Kini nakaguba sa tibuok nga learning process.*
> (It is harder to feel confident in a student's true progress. If their written work is AI-generated, I cannot accurately identify their learning gaps. This makes it difficult to provide targeted support and help them improve. I want to see their real struggles so I can help them grow. It undermines the whole learning process.)

Assessment Becoming Easier. An advantage of AI in evaluation has been the convenience brought about by grading tests, particularly for longer pieces, between checking sentences, paragraphs, or essays, according to one of the informants. Truly, the meaning of this convenience, regarding its opposite

challenges, is well understood. It gives the benefit of high convenience and time saving through fast-tracking assessment processes, thus making the whole process efficient for a learning site.

Informant 3 highlighted a significant positive contribution of AI to assessment, noting how it can streamline the process of checking student papers, especially for longer writing tasks. She highlighted that;

> *One of the biggest contributions of AI when it comes to assessment is makatabang yun siya sa kanang pag-check sa papel especially if takes longer na mag-check sa ilahang sentences, paragraph, or essays. But with the use of AI, naa gyud convenience and at the same time maka-save ka ug time. Because AI in general, mura na ikaw mismo bang pero mas ipapaspas niya kay in just one look, wow, mas paspas mo trabaho kung na ay AI nagigamit.*
>
> (One of the biggest contributions of AI when it comes to assessment is that it can help with checking papers, especially if it takes longer to check their sentences, paragraphs, or essays. But with the use of AI, there is genuine convenience, and at the same time, you can save time. Because AI, in general, is like you, but it makes things faster at just one look, wow, you work much faster if AI is used.)

Time-consuming in Checking Outputs. With AI, much has changed-an assessment by machine has even become more annoying and time-consuming for the students. Many times, an authentication verification process ranges from the boring activity of comparing its submission using an online AI detection tool or checking the output for various patterns. These kinds of activities waste precious moments of a teacher who, this time, must maximize their time. It has put a teacher in a position where it's difficult to know the real skills of the student and the authenticity of his or her work, since those are very high-level outputs not at par with the actual skill level of the student.

Informant 4 highlighted the significant time investment required for teachers to assess student work, especially when attempting to verify authenticity against AI-generated content. She mentioned that;

> *As a teacher, you want to utilize your time, you want to maximize your time. It's very time-consuming. You take a picture human you check it to another AI-generated. So somehow, although you know about AI generation, you just let it pass… Because there are some college students who are not good at it. But when they go to their work, it's very good. But it's not good. It's not accessible to the highest level. When it comes to grammar, you know that the student is not really good at grammar. But when it comes to how do I grab the English, how do I... So that's one. Okay, thank you.*
>
> (As a teacher, you want to utilize your time, you want to maximize your time. It is very time-consuming. You take a picture, and then you check it against another AI-generated text. So somehow, although you know about AI generation, you just let it pass…Because there are some college students who are not good at writing, but when they submit their work, it's very good. However, it's not genuinely good; it's not accessible to the highest level of their skill. When it comes to grammar, you know that the student is not good

at grammar, but then you see perfect grammar. So that's one of the challenges. Okay, thank you.)

Change in giving Feedback. The responses add another disruption to the delivery modes of teacher feedback that go beyond simply correcting grammar. Increasingly, the emphasis in discussions with students is now shifting to promoting critical thinking, creativity of ideas, and expressing a unique voice, so it sounds more like student speak. This shift speaks volumes about intentionality for moving students into deeper modes of thinking, as opposed to modes focused on the production of grammatically perfect sentences, and on intellectual engagement in place of AI-aided mere correctness of outcomes.

Informant 5 highlighted a significant shift in their approach to giving feedback, moving beyond mere grammatical corrections to emphasize critical thinking, originality, and the student's unique voice. She explained that;

Nausab pud ang paghatag og feedback. Imbes nga mag-korek lang og grammar, mas nag-focus na ko karon sa critical thinking, originality sa mga ideas, ug sa unique voice sa estudyante. Gapaningkamot ko nga giyahan sila nga ma-develop ang ilang own thoughts, dili lang kay mo-produce og perfect sentences. Bahin ni sa pagtudlo nila nga mag-think deeply, dili lang basta mo-write og flawlessly. Importante gyud kining kausaban sa focus.

(Giving feedback has also changed. Instead of just correcting grammar, I now focus more on critical thinking, originality of ideas, and the student's unique voice. I try to guide them to develop their thoughts, not just produce perfect sentences. It is about teaching them to think deeply, not just to write flawlessly. This shift in focus is very important.)

Use Detection Tools for Accuracy. The participants use detection tools, yet they know very well the limitations of these tools, and that they could be right or wrong. Thus, even while AI detection might offer some sort of an indication, the teachers should rely on the judgment of professionals and their knowledge about a student's writing; the so-called AI detection tools could provide significant contradiction and complication in assessment. Informant 6 elaborated that;

Usahay mogamit ko og mga AI detection tools, pero kabalo ko nga dili ni sila 100% accurate. Maka-serve lang ni sila as starting point para magduda, pero dili nako sila masaligan completely. Buot pasabot, kinahanglan pa gihapon nako gamiton ang akong own judgment ug knowledge sa estudyante. Nakadugang ni og laing layer of uncertainty sa assessment. Helpful man ning mga tools pero dili sila definitive.

(I sometimes use AI detection tools, but I know they are not 100% accurate. They can be a starting point for suspicion, but I cannot rely on them completely. This means I still must use my judgment and knowledge of the student. It adds another layer of uncertainty to the assessment. These tools are helpful but not definitive.)

Changing Assessments to Oral. With artificial intelligence-generated material, more educators reportedly emphasize oral tasks. An informant went on to suggest that oral assessment might now carry

some weight, especially where one suspects artificial intelligence manipulation. The teacher may ask students about their work to verify their understanding and ability to communicate ideas. This is, of course, a more expensive exercise in terms of time for assessment. Informant 7 explained that;

> *Mas nahimo nang importante ang oral assessments sa akong klase. Kung magduda ko nga naay paggamit og AI sa usa ka written assignment, posible nako hangyuon ang estudyante nga i-explain ang ilang work verbally. Makatabang ni nako aron masukod ang ilang tinuod nga understanding ug abilidad sa pag-articulate sa mga ideas. Usa ni ka paagi para ma-confirm kung ila ba gyud ang knowledge. Makadugang lang ni og oras sa akong assessment schedule.*
> (Oral assessments have become more important in my class. If I suspect AI use in a written assignment, I might ask the student to explain their work verbally. This helps me gauge their true understanding and ability to articulate ideas. It is a way to confirm if the knowledge is truly theirs. This adds more time to my assessment schedule.)

More Time to Discuss Academic Integrity. The impending threat of AI-generated text has almost inexorably broadened the time teachers can discuss academic integrity with their students. More discussion has been given to clarifying cheating with AI, stressing the importance of students submitting their work. These conversations remain crucial in setting expectations and promoting integrity, with teachers valuing teaching ethics as an essential part of their teaching. Informant 8, claimed that;

> *Mas dako na akong oras karon sa pag-discuss og academic integrity sa akong mga estudyante. Maghisgot mi bahin sa unsa ang tawag nga cheating with AI ug ngano nga importante nga ila gyud ang own work. Bahin ni sa pagtudlo nila og ethics, dili lang kay English. Kining nagpadayon nga conversation crucial kaayo para sa pag-set og expectations. Kinahanglan nato magtukod og culture of honesty.*
> (I spend more time now discussing academic integrity with my students. We talk about what constitutes cheating with AI and why it's important to do their work. It is about teaching them ethics, not just English. This ongoing conversation is crucial for setting expectations. We need to build a culture of honesty.)

Ways to Know AI-generated Output

This section further presents the results to the specific research question 1.4: "How did you know that the output was AI-generated?" under the first major research question, "What are the experiences of language teachers in determining AI-generated language output?" The following themes served as results, which were: No Mistakes in Outputs, Sophisticated Vocabulary, No Personal or Unique Insights, Improvement in Writing Quality, Lack of Contextual Awareness, Difficulty Breaking Down Output, Lacking Critical Analysis, and Strikingly Similar Sentence Patterns.

No Mistakes in Output. As stated by the participants, they will strongly highlight the absence of any grammatical, spelling, or other imperfections characteristic of human hands, creating student outputs as

an indicator of AI generation. Any refinements above normal in conjunction with strange expressions, rambling abstract sentences, or brutally concise ones cast instant suspicion, for these features are far removed from conventionally expected patterns of writing and developmental stages of human students, not even in the case of the brightest.

Informant 1 immediately suspected AI involvement when encountering essays with no grammatical errors or spelling mistakes, a level of perfection uncharacteristic of even their best students. He shared that;

> *Kabalo ko nga AI-generated to kay ang essay walay gyuy bisan gamayng grammatical errors o spelling mistakes. Ang akong mga estudyante, bisan ang pinakamaayo, kanunay gyud naay gagmayng sayop sa ilang mga drafts. Kining level sa perfection mag suspicion dayon ko. Dili gyud ni nag-reflect sa typical human writing process. Ang flawless execution maoy una nakong dakong timailhan.*
>
> (I knew it was AI-generated because the essay had absolutely no grammatical errors or spelling mistakes. My students, even the brightest ones, always make some small errors in their drafts. This level of perfection immediately made me suspicious. It just didn't reflect the typical human writing process. The flawless execution was the first major clue.)

Informant 7 noted highly unusual and awkward sentence structures that, despite being grammatically correct, sounded unnatural and robotic, signaling AI generation. She mentioned that;

> *Nakakita ko og very unusual phrasing o awkward sentence structures nga grammatically correct man unta pero paminawon nga unnatural para sa usa ka human writer. Murag ang AI naningkamot nga maging too clever sa iyang syntax. Ang flow murag forced ug dili organic. Kining distinct, halos robotic phrasing nakapaduda gyud nako pag-ayo. Dili gyud to paminawon nga tipikal nga estudyante.*
>
> (I found very unusual phrasing or awkward sentence structures that were grammatically correct but sounded unnatural for a human writer. It was like the AI was trying to be too clever with its syntax. The flow felt forced and not organic. This distinct, almost robotic phrasing made me very suspicious. It just didn't sound like a typical student.)

Informant 10 observed essays that were perfectly concise and efficient, lacking the usual rambling or extra details found in human drafts, which suggested an AI-optimized output. He explained that;

> *Ang essay perfectly concise ug efficient, diretso gyud sa punto nga walay bisan unsang unnecessary words. Kasagaran ang mga estudyante maglakip man unta og mga rumbling o extra details sa ilang pagsulat. Kining grabe nga brevity ug directness murag unnatural para sa usa ka human draft. Murag ang AI gi-optimize gyud para sa efficiency. Gikulang kini sa human touch sa elaboration.*
>
> (The essay was perfectly concise and efficient, getting straight to the point without any unnecessary words. Students usually include some rambling or extra details when they write. This extreme brevity and directness felt

unnatural for a human draft. It seemed like the AI was optimized for efficiency. It lacked the human touch of elaboration.)

Sophisticated Vocabulary. In the words of one of the participants has one possible signal of computer-generated text is "voice" that is overly sophisticated for the age or otherwise normal proficiency level of the speaker. Most likely, luck has fallen with diction so elevated that it could never match any part of a student's day-so complex yet still produced correctly. Inquiry into some of this rather complex wording poses the single biggest red flag: the students cannott define or explain these terms, creating a serious disconnect between what they write and their understanding of them lexically. This suggests that it does not hold the authentic voice of the student.

Informant 2 observed that the vocabulary used in student outputs was often too sophisticated for their age and usual proficiency level, noting that students struggled to explain complex words they had used correctly. She discussed that;

Ang vocabulary nga gigamit far too sophisticated para sa edad ug sa usual proficiency level sa estudyante. Gigamit nila ang mga words sama sa "ubiquitous" o "profound" sa husto nga paagi, pero dili gyud nila kini gigamit sa ilang daily conversations. Pagpangutana nako nga i-define nila kining mga pulonga, naglisod sila pag-explain. Kining disconnect tali sa ilang spoken ug written vocabulary usa ka klarong timailhan. Dili gyud to ilang own voice.

(The vocabulary used was far too sophisticated for the student's age and usual proficiency level. They were using words like "ubiquitous" or "profound" correctly, but never in their daily conversations. When I asked them to define these words, they struggled to explain them. This disconnect between their spoken and written vocabulary was a clear indicator. It was simply not their voice.)

No Personal or Unique Insights. The writing produced by students, according to some respondents, often lacks an individual's voice or insight and sounds like just another general explanation of a concept or instance. Another marker of AI assistance is a text devoid of any individualistic, passionate, or personal view; grammatically good, but too nice and stiff. Always correct but unable to establish that human touch; a work from a student is expected to contain.

Informant 3 described how the writing style they observed was generic and lacked any personal voice or unique insights, resembling a standard textbook explanation rather than original student thought. She described that;

Ang writing style generic ra kaayo ug walay bisan gamayng personal voice o unique insights. Murag standard textbook explanation, dili original thought sa estudyante. Walay passion o individual perspective nga nipagawas sa mga pulong. Tama man unta pero bland, walay bisan gamayng spark of personality. Kining kawala sa individuality usa ka lig-on nga timailhan.

(The writing style was very generic and lacked any personal voice or unique insights. It felt like a standard textbook explanation, not a student's original

thought. No passion or individual perspective was coming through the words. It was correct but bland, without any spark of personality. This absence of individuality was a strong sign.)

Improvement in Quality of Writing. This is often observed in writing quality among students. A person who had probably just been visible at a fairly poor performance suddenly produced a paper that might arguably be defined as completely immaculate because it is creative. Such great and unplausible jumps in a student's achievement from one assignment to the next-if one considers the previous efforts of that student-seem to be very suspect indicators that indicate A.I. presence.

Informant 4 observed a sudden and significant improvement in a student's writing quality, which was uncharacteristic of their previous performance, leading to suspicion. She explained that;

Na-notice nako ang kalit ug dako kaayong improvement sa writing quality sa estudyante gikan sa usa ka assignment ngadto sa sunod. Usa ka estudyante nga kasagaran ubos ang score kalit lang nag-submit og perfect paper. Kining paspas nga paglukso sa abilidad halos imposible ma-achieve overnight. Too good to be true gyud, kung tan-awon ang ilang previous performance. Ang drastic change kadudahang kaayo.

(I noticed a sudden and dramatic improvement in the students' writing quality from one assignment to the next. A student who usually scored low suddenly submitted a perfect paper. This rapid leap in ability is almost impossible to achieve overnight. It was too good to be true, given their previous performance. The drastic change was highly suspicious.)

Lack of Contextual Awareness. The participants have found that AI-generated essays may tend to score well on the usual proper answering of prompts; however, they do not meet some of the requirements, such as putting local examples into the mix. This is a definitive mark of the output of AI that ignores local context, lesson-real examples in favor of generic international examples, thus underscoring an AI's incapacity to follow within-context, nuanced directions.

Informant 5 observed that essays often answered prompts accurately but completely ignored specific, locally contextualized instructions. She explained that;

Ang essay ni-answer sa prompt accurately pero completely gi-ignore ang mga specific instructions nga akong gihatag sa class. For example, nangayo ko og local examples gikan sa Monkayo, pero ang essay migamit og generic international ones. Nagpakita ni og lack of contextual awareness nga specific sa atong mga lessons. Kining pagkapakyas sa pagsunod sa nuanced instructions maoy usa ka key giveaway. Wala kabalo ang AI sa atong local context.

(The essay answered the prompt accurately but completely ignored specific instructions I had given in class. For example, I asked for local examples from Monkayo, but the essay used generic international ones. It showed a lack of contextual awareness specific to our lessons. This failure to follow nuanced instructions was a key giveaway. The AI didn't know our local context.)

Difficulty in Breaking Down Output. The teachers may perceive that their students struggle in general with issues regarding making general statements or argumentative elaboration from their just-turned-in work. This shows incoherence in these assignments: breaking down or discussing some written work without a proper understanding of the text within it. This speaks of an unarguable lack of ability on the writer's part and shows an undue dependence on AI to relieve or conceal that inability.

Informant 6 highlighted students' struggle to explain or elaborate on their complex sentences or arguments from their papers, indicating a lack of true understanding. She shared that;

> *Paghangyo nako sa estudyante nga i-explain ang usa ka complex sentence o i-elaborate ang usa ka specific argument gikan sa ilang paper, grabe kaayo sila naglisod. Dili nila ma-break down ang ilang own writing o ma-articulate ang rason sa luyo niini. Kining kawala nila sa abilidad nga ma-discuss ang ilang own work coherently usa ka lig-ong kumpirmasyon. Nagpamatuod kini nga wala gyud nila tinuod nga nasabtan o nahimo ang text.*
>
> (When I asked the student to explain a complex sentence or elaborate on a specific argument from their paper, they struggled immensely. They could not break down their writing or articulate the reasoning behind it. This inability to discuss their work coherently was a strong confirmation. It proved they had not genuinely understood or created the text.)

Lacking of Critical Analysis. It is a fact that if a group of observers were to behold any AI-generated content, they would say just the opposite of it, having a sense of real fact, but little critical analysis or higher-order thinking associated with it. The submitted paper is a mere submission of information, having no implication or angle on the same. If any, it would be summary-like, that is, not synthesized thinking. Perhaps the highest deduction of superficialness here might indicate the use of AI-though sunny factual correctness is said about all so-called superior thinking.

Informant 8 noted that student content, while factually correct, often entirely lacked critical analysis or deeper thinking, presenting information without exploring implications or offering unique perspectives. She shared that;

> *Ang content nga gihatag factually correct man unta pero completely lacked og bisan unsang critical analysis o deeper thinking. Nag-present lang og information nga wala gi-explore ang mga implications niini o nag-offer og unique perspective. Murag ang AI nag-summarize lang, dili nag-synthesize. Kining kawala sa higher-order thinking, bisag husto ang mga facts, usa ka lig-on nga timailhan. Too superficial ra kaayo.*
>
> (The content provided was factually correct but completely lacked any critical analysis or deeper thinking. It just presented information without exploring its implications or offering a unique perspective. It seemed like the AI was summarizing, not synthesizing. This absence of higher-order thinking, despite correct facts, was a strong clue. It was too superficial.)

Strikingly Similar Sentence Patterns. Teachers observe that student submissions carry sentence patterns and argument structures that are very closely similar, with perhaps slight variation in the particular words used. These observations suggest an overarching uniformity, indicating that these students are using the same or very similar AI tools or prompts. AI use by the student is presumed, given the absence of any individual stylistic variation.

Informant 9 observed strikingly similar sentence patterns or argument structures across multiple student submissions, suggesting the use of the same or very similar AI tools. She commented that;

> *Na-obserbahan nako ang strikingly similar sentence patterns o argument structures sa daghang student submissions. Bisan og gamay ra ang kalainan sa mga words, ang underlying framework parehas ra gyud. Nagpasabot ni nga nagamit sila sa parehas nga AI tool o very similar prompt. Kining kawala sa individual variation usa ka klarong pattern sa paggamit og AI. Murag gigamit nila tanan ang parehas nga template.*
>
> (I observed strikingly similar sentence patterns or argument structures across multiple student submissions. Even if the words were slightly different, the underlying framework was identical. This suggested they were all using the same AI tool or a very similar prompt. The lack of individual variation was a clear pattern of AI use. It's like they all used the same template.)

What are the challenges of language teachers in determining AI-generated language output?

This section presents the results of the 2nd major research question, 'What are the challenges of language teachers in determining AI-generated language output? Four specific questions were utilized to gather data that would answer to the question.

Difficulty in Identifying AI-generated Text

This section also presents the results to the specific research question 2.1: "What makes it difficult to definitively identify AI-generated text, especially when it is well-crafted or when students edit it?" under the second major research question, "What are the challenges of language teachers in determining AI-generated language output?" The following themes served as results, which were: Quite Difficult to Detect, When Students Edit It, Difficult with Well-crafted Work, AI Outputs Becoming Contextualized, Need for Careful Judgments for Outputs of Good Writers, and No Consistent AI Style.

Difficulty in Identifying AI-generated Text. Participants consistently express that identifying AI-generated student work is quite difficult, as teachers are keenly aware of their students' capabilities and what they are truly capable of producing. The absence of definitive, widely accessible, and reliable forensic tools for AI detection further complicates this task, forcing educators to rely on intuition and observation, which are not foolproof. This challenge is exacerbated by students' collaborative efforts to "trick" the system by editing AI output to sound more human, creating a constant "cat-and-mouse game" for teachers.

Informant 4 shared their perspective on the difficulty in identifying AI-generated text, emphasizing that it's not easy to discern when students' work is AI-assisted, especially given a teacher's knowledge of their students' capabilities. She shared that;

> *Honestly speaking, okay ra man gyud para nako kung AI-generated pero dili sobra. Pero para nako, dili gyud sayon mailhan ang mga AI-generated works sa mga estudyante, kay isip magtutudlo, kabalo ka sa capability sa imong mga estudyante. Kabalo ka unsa ang ilang mahimo, ug unsa ang dili nila mahimo. So, dili gyud sayon mailhan nga kini nga work kay AI-generated. Para nako.*
>
> (Honestly speaking, it is okay for me if it is AI-generated, but not too much. But for me, knowing that it is not easy to identify AI-generated works of children, because you, as a teacher, know the capability of your students. You know what they can do, what they cannot do. So, it is not easy to identify that this work is AI-generated, for me.)

Informant 9 pointed out the difficulty in identifying AI-generated text due to the current lack of definitive and widely accessible forensic tools for AI detection, leaving teachers to rely on less foolproof methods. She explained that;

> *Walay pa gyu'y definitive forensic tool para sa AI detection nga widely accessible ug reliable para sa mga eskwelahan. Wala pa ta'y teknolohiya nga makahimo og tinuod nga "scan" sa usa ka paper ug makakuha og conclusive answer. Nagsalig lang gyud ta sa atong intuition ug observation, nga dili man foolproof. Kining kawala sa usa ka lig-on nga technological solution usa ka dakong barrier.*
> (There is no definitive forensic tool for AI detection yet that is widely accessible and reliable for schools. We do not have the technology to truly scan a paper and get a conclusive answer. We rely on our intuition and observation, which are not foolproof. This lack of a strong technological solution is a major barrier.)

Informant 10 highlighted the difficulty in identifying AI-generated text due to students' collaborative efforts to trick the system by editing AI output to sound more human, creating a continuous cat-and-mouse game. He explained that;

> *Ang mga estudyante kanunay magkat-on gikan sa usag usa unsaon pag trick ang system o unsaon paghimo sa AI output nga mas mo-sound nga human. Mag-share sila og mga tips sa pag-edit sa AI-generated text aron dili ma-detect. Kining collaborative effort nila aron ma-bypass ang among mga checks maoy nakapalisod sa among trabaho. Usa ni ka kanunay nga cat-and-mouse game tali kanamo ug sa mga estudyante.*
> (Students often learn from each other how to trick the system or make AI output sound more human. They share tips on editing AI-generated text to avoid detection. This collaborative effort to bypass our checks makes our

job harder. It is a constant cat-and-mouse game between us and the students.)

When Students Edit It. A significant challenge in identifying AI-generated text arises when students engage in editing or paraphrasing the AI's output. Participants find it particularly difficult to definitively distinguish such modified content from original work, as the revisions can make the AI-generated text closely resemble a student's writing, blurring the lines of authenticity.

Informant 1 explained that it becomes difficult to definitively identify AI-generated text when students edit it, making it harder to distinguish between original and AI-assisted content. He emphasized that;

> *It is difficult to identify AI-generated text when students refine the output by mixing their original ideas or paraphrasing content from ChatGPT and also when students are very good in giving command sa mga AI tools mam. We know that AI tools are all about giving right instructions and so when students know how to direct and guide chatgpt and with matching humanize command, it gives me hard time na mo identify sa ilang work mam na AI diay siya. Some even use Grammarly or QuillBot to alter the AI-generated drafts, making them appear more personalized. These modifications blur the line between original and assisted writing, especially when the content is well-organized and contextually accurate.*
>
> (It is difficult to identify AI-generated text when students refine the output by mixing their original ideas or paraphrasing content from ChatGPT, and when students are very good at giving commands to AI tools, ma'am. We know that AI tools are all about giving the right instructions, and so when students know how to direct and guide ChatGPT with humanized commands, it gives me a hard time identifying their work as AI-generated, ma'am. Some even use Grammarly or QuillBot to alter the AI-generated drafts, making them appear more personalized. These modifications blur the line between original and assisted writing, especially when the content is well-organized and contextually accurate.)

Informant 2 shared their experience that it's difficult to identify when students paraphrase or revise AI output, as the edited content can closely resemble original work. She shared that;

> *Base sa akong experience, lisod gyud mailhan kung kanus-a nag-paraphrase o nag-revise ang mga estudyante sa output gikan sa AI. Mahimo gyud ni nga moparehas sa original output.*
>
> (Based on my experience, it is difficult to identify when the students paraphrase or revise the output from AI. It can appear as original output.)

Difficult with Well-crafted Work. Teachers find it increasingly difficult to identify AI-generated content when the output is well-crafted, natural-sounding, or "humanized." This challenge is compounded by the imperfections of current AI detection tools, which may fail to flag sophisticated AI-generated text, leading to a dilemma when assessing the work of genuinely good writers whose outputs might inadvertently resemble AI perfection. The subtle use of AI for brainstorming or initial structuring, where students then

write the content themselves, further complicates detection, creating a fine line between legitimate assistance and academic dishonesty.

Informant 3 noted that it's difficult with well-crafted work to discern if the submission is genuinely human written, especially since even AI detection tools are not perfect at identifying such outputs. She explained that;

> *Lisod na gyud mailhan kung ang answer nga ilang gi submit kay well-crafted o mas natural o mas humanized. Murag sila gyud ang nagsulat kay ila man ang mga pulong. Dugang pa, lisod ni tungod kay sa akong tan-aw, bisan ang mga AI detection tools dili perpekto. Mao nga kung ma-detect nga okay ang ilang tubag, posibleng tungod kay ang mga AI detection tools mismo dili gyud perpekto para makaila niini.*
>
> (It is difficult to identify when their answer submitted is well-crafted or, let us say, more natural or more humanized. It seems like they wrote it because the words are theirs. Another thing, it is difficult because I think even AI detection tools are not perfect. So, once it can be detected that their answer is okay, it is because even the AI detection tools are not perfect enough to determine it.)

Informant 8 described the difficulty with well-crafted work when students use AI subtly for brainstorming or structuring, making the final, human-written product almost impossible to detect as AI-assisted. She claimed that;

> *Kung ang mga estudyante mogamit lang og AI para sa brainstorming ideas o pag-structure og essay, unya sila ra mismo ang mosulat sa content, halos imposible gyud ni ma-detect. Ang final product ila man, pero ang initial inspiration gikan sa AI. Kining subtle use sa AI para sa pre-writing lisod kaayo i-pinpoint. Usa ni ka fine line tali sa assistance ug cheating.*
> (When students only use AI for brainstorming ideas or structuring an essay, and then write the content themselves, it is almost impossible to detect. The final product is their own, but the initial inspiration came from AI. This subtle use of AI for pre-writing is very hard to pinpoint. It's a fine line between assistance and cheating.)

AI Outputs Becoming Contextualized. Participants observe that AI is increasingly capable of generating content that is contextually relevant to local settings, especially when students provide specific prompts. This advancement makes it harder to detect AI involvement, as the output no longer appears generic but rather aligns well with specific lessons and local contexts, indicating AI's growing ability to adapt and become more specific in its responses.

Informant 5 observed that AI outputs are becoming contextualized, as AI can now generate content that is locally relevant when students provide specific prompts, making detection more challenging. She shared that;

> *Ang AI makahimo na karon og content nga contextually relevant sa atong local setting, labi na kung ang mga estudyante mohatag og specific prompts.*

Dili na lang ni generic information. Nakapalisod ni sa pag-spot kay ang content murag haom gyud sa atong mga lessons. Nagkat-on ang AI nga mahimong mas specific. Mo-adapt gyud ni sa prompt og maayo.
(The AI can now generate content that is contextually relevant to our local setting, especially if students give it specific prompts. It is no longer just generic information. This makes it harder to spot because the content seems to fit our lessons. The AI is learning to be more specific. It adapts to the prompt very well.)

Need for Careful Judgments for Outputs of Good Writers. A significant dilemma for teachers is the need for extremely careful judgments when assessing the outputs of genuinely good writers, whose work can sometimes exhibit a level of perfection that resembles AI-generated content. This overlap makes it challenging to differentiate between a naturally talented student and one who might be using AI, leading to a fear of falsely accusing innocent students and highlighting the critical importance of meticulous and nuanced evaluation.

Informant 6 highlighted the need for careful judgment for outputs of good writers, as their genuinely high-quality work can sometimes resemble AI-generated perfection, creating a dilemma for teachers. She expressed that;

Naa gyu'y ubang estudyante nga genuinely good writers, ug ang ilang work usahay murag AI-generated perfection. Mao ni ang nakapalisod pag-ila labi na sa usa ka naturally talented student ug sa usa nga naggamit og AI. Dili ko gusto nga akusahan ang usa ka inosente nga estudyante. Nakahimo ni og dilemma para sa amoa nga mga magtutudlo. Kinahanglan gyud mi nga very careful sa among mga judgments.

(Some students are genuinely good writers, and their work can sometimes resemble AI-generated perfection. This makes it hard to distinguish between a naturally talented student and one using AI. I do not want to accuse an innocent student. It creates a dilemma for us teachers. We must be very careful with our judgments.)

No Consistent AI Style. The absence of a consistent AI style across different models and student uses makes detection particularly challenging. Participants note that various AI tools can produce diverse outputs, and students may utilize a range of these tools, eliminating a single, clear set of characteristics to look for. This variability adds to the difficulty, making AI-generated text feel like a ghost—known to be present but not always clearly discernible.

Informant 7 pointed out that the lack of a consistent AI style makes detection difficult, as different AI models and student usage patterns result in varied outputs, making it hard to identify common characteristics. She expressed that;

Ang kawala'y consistent AI style maoy nakapalisod. Ang lain-laing AI models basin lahi-lahi og output ang ihatag, ug ang mga estudyante naggamit og lain-laing tools. Wala na'y usa ka klaro nga set sa mga characteristics nga pangitaon. Mura naman ug multo; kabalo ka nga naa

pero dili nimo pirmi makita sa klaro. Kining variability maoy nakadugang sa kalisod.

(The lack of a consistent AI style makes it challenging. Different AI models might produce different outputs, and students use various tools. There is not one clear set of characteristics to look for anymore. It is like trying to identify a ghost; you know it's there, but you cannot always see it. This variability adds to the difficulty.)

Reliability and Practicality of Current AI Detection Tools

This section additionally presents the results to the specific research question 2.2: "How reliable and practical do you find current AI detection tools?" under the second major research question, "What are the challenges of language teachers in determining AI-generated language output?" The following themes served as results, which were: Not Efficient, Not Quite Reliable and Practical, Not Always Dependable, Not Totally Accurate, Reliable but Impractical, and Confusing and Unreliable.

Not Efficient. Participants consistently highlighted that AI detection tools introduce significant inefficiencies into the assessment process. They described these tools as adding an extra layer of tedious work, consuming valuable time that could otherwise be dedicated to direct instruction or providing meaningful feedback. Furthermore, concerns were raised about the ethical implications of data privacy when uploading student work to third-party platforms, and the limited educational value of tools that merely flag AI use without fostering genuine understanding of academic integrity. Informant 5 highlighted how these tools add an extra layer of work, consuming valuable teaching time. She shared that;

Nagdugang gyud sila og laing layer of work sa akong assessment process. Imbes nga magbasa lang ug mo-evaluate, kinahanglan na kong mo-copy-paste og text sa usa ka detector ug maghulat sa results. Nakakaon ni og bililhong oras nga mahimo unta nako magamit para sa aktuwal nga pagtudlo o paghatag og meaningful feedback. Usa ni ka extra step nga makapahinay sa tanan. Dili gyud sila efficient para sa mga busy teachers.

(They add another layer of work to my assessment process. Instead of just reading and evaluating, I now have to copy-paste text into a detector and wait for results. This takes up valuable time that I could be using for actual teaching or giving meaningful feedback. It's an extra step that slows everything down. They are not very efficient for busy teachers.)

Informant 6 explained that these tools are more useful for confirming existing suspicions rather than initiating detection, underscoring their limited primary efficiency. She expressed that;

Mas makita nako sila nga useful para sa pag-confirm sa akong mga pagduda kaysa sa pagsugod. Kung naa na ko'y dakong pagbati nga ang usa ka paper kay AI-generated, basin suportahan to sa tool. Pero dili gyud ko moakusar og estudyante base lang sa report sa detection tool. Ang akong own judgment ug knowledge sa estudyante mao gihapon ang labaw sa tanan. Sila usa lang ka supplement, dili replacement.

(I find them more useful for confirming my suspicions rather than initiating them. If I already have a strong feeling that a paper is AI-generated, the tool

might support that. But I would never accuse a student based solely on a detection tool's report. My own judgment and knowledge of the student remain paramount. They are a supplement, not a replacement.)

Informant 9 expressed concerns about data privacy when using online tools, which makes them less efficient due to ethical considerations regarding student information. She shared that;

> *Naa gyu'y concern bahin sa data privacy kung mogamit aning mga online tools. Nag-problema ko sa pag-upload sa student work, nga basin naa'y personal information, ngadto sa mga third-party websites. Dili kanunay klaro kung giunsa nila pag-handle ang data. Kining ethical concern maoy nakapahimo nako nga magduha-duha sa kanunay nga paggamit niini. Kinahanglan nato protektahan ang information sa atong mga estudyante.*
> (There is a concern about data privacy when using these online tools. I worry about uploading student work, which might contain personal information, to third-party websites. It's not always clear how they handle the data. This ethical concern makes me hesitant to use them frequently. We need to protect our students' information.)

Informant 10 stated that these tools fail to educate students on academic integrity, acting merely as detection mechanisms rather than effective teaching aids. She shard that;

> *Wala sila nagtudlo sa mga estudyante bahin sa academic integrity. Bisag basin ma-flag nila ang paggamit sa AI, dili sila mo-explain nganong sayop ni o unsaon pagsulat og authentically. Usa lang sila ka detection mechanism, dili educational tool. Kinahanglan nato og mga solusyon nga nag-promote og learning, dili lang pag-policing. Dili sila makatabang sa mga estudyante nga mapaayo ang ilang writing.*
> (They do not teach students anything about academic integrity. While they might flag AI use, they do not explain *why* it is wrong or how to write authentically. They are just a detection mechanism, not an educational tool. We need solutions that promote learning, not just policing. They do not help students improve their writing.)

Not Quite Reliable and Practical. A recurring sentiment among participants was that AI detection tools are not entirely reliable or practical for widespread use. Teachers noted the inherent inaccuracies and potential for errors within the AI tools themselves, making them less than 100% dependable. Additionally, many tools were described as lacking user-friendliness, featuring complex interfaces or requiring specific file formats, which creates a significant barrier for busy educators who require simple and intuitive solutions. This combination of unreliability and impracticality limits their effective integration into classroom assessment. Informant 3 asserted that these tools are unreliable due to inherent mistakes and the potential for AI answers to change, making them less than 100% dependable. She explained that;

> *Dili siya kaayo reliable and practical as what I have said before that even AI kay naa poy some mistakes or even in small edits, pwede gyud pong ikaw na ang mag change iyahang answer so dili siya ana ka reliable. And at the same time, of course, kay binuhat raman gihapon siya sa tao, mao nang I believe so, you can't always rely it 100%. And I think AI, dili siyang anak ka*

> *solid mo hatag o proof, even the answers you get, even the ideas you will have kay I think more on guesses, possible situations lang siya, but when it comes to proof, I think you shouldn't rely on it too much.*
> (It is not very reliable and practical, as I have said before, that even AI can have some mistakes, or even with small edits or prompts, its answer can change, so it is not that reliable. And at the same time, of course, because it is still created by humans, that is why I believe you cannot always rely on it 100%. And I think AI is not that solid in providing proof; even the answers you get, even the ideas you will have, I think are more on guesses, just possible situations, but when it comes to proof, I think you should not rely on it too much.)

Informant 8 pointed out that some tools are not user-friendly due to complicated interfaces or specific file format requirements, making them impractical for busy teachers. She shared that;

> *Ang ubang mga tools dili kaayo user-friendly. Basin naa sila'y mga complicated interfaces o mangayo og specific file formats nga dili sayon. Nakapahimo ni nila nga dili kaayo praktikal para sa mga teachers nga busy na daan ug dili kaayo tech-savvy. Kinahanglan gyud nato og something nga simple ug intuitive gamiton. Ang complexity usa ka barrier para sa daghan kanato.*
> (Some tools are not very user-friendly. They might have complicated interfaces or require specific file formats that are inconvenient. This makes them less practical for teachers who are already busy and not highly tech-savvy. We need something simple and intuitive to use. Complexity is a barrier for many of us.)

Not Always Dependable. Participants expressed a strong consensus that current AI detection tools are not always dependable. They highlighted instances where these tools incorrectly flagged original student work as AI-generated, while simultaneously failing to identify genuinely AI-written content. This unreliability, coupled with the high cost of subscriptions and general inaccessibility for many teachers, means that educators cannot solely rely on these tools. Instead, they are often used as a secondary, limited check, with teachers ultimately depending on their professional judgment and familiarity with their students' writing patterns.

Informant 1 explained that these tools are unreliable, especially for teachers who cannot afford subscriptions, as they sometimes misidentify original student work as AI-generated. He shard that;

> *The AI detection tools we currently have right now mam are not always dependable. Labi na sa atoa mam na mga uyamot raman ta na mga teachers and we cannot afford to subscribe in any AI detection tool. Some of them flag original student writing as AI-generated while letting actual AI-written content pass through mao akong pagka balo mam. Additionally, these tools are often inaccessible and too expensive para sa akoa mam. Relying solely on them is not practical, so I use them only as a secondary check with*

> *limitation kay tong free raman akong makaya mam while still depending on my professional judgment and familiarity with my students' writing patterns.*
> (The AI detection tools we currently have right now, ma'am, are not always dependable. Especially for us, ma'am, who are just humble teachers and cannot afford to subscribe to any AI detection tool. Some of them flag original student writing as AI-generated while letting actual AI-written content pass through, as far as I know, ma'am. Additionally, these tools are often inaccessible and too expensive for me, ma'am. Relying solely on them is not practical, so I use them only as a secondary check with limitations, because I can only afford the free ones, ma'am, while still depending on my professional judgment and familiarity with my students' writing patterns.)

Not Totally Accurate. The lack of complete accuracy in AI detection tools was a significant concern for participants. Teachers explicitly stated their belief that most of these tools are not 100% precise in identifying AI-generated content. This fundamental inaccuracy leads them to question the practicality of investing in or heavily relying on such tools, as their outputs cannot be fully trusted as definitive indicators of AI use. Informant 2 expressed their belief that most such tools are not 100% accurate and are impractical for investment. She expressed that;

> *Para nako, kadaghanan sa mga AI detection tools dili 100% accurate, ug dili practical nga mag-invest og ingon ana nga matang sa tools.*
> (For me, most AI detection tools are not 100% accurate, and it is not practical to invest in these kinds of tools.)

Reliable but Impractical. While acknowledging the potential reliability of AI detection tools in identifying AI-generated content, participants largely found them to be impractical for implementation. The primary reasons cited were the substantial financial burden of subscriptions and the immense time commitment required to process large volumes of student work, particularly hard copies that necessitate manual scanning. This practical barrier significantly outweighs any perceived reliability, making comprehensive use of these tools unfeasible for teachers with numerous students.

Informant 4 stated that while these tools might be reliable, their practicality is hindered by subscription costs and the significant time required to manually scan numerous hard copy student submissions. She claimed that;

> *Reliable na ba na practically you can currently AI detection pose? It's reliable naman but when it comes to practicality, I think using the AI detection tool for me, it's very impractical because of course, first you have to make subscription, you have to pay for it. So that's another one. And then, you know, detecting them, all of them, for example, in my case I have few sections and then each of them 42, so 120 plus, it would really take time to spend some, it would really take time na each and every work na AI. So as a teacher, you really, siguro, especially hard copy, we are asking for hard copy. Although there are some na mopasa gani, ug soft copy, pero mostly talaga hard copy because I wanted to read their works.*

(Are these current AI detection tools reliable and practical? It is reliable, but when it comes to practicality, I think using the AI detection tool for me is very impractical because, of course, first, you must subscribe, and you have to pay for it. So that's another issue. And then, you know, detecting all of them, for example, in my case, I have a few sections, and each of them has 42 students, so 120 plus students. It would really take time to spend on each work to check for AI. So as a teacher, you, perhaps, especially with hard copies, we are asking for hard copies because I wanted to read their works, it is different.)

Confusing and Unreliable. Participants found AI detection tools to be confusing and unreliable due to the inconsistencies in their results. They observed that different tools often produced vastly varying assessments for the same piece of text, with one tool indicating high AI involvement while another suggested minimal. This significant lack of standardization and agreement among the tools makes it incredibly difficult for teachers to determine which results to trust, adding a considerable layer of uncertainty and frustration to the assessment process. Informant 7 explained that the inconsistent results from different tools make them highly confusing and unreliable for teachers. She expressed that;

Ang results gikan sa lain-laing AI detection tools magkalahi gyud kaayo para sa parehas nga piece of text. Ang usa ka tool moingon nga 90% AI, samtang ang lain moingon nga 10% human. Kining inconsistency maoy nakapahimo nila nga very confusing ug unreliable. Lisod gyud mahibalo kung asa ang saligan, kung naa man gani. Kining lack of standardization usa ka dakong problema.

(The results from different AI detection tools can vary wildly for the same piece of text. One tool might say it's 90% AI, while another says 10% human. This inconsistency makes them very confusing and unreliable. It's hard to know which one to trust, if any. This lack of standardization is a major problem.)

Time and Resource Implications of Determining Authenticity of Student Work

This section further presents the results to the specific research question 2.3: "What are the time and resource implications of determining the authenticity of student work in the face of AI-generated content?" under the second major research question, "What are the challenges of language teachers in determining AI-generated language output?" The following themes served as results, which were: Demanding Extra Time, Need for AI Literacy and Detection Strategy, Need for Stable Internet Connection, and Huge Emotional and Mental Toll.

Demanding Extra Time. Participants consistently highlighted that addressing AI-generated content significantly increases their workload, demanding extra time and effort. This burden extends beyond just using detection tools; it involves manual checking, comparing student outputs, and even engaging in sensitive discussions with students, parents, and administrators. Teachers expressed that this shift diverts precious time away from actual teaching and providing meaningful feedback, transforming their role from educators to "policing and detecting." This added layer of responsibility consumes both their professional and personal time, creating immense pressure on their schedules and planning.

Informant 1 elaborated on how determining the authenticity of student work now demands extra time and effort, leading to increased workload and pressure. He shared that;

> *Determining the authenticity of student work now demands extra time and effort. Syempre, it means more work and less time for your personal matters. I spend more hours reviewing submissions, unya comparing with previous work, ug preparing alternative assessments like interviews or handwritten drafts. It also takes emotional energy to address suspected misuse in a way that maintains trust while upholding academic standards. This shift has added a layer of pressure to my workload and planning.*
> (Determining the authenticity of student work now demands extra time and effort. It means more work and less time for your matters. I spend more hours reviewing submissions, comparing with previous work, and preparing alternative assessments like interviews or handwritten drafts. It also takes emotional energy to address suspected misuse in a way that maintains trust while upholding academic standards. This shift has added a layer of pressure to my workload and planning.)

Informant 2 stated that verifying student output demands extra time and adds to the workload, with time constraints being the biggest issue. She explained that;

> *Ang pag-verify sa output sa matag estudyante makadugang og extra workload sa pag-ila sa authenticity. Ang time constraints maoy pinakadakong problema.*
> (Verifying each student's output adds extra workload on identifying the authenticity. Time constraints are the major issue.)

Informant 3 explained that assessing the authenticity of AI-generated content demands extra time due to the need for both AI detection tools and manual checking, as well as comparing student work. She discussed that;

> *I think this will take a lot more of time simply because aside nga mag-AI detection tools ka, you also have to do manual checking and you have to compare the students from one student to another. So para sa akoa, it takes a lot of time and it's of course the resources kay you need to go with AI detection tools, AI website and at the same time, of course, the internet naman diba. And even your own resources as well. So mao nang mas bugat siya kung ato ang kuhaon yun iyang authenticity. You need to work harder to put a lot of effort kay para makainon yun ka that the checking, ang pag-check sa papel kay more reliable yun.*
> (I think this will take a lot more time. This is simply because aside from using AI detection tools, you also must do manual checking, and you must compare the students' work from one student to another. So, for me, it takes a lot of time, and of course, there are resource implications because you need to use AI detection tools, AI websites, and at the same time, of course, the internet. And even your resources as well. So that's why it's a heavier

burden if we want to confirm its authenticity. You need to work harder and put in a lot of effort so that you can say the checking of the papers is more reliable.)

Informant 4 emphasized that the process of verifying student work demands extra time, which is the most precious resource, especially for a part-time teacher. She claimed that;

Mao gyud. Naga-usik gyud ni og oras, ug gawas sa resources, kinahanglan pa gyud bayran. Bisag daghan na karong mga cracks (alternatives/workarounds), medyo affordable na man unta ang pagbayad. Pero ang process sa oras, mao gyud ang pinaka-precious sa tanan. Para nako, isip usa ka part-time teacher, daghan gyud og concerns. So, ang oras gyud ang challenge. Bisag gusto nako hatagan og hustisya ang trabaho, buhaton gyud nako. Pero sa high school, dili na nako makaya. So, salamat.
(It takes time, and aside from resources, you must pay for it. Although there are many cracks now, it is already affordable to pay for it. However, the process of time is the most precious of all. As a part-time teacher, there are many concerns. So, the time is the challenge. Although I wanted to give the job, I will do it. But in high school, I could not do it. So, thank you.)

Informant 8 highlighted that the shift to policing and detecting AI use demands extra time, diverting focus from teaching and learning to verification. She highlighted that;

Mao ni ang naka pa usab sa atong focus gikan sa teaching and learning ngadto sa policing and detecting. Imbes nga mogahin og oras sa meaningful feedback nga makatabang sa grow sa mga estudyante, akong gigahin sa verification. Gipa usab gyud ni ang dynamic sa classroom ug ang purpose sa assessment. Usa ni ka misallocation sa atong pinaka bililhon nga resource: ang teaching time.
(It shifts our focus from teaching and learning to policing and detecting. Instead of spending time on meaningful feedback that helps students grow, I am spending it on verification. This changes the dynamic of the classroom and the purpose of assessment. It is a misallocation of our most valuable resource: teaching time.)

Informant 9 noted that resolving cases of suspected AI use, including discussions with various stakeholders, demands extra time and adds to administrative burdens. She discussed that;

Ang oras nga gigahin sa pag resolve sa mga kaso sa pagduda nga paggamit og AI, apil na ang mga panaghisgot uban sa mga estudyante, ginikanan, ug mga administrador, grabe kaayo kadako. Kining mga panag-istoryahanay sensitibo ug dugay. Makakuha ni og oras gikan sa instructional time ug makadugang sa mga administrative burdens. Usa ni ka bag-ong layer sa conflict resolution.
(The time spent on resolving cases of suspected AI use, including discussions with students, parents, and administrators, is immense. These

conversations can be sensitive and lengthy. It takes away from instructional time and adds to administrative burdens. It's a whole new layer of conflict resolution.)

Need for AI Literacy and Detection Strategy. Participants highlighted a critical need for enhanced AI literacy and effective detection strategies among educators. They expressed a strong desire for more professional development, emphasizing that teachers require training on how to identify AI-generated content, utilize detection tools, and adapt their pedagogical approaches. Without such support, teachers feel compelled to discover these methods independently, leading to a significant resource issue. There is also a call for access to updated research and best practices to stay informed about the latest AI trends and detection methods, acknowledging this as a demanding but crucial ongoing learning curve.

Informant 6 emphasized the need for AI literacy and detection strategies, highlighting the necessity for more professional development and training for teachers to effectively spot and manage AI use. She explained that

Kinahanglan gyud namo og dugang professional development bahin sa AI literacy ug detection strategies, nga nag kinahanglan og oras ug pondo. Kinahanglan ma-train ang mga magtutudlo kung unsaon pag-spot ang AI, unsaon paggamit sa mga detection tools, ug unsaon pag-adapt sa ilang pedagogy. Kung walay ingon ani nga training, kami ra ang mag-iyahay og diskobre. Kining kawala sa suporta usa ka dakong resource issue.

(We need more professional development on AI literacy and detection strategies, which requires both time and funding. Teachers need to be trained on how to spot AI, how to use detection tools, and how to adapt their pedagogy. Without this training, we're left to figure things out on our own. This lack of support is a major resource issue.)

Informant 10 stressed the need for AI literacy and detection strategies, specifically access to updated research and best practices to stay informed about the latest AI trends and detection methods. He shared that;

Kinahanglan gyud namo og access sa mga updated research ug best practices bahin sa AI sa education, nga nagkinahanglan og oras para sa pagbasa ug professional learning. Ang pagpabilin nga informed bahin sa mga labing bag-o nga AI trends ug detection methods kritikal apan demanding. Usa ni ka padayon nga learning curve nga nagkinahanglan og gipahinungod nga resources. Dili gyud mi angay magpabiling ulahi.

(We need access to updated research and best practices on AI in education, which requires time for reading and professional learning. Staying informed about the latest AI trends and detection methods is crucial but demanding. It is a continuous learning curve that requires dedicated resources. We can't afford to fall behind.)

Need for Stable Internet Connection. A significant barrier to implementing AI-related solutions in language education, as identified by participants, is the lack of reliable internet access. This issue affects

both the school environment and many students' homes. The participant explicitly states that stable connectivity is fundamental for utilizing online detection tools or integrating AI-powered assignments. This infrastructure gap renders many potential solutions impractical, underscoring it as a basic yet critical resource problem in their local context.

Informant 7 highlighted the need for a stable internet connection as a fundamental barrier, making it impractical to implement online detection tools or AI-integrated assignments without reliable connectivity. She explained that;

> *Ang kawala'y reliable internet access sa school ug para sa daghang estudyante sa balay usa ka dako kaayong barrier. Kung gusto ta mogamit og online detection tools o AI-integrated assignments, kinahanglan gyud nato og stable connectivity. Kining infrastructure gap maoy nakapahimo nga dili praktikal ang pag-implementar sa daghang solusyon. Usa ni ka fundamental resource problem dinhi sa Monkayo.*
>
> (The lack of reliable internet access at school and for many students at home is a huge barrier. If we want to use online detection tools or AI-integrated assignments, we need stable connectivity. This infrastructure gap makes it impractical to implement many solutions. It's a fundamental resource problem here in Monkayo.)

Huge Emotional and Mental Toll. participants revealed that managing AI-generated student work exacts a huge emotional and mental toll on teachers. The constant suspicion surrounding student outputs is described as exhausting and fosters a pervasive sense of distrust. The disheartening realization that students might be resorting to deception significantly affects teacher morale, making their work feel less rewarding. This emotional burden, though unseen, is a heavy and impactful consequence of the proliferation of AI in academic submissions.

Informant 5 described the huge emotional and mental toll that the constant suspicion of student work takes on teachers, leading to fatigue, distrust, and a negative impact on morale. She mentioned that;

> *Naa gyu'y dakong emotional ug mental toll para kanamo nga mga teachers. Ang kanunay nga pagduda sa work sa mga estudyante makakapoy ug makamugna og pagbati sa distrust. Makapaluya ang paghunahuna nga basin naglimbong ang mga estudyante, ug makaapekto kini sa among morale. Kining emotional burden usa ka dili makita apan bug-at nga epekto. Makapahimo kini sa among trabaho nga dili kaayo rewarding.*
>
> (There is a significant emotional and mental toll on us teachers. Constantly suspecting students' work can be draining and creates a sense of distrust. It is disheartening to think that students might be cheating, and it affects our morale. This emotional burden is an unseen but heavy implication. It makes our job feel less rewarding.)

Problems Encountered in Determining AI-generated Output

This section further presents the findings of the research question, 2.4. ‘What are the problems you encountered in determining the output AI generated?’ under the 2nd major question, ‘What are the

challenges of language teachers in determining AI-generated language output? The following are the themes are Perfect AI Output, Unreliable AI Detection Tools, No Unique AI Signature, Difficult to prove the Source of Idea, Time Constraint, Generic Nature of other AI Output, Fast Evolution of Detection Methods, Students Becoming Aware of Detection Methods.

Perfect AI Output. Participants frequently cited the uncanny perfection of AI-generated work as a significant problem in identification. This flawless grammar and spelling often stand in stark contrast to a student's typical writing, immediately raising suspicion. However, the challenge lies in proving AI involvement without concrete evidence, as teachers are hesitant to accuse students based solely on perfection, leading to a sense of helplessness when definitive proof is elusive. This issue is further complicated when students subtly edit AI-generated text, blending human touches that make detection by tools or even the human eye incredibly difficult. Moreover, distinguishing between a naturally gifted student writer and one using AI becomes a sensitive and ambiguous task, as teachers are wary of unjustly accusing diligent students.

Informant 1 articulated that the perfect AI output, characterized by flawless grammar and spelling, is a significant problem, as it immediately raises suspicion but is difficult to prove without definitive evidence. He shared that;

> *Ang usa sa pinakadakong problema kay ang grabeng perfection sa grammar ug spelling. Ang akong mga estudyante talagsa ra makahimo og trabaho nga walay bisan gamayng sayop, mao nga kung ang usa ka essay walay depekto, diha-diha dayon makapaduda ni. Apan, ang pagpamatuod nga AI kini nga walay lig-ong ebidensya lisod kaayo. Dili lang ko basta makaakusar og estudyante base lang sa perfection. Makapaluya gyud ang kawala'y definitive proof.*
>
> (One major problem is the sheer perfection of the grammar and spelling. My students rarely produce work without any errors, so when an essay is flawless, it immediately triggers suspicion. However, proving it is AI without concrete evidence is very difficult. I cannot just accuse a student based on perfection alone. It's a frustrating lack of definitive proof.)

Informant 2 highlighted a problem where students subtly edit AI-generated text, making the perfect AI output difficult to detect by both tools and the teacher's eye, creating a hybrid that is almost impossible to identify. She clarified that;

> *Kanang usa pa ka problema kay kung ang mga estudyante subtil kaayo nga mag-edit sa AI-generated text. Basin mag-ilis sila og pipila ka words o mag-rephrase og mga sentence, nga makapalisod sa mga detection tools o bisan sa akong kaugalingong mata nga makamatikod. Kining human touch mosagol sa AI, maghimo og hybrid nga halos imposible na gyud mailhan. Murag mangita ka og multo; ma feel nimo ang presensya pero dili nimo magunitan. Kini ang nakapahimo sa among trabaho nga mas komplikado.*
>
> (Another problem is when students subtly edit the AI-generated text. They might change a few words or rephrase sentences, making it harder for detection tools or even my eye to spot. This human touch blends with the AI, creating a hybrid that is almost impossible to definitively categorize. It

is like finding a ghost; you feel its presence but cannot grasp it. This makes our job much more complex.)

Informant 4 described the challenge of differentiating between a naturally gifted student writer and one using AI, as the perfect AI output can resemble high-quality human work, leading to hesitation in confronting students without absolute certainty. She discussed that;

Lisod gyud i-differentiate ang usa ka naturally gifted student writer ug ang usa nga naggamit og AI. Ang ubang estudyante nako tinuod gyud nga talented ug makahimo og high-quality work. Dili ko gusto nga dili makiangayon nga accuse ang usa ka kugihan nga estudyante og pagpanglimbong. Kining ambiguity makapahimo nako nga magduha-duha sa pag confront sa mga estudyante kung walay hingpit nga kasiguradohan. Usa ni ka sensitibo kaayo nga linya nga lakwan.

(It is hard to differentiate between a naturally gifted student writer and one using AI. Some of my students are genuinely talented and produce high-quality work. I do not want to unfairly accuse a diligent student of cheating. This ambiguity makes me hesitant to confront students without absolute certainty. It is a very sensitive line to walk.)

Unreliable AI Detection Tools. A major problem highlighted by participants is the inherent unreliability of current AI detection tools. These tools often produce false positives, incorrectly flagging original student work as AI-generated, which causes distress. Conversely, they also fail to detect clearly AI-generated papers, undermining teachers' trust in their accuracy. This inconsistency means educators cannot rely on technology for definitive answers, leading to more confusion than clarity in the assessment process. Informant 3, explained that;

Ang mga AI detection tools mismo usa ka problema tungod kay kasagaran dili kini kasaligan. Kanunay silang mohatag og false positives, diin ang trabaho sa inosenteng estudyante ma-flag nga AI-generated, nga makapaguol. Sa pikas bahin, ang ubang mga papel nga klaro nga AI-generated dili usab ma-detect, nga makapahuyang sa atong pagsalig sa mga himan. Kining inconsistency nagpasabot nga dili gyud ko makasalig sa teknolohiya para sa depinitibo nga tubag. Nagdugang kini og dugang kalibog kaysa katin-awan.

(The AI detection tools themselves are a problem because they are often unreliable. They frequently give false positives, flagging innocent student work as AI-generated, which causes distress. Conversely, some clearly AI-generated papers slip through undetected, undermining our trust in the tools. This inconsistency means I cannot fully rely on technology for a definitive answer. It adds more confusion than clarity.)

No Unique AI Signature Participants identified the absence of a consistent AI signature as a significant challenge. With various AI models producing diverse outputs and students utilizing different tools, there is no single, reliable pattern or style that teachers can consistently look for. This diversity in AI-generated

content makes it difficult to create a dependable mental checklist for detection, akin to trying to catch smoke due to the elusive nature of AI's varied outputs. Informant 3, shared that;

> *Ang kawala'y unique AI signature usa ka problema. Lahi-lahi ang mga output sa lain-laing AI models, ug ang mga estudyante naggamit og nagkalain-laing tools. Walay usa ka consistent pattern o style nga kanunay nakong pangitaon. Kining diversity sa AI output nakapalisod sa paghimo og kasaligan nga mental checklist. Murag maningkamot ka og dakop og aso.*
>
> (The lack of a unique AI signature is a problem. Different AI models produce varied outputs, and students use a wide range of tools. There is no one consistent pattern or style that I can always look for. This diversity in AI output makes it harder to develop a reliable mental checklist. It's like trying to catch smoke.)

Difficult to Prove the Source of Idea. Teachers face considerable difficulty in proving the true source of ideas when students use AI for initial brainstorming or outlining. Even if the final written product is the student's own, the origin of the foundational ideas remains ambiguous. This subtle integration of AI in the early stages of the writing process makes it almost impossible to definitively identify, blurring the line between legitimate assistance and academic dishonesty.

Informant 6 explained that it is difficult to prove the source of an idea when students use AI for brainstorming or outlining, as the final written product can still be their own, blurring the line between assistance and authorship. She mentioned that;

> *Kung ang mga estudyante mogamit lang og AI para sa brainstorming o outlining, ang katapusang sinulat nga produkto mahimo gihapon nga ila. Lisod kaayo pamatud-an kung ang pasiunang mga ideya gikan ba sa AI o sa ilang kaugalingong hunahuna. Kining maliputon nga paghiusa sa AI sa sayong bahin sa pagsulat halos imposible na mailhan. Nakapalubog kini sa linya tali sa assistance ug authorship.*
>
> (When students use AI only for brainstorming or outlining, the final written product can still be their own. It is very difficult to prove if the initial ideas came from AI or their mind. This subtle integration of AI into the early stages of writing is almost impossible to detect. It blurs the line between assistance and authorship.)

Time Constraint. The significant time constraint faced by teachers is a major problem in effectively detecting AI-generated content. Large class sizes and numerous assignments mean educators lack sufficient time for detailed analysis of each paper for AI indicators. This practical limitation, coupled with other teaching duties, often results in some AI-generated work going unnoticed, making detection a constant "battle against time."

Informant 7 identified time constraints as a major problem, as large class sizes and numerous assignments prevent detailed analysis of every paper for AI indicators, meaning some AI-generated work may go unnoticed. She discussed that;

> *Ang time constraint usa gyud ka dakong problema. Tungod sa dagko nga class sizes ug daghan nga assignments, wala gyud ko'y igong oras nga detalyado nga i-analyze ang matag usa ka paper para sa mga timailhan sa AI. Naa pa ko'y ubang teaching duties nga nanginahanglan sa akong atensyon. Kining practical limitation nagpasabot nga ang ubang AI-generated work mahimong dili gyud mamatikdan. Usa gyud ni ka kanunay nga gubat batok sa oras.*
> (The time constraint is a huge problem. With large class sizes and many assignments, I simply do not have enough time to meticulously analyze every single paper for AI signs. I have other teaching duties that demand my attention. This practical limitation means some AI-generated work might inevitably go unnoticed. It's a constant battle against the clock.)

Generic Nature of other AI Output. The generic nature of some AI outputs presents a unique problem, as these texts do not necessarily stand out as too good or too complex. Instead, they often appear average or uninspired, blending in with typical student writing that might also lack originality or depth. This mediocrity means AI-generated content doesn't always raise immediate red flags, making it harder to pinpoint and allowing it to pass unnoticed within a large volume of submissions.

Informant 8 noted that the generic nature of other AI output poses a problem because it doesn't always stand out as too good or too complex, making it blend with typical student writing that may also lack originality or depth. She explained that;

> *Ang generic nature sa ubang AI output mahimong problema. Dili kini molutaw nga too good o too complex, apan, kasagaran, morag average o walay inspirasyon. Kini ang nakapahimo nga mosagol kini sa tipikal nga sinulat sa estudyante nga mahimo usab nga dili orihinal o lacking depth. Dili kini dayon makapataas og red flags, nga makapalisod sa pagtumbok. Moagi lang kini nga mediocre.*
> (The generic nature of some AI output can be a problem. It does not stand out as too good or too complex, but rather as just average or uninspired. This makes it blend in with typical student writing that might also be not original or lacking depth. It does not raise immediate red flags, making it harder to pinpoint. It just passes as mediocre.)

Fast Evolution of Detection Methods. Participants highlighted that the rapid evolution of AI technology means that detection methods quickly become outdated. As soon as educators learn to identify one type of AI output, a newer, more sophisticated version emerges. This creates a continuous race to catch up with technology, making detection efforts feel futile at times and leaving teachers constantly playing catch-up in a rapidly changing landscape.

Informant 9 highlighted the problem of the fast evolution of detection methods, as AI technology advances rapidly, making current detection techniques quickly obsolete and creating a continuous race to keep up. She explained that;

> *Ang paspas nga evolution sa AI technology nagpasabot nga ang mga detection methods dali ra usab mawala sa uso. Sa diha nga makat-on kita*

sa pag-ila sa usa ka matang sa AI output, usa ka bag-o, mas sophisticated version ang mugawas. Usa ni ka padayon nga lumba sa pag-apas sa teknolohiya. Kining paspas nga pagbag-o maoy nakapahimo sa atong mga paningkamot nga murag walay pulos usahay. Kanunay gyud ta nga nag-apas.

(The rapid evolution of AI technology means that detection methods quickly become outdated. As soon as we learn to identify one type of AI output, a new, more sophisticated version emerges. It is a constant race to keep up with the technology. This rapid change makes our efforts feel futile sometimes. We are always playing catch-up.)

Students Becoming Aware of Detection Methods. A significant challenge arises from students becoming increasingly aware of AI detection methods and actively working to bypass them. They share tips on rephrasing AI text or using specific prompts to avoid being flagged. This proactive effort by students to circumvent checks makes teachers' work considerably more difficult, transforming assessment into a frustrating hide-and-seek game where students are constantly striving to outsmart detection.

Informant 10 described the problem of students becoming aware of detection methods and actively working to circumvent them by sharing tips on rephrasing AI text or using specific prompts to avoid flagging. He mentioned that;

Nahimong mas aware ang mga estudyante sa mga detection methods ug aktibo silang nagapaningkamot nga malikayan kini. Nag-share sila og mga tips kung unsaon pag-rephrase sa AI text o unsaon paggamit og specific prompts aron dili ma-flag. Kining aktibong paningkamot nga malikayan ang among mga checks maoy nakapalisod pag-ayo sa among trabaho. Usa ni ka makapaluya nga hide-and-seek game.

(Students are becoming more aware of detection methods and actively try to circumvent them. They share tips on how to rephrase AI text or use specific prompts to avoid being flagged. This active effort to bypass our checks makes our job significantly harder. It's a frustrating game of hide-and-seek.)

How do language teachers cope with the challenges they experience in determining AI-generated language output?

This section further presents the findings for major research question number 3, ‘How do language teachers cope with the challenges they experience in determining AI-generated language output?’ Three specific research questions were utilized to gather data that would answer the question.

Adopted Pedagogical Strategies to Mitigate the Potential for Students' AI-generated Work

This section also presents the results to the specific research question 3.1: "What strategies or pedagogical approaches have you adopted to mitigate the potential for students to submit AI-generated work?" under the third major research question, "How do language teachers cope with the challenges they experience in determining AI-generated language output?" The following themes served as results, which were: Adopted More In-class Writing Tasks, Manual Reading of Students’ Outputs, Teach Students Responsible Use of

AI, Assignments Composed of Specific Questions, Divide Big Writing Tasks into Small Ones, Encourage Peer Review Sessions, Develop Individual Writing Style, and Use of Different Assessment Methods.

Adopted More In-class Writing Tasks. Participants consistently emphasized the strategic shift towards adopting more in-class writing tasks and incorporating drafting and brainstorming sessions to ensure the authenticity of student work. This approach allows teachers to directly observe the writing process, preventing reliance on AI tools by disallowing phone use and encouraging students to ask teachers or use physical dictionaries for vocabulary assistance. The goal is to maximize class time for writing completion, thereby reducing the opportunity for AI intervention and fostering genuine skill development and confidence in students.

Informant 1 explained that they have adopted more in-class writing tasks and encouraged drafting sessions to directly observe the writing process and ensure authenticity. He shared that;

> *To address the challenges, I have adopted more in-class writing tasks and encouraged drafting and brainstorming sessions so I can witness the writing process. Dapat jud as much as possible they have to draft their essay during my class, and no cellphones are allowed. I also ask questions or add personal and contextualized instruction para dili ka relate si AI sa pangutana. I also guide students on how to use sources properly and promote writing as a process of thinking, not just producing polished texts. These steps help reduce the temptation to rely solely on ChatGPT or Wikipedia and build writing confidence.*
>
> (To address the challenges, I have adopted more in-class writing tasks and encouraged drafting and brainstorming sessions so I can witness the writing process. As much as possible, they really must draft their essay during my class, and no cellphones are allowed. I also ask questions or add personal and contextualized instructions so that AI cannot relate to the question. I also guide students on how to use sources properly and promote writing as a process of thinking, not just producing polished texts. These steps help reduce the temptation to rely solely on ChatGPT or Wikipedia and build writing confidence.)

Informant 2 stated that they primarily adopted more in-class writing tasks and required students to submit drafts to effectively monitor their progress and authenticity. She explained that;

> *Kasagaran, nag-conduct ko og in-class writing ug nangayo ko sa mga estudyante nga mag-submit og mga drafts aron ma-monitor nako ang ilang writing progress.*
>
> (Usually, I conduct in-class writing and require students to submit drafts so I can monitor their writing progress.)

Informant 3 emphasized their strategy to adopt more in-class writing tasks by utilizing class time for completion and prohibiting phone use to prevent AI reliance. She discussed that;

> *Gusto ko ang mga approaches kung magpatrabaho ko sa bata is to make use of the time allotment during classes para langyud malikayan ang AI. Okay, example, I have an art class sa senior high then use that one art class*

> *to complete and then submit din their output. Isa pa po, I wouldn't allow the students to use phones during the writing process para ma-avoid nila nga makonect sa internet. If they are concerns just like kung sa English ani ma'am, syempre naaman yung tay tendency na shortage in vocabulary, so they can ask me what the word they would like to know. However, when it comes to sentences, then I refrain myself to help them out. Or they could use physical books just like dictionaries to help them out para makasulat but not necessarily na magamit ang cell phone para dili sila mo tempt mo gamit sa AI.*
>
> (What I want for my approaches when I give students work is to make use of the time allotment during classes, precisely to avoid AI. For example, if I have an art class in senior high, I'd use that one art class to complete and submit their output. Another thing is, I would not allow students to use phones during the writing process to avoid them connecting to the internet. If they have concerns, like in English, ma'am, of course, there is a tendency for a shortage in vocabulary, so they can ask me what word they would like to know. However, when it comes to sentences, I refrain from helping them out. Or they could use physical books like dictionaries to help them write, but not necessarily use cell phones, so they won't be tempted to use AI.)

Manual Reading of Students' Outputs. Participants highlighted the continued importance of manually reading student outputs as a direct and effective method for providing feedback and assessing authenticity. This involves not only leaving written comments but also engaging in oral feedback to help students understand their errors and the reasons behind any suspicion of AI-generated work. By encouraging students to connect their writing to personal experiences, teachers aim to foster deeper, more authentic compositions that move beyond reliance on AI-generated ideas.

Informant 4 described their approach of manual reading of students' outputs and providing direct feedback, including oral comments, to address AI-generated content and encourage deeper, personal writing. She mentioned that;

> *Ginabasa nako manually sa mga sinulat sa estudyante ug ang pagbilin og mga comments kung naa bay AI-generated usa ka direct nga paagi sa paghatag og feedback. Through oral feedback dugang sa sinulat nga comments makatabang gyud sa estudyante nga mas masabtan ang ilang mga sayop ug ang rason nganong giila nga AI-generated ang ilang trabaho. Ang pagpangutana kung unsa ilang personal nga kinabuhi, makapadasig kanila sa paghimo og mga sinulat nga mas lawom ug personal, imbes nga magsalig lang sa AI-generated nga mga ideya.*
>
> (My intervention for this one is that I read their works. I manually read their works, and then I would leave comments on their works stating that this is AI-generated. I would leave comments. And then sometimes feedback. I give feedback orally, aside from the feedback that I give on their work, saying that their work is AI-generated. I would also give overall feedback to the class, encouraging them to not fully be reliant on the use of AI.)

Teach Students Responsible Use of AI. Participants emphasized the critical need to teach students how to use AI responsibly, viewing it as a tool for process enhancement rather than a shortcut. This involves open discussions about AI's limitations and the paramount importance of students' critical thinking. By demonstrating how AI can be utilized for brainstorming or grammar checks while stressing that the final output must be original, educators aim to guide students toward ethical digital literacy and deeper engagement with their own thoughts.

Informant 5 outlined their commitment to teach students responsible use of AI, guiding them to view it as a process tool rather than a shortcut, and emphasizing critical thinking and originality. She shared that;

> *Nagsugod ko sa pagtudlo sa mga estudyante kung unsaon paggamit ang AI nga responsible isip usa ka process, dili usa ka shortcut. Gihisgutan namo ang mga limitasyon niini ug ang importance sa ilang kaugalingong critical thinking. Gipakita nako kanila kung unsaon kini paggamit alang sa brainstorming o grammar checks, apan gipataas nako ang gibug-aton nga ang final output kinahanglan nga ilang kaugalingon. Kini nga pamaagi ga target sa pag guide kanila nga ethical. Bahin kini sa pagtudlo kanila sa digital literacy.*
>
> (I have begun teaching students how to use AI responsibly as a tool, not a shortcut. We discuss its limitations and the importance of critical thinking. I show them how to use it for brainstorming or grammar checks, but emphasize that the final output must be their own. This approach aims to guide them ethically. It's about teaching them digital literacy.)

Assignments Composed of Specific Questions. Participants have adapted their assignment design to include very specific, niche questions that demand a deep understanding of class discussions or texts. This strategy aims to deter the use of generic AI answers, which are insufficient for such prompts. By forcing students to engage deeply with the material, these assignments make it difficult for AI to provide relevant responses, thereby compelling students to move beyond simple factual recall and engage in higher-level thinking.

Informant 6 explained that their assignments are now composed of specific questions that demand a deep understanding of class discussions or specific texts, making generic AI answers insufficient. She mentioned that;

> *Ang akong mga assignments karon composed na og very specific, niche questions nga nagkinahanglan og deep understanding sa among mga class discussions o sa mga specific texts nga among nabasa. Ang mga generic AI answers dili na igo para niining mga prompts. Kini nagpugos sa mga estudyante nga mo-engage og lawom sa material mismo. Naglisod ang AI sa paghatag og relevant response. Kinahanglan silang molapas sa simple nga mga kamatuoran.*
>
> (My assignments now include very specific, niche questions that require a deep understanding of our class discussions or specific texts we have read. Generic AI answers would not suffice for these prompts. This forces students to engage deeply with the material themselves. It makes it difficult for AI to provide a relevant response. They must think beyond simple facts.)

Divide Big Writing Tasks into Small Ones. Participants found that breaking down large writing tasks into smaller, more frequent checkpoints is an effective strategy. This approach allows teachers to monitor student progress incrementally, making it more difficult for students to use AI for an entire project at once. Furthermore, it provides opportunities for early intervention and feedback, helping teachers track students' genuine effort and provide timely support throughout the writing process.

Informant 7 shared their strategy to divide big writing tasks into small ones, creating more frequent checkpoints to monitor student progress and deter the use of AI for entire projects. She expressed that;

> *Ang pagbahin-bahin sa dagkong writing tasks ngadto sa gagmay, mas kanunay nga checkpoints makatabang gyud. Pinaagi sa pag-submit sa mga estudyante og mga bahin sa assignment sa hinay-hinay, makamonitor ka sa ilang progress. Nakapalisod ni sa paggamit nila og AI para sa tibuok nga project dayon. Naghatag usab kini og mga kahigayonan para sa sayo nga intervention ug feedback. Nakatabang ni nimo sa pag-track sa ilang tinuod nga effort.*
>
> (I break down larger writing tasks into smaller, more frequent checkpoints. Students submit parts of the assignment progressively, allowing me to monitor their progress. This makes it harder for them to use AI for the entire project at once. It also provides opportunities for early intervention and feedback. This helps me track their genuine effort.)

Encourage Peer Review Sessions. Participants emphasized the effectiveness of encouraging peer review sessions where students read and critique each other's work. This strategy adds layer of scrutiny, as students are often adept at spotting inconsistencies or unnatural phrasing in their classmates' writing. Beyond detection, it also serves as a valuable learning opportunity, teaching students to critically evaluate text and learn from each other's mistakes.

Informant 8 highlighted the effectiveness of encouraging peer review sessions, where students critically evaluate each other's work, adding an extra layer of scrutiny and fostering critical thinking. She claimed that;

> *Ang pag- encourage sa peer review sessions kung asa ang mga estudyante magbasa ug mag-critique sa trabaho sa usag usa epektive kaayo. Kasagaran maayo sila sa pag-spot sa mga inconsistencies o unnatural phrasing sa sinulat sa ilang mga classmate. Nagdugang kini og laing layer sa scrutiny gikan sa ilang mga kauban. Nagtudlo usab kini kanila sa critically evaluate text. Nagkat-on sila gikan sa mga sayop sa usag usa.*
>
> (I encourage peer review sessions where students read and critique each other's work. They are often good at spotting inconsistencies or unnatural phrasing in their classmates' writing. This adds another layer of scrutiny from their peers. It also teaches them to critically evaluate text. They learn from each other's mistakes.)

Develop Individual Writing Style. Informants underscored the importance of fostering the development of a personal voice and individual writing style in their lessons. This approach aims to instill in students the value of their thoughts and expression, guiding them to create content that is not only factually correct but also rich in life and personality. By encouraging unique voices, teachers help students differentiate between generic AI output and authentic human touch, making them more discerning readers and writers.

Informant 9 stressed the importance of continually developing individual writing styles in lessons to instill the value of students' thoughts and expressions, helping them distinguish authentic work from generic AI output. She explained that;

> *Padayon sa pag pagpalambo sa personal nga tingog ug indibidwal nga style sa pagsulat sa imong mga lesson. Kini usa ka lig-on nga paagi aron ma encourage ang mga estudyante sa ilang kaugalingong panghunahuna ug expression. Pinaagi sa mga kalihokan nga nag-awhag kanila sa paggamit sa ilang unique voice, imong gitudloan sila sa pagmugna og content nga dili lang husto sa impormasyon, apan puno usab sa kinabuhi ug personalidad. Kining maong pamaagi makatabang usab kanila nga mas mailhan ang generic ug bland nga output sa AI kung makasugat sila niini, tungod kay nasayod na sila sa kalainan sa tinuod nga human touch.*
>
> (I emphasize the development of a unique writing voice and style in my lessons. We do activities that focus on personal expression and individuality in writing. This encourages students to move beyond the generic, often bland, output of AI. I want them to find their own way of communicating. It's about celebrating their personal style.)

Use of Different Assessment Methods. Participants found that utilizing a variety of assessment methods beyond traditional essays is highly effective. By incorporating creative projects, multimedia presentations, and practical tasks that are not easily replicable by AI, teachers reduce reliance on written submissions. This approach provides students with diverse opportunities to demonstrate their learning, helping to capture their true abilities and offering a more comprehensive and authentic evaluation of their skills.

Informant 10 advocated for the use of different assessment methods beyond traditional essays, such as creative projects and multimedia presentations, to reduce reliance on written submissions and capture students' true abilities. He explained that;

> *Ang paggamit og lain-laing assessment methods, dili lang mga essays, epektibo kaayo. Pinaagi sa paglakip sa mga creative projects, multimedia presentations, ug practical tasks nga dili sayon mahimo sa AI, imong gipakunhod ang pagsalig sa sinulat nga mga submission. Naghatag kini og kahigayonan sa mga estudyante nga ipakita ang ilang nakat-unan sa nagkalain-laing paagi, nga makatabang sa pagkuha sa ilang tinuod nga mga abilidad.*
>
> (I use a variety of assessment methods, not just essays. This includes creative projects, multimedia presentations, and practical tasks that AI cannot easily complete. Diversifying assessment reduces reliance on written submissions alone. It allows students to demonstrate learning in different ways. This helps capture their true abilities.)

Incorporating Discussions on Academic Integrity and Ethical Use of AI into Teaching Practice

This section additionally presents the results to the specific research question 3.2: "How are you incorporating discussions about academic integrity and the ethical use of AI into your teaching practice?" under the third major research question, "How do language teachers cope with the challenges they experience in determining AI-generated language output?" The following themes served as results, which

were: Responsible Use of AI, Into the Lessons and not to Depend on AI, Explain the Importance of Own Learning, Discuss Long Term Implications, Present Ethical Dilemmas on the Use of AI, and Put Emphasis on Academic Integrity.

Responsible Use of AI. Participants consistently emphasized the critical need to educate students on the responsible use of AI, framing it as a learning tool rather than a shortcut for cheating. They advocate for guiding students to use AI for specific purposes like online research, paraphrasing, or editing, while strictly prohibiting direct copying. Teachers themselves acknowledge using AI for assistance and aim to instill in students the importance of balancing AI use with personal contribution, advocating against 100% reliance. This approach fosters digital literacy and encourages students to develop their own ideas and critical thinking skills, ensuring they understand the ethical boundaries and the value of their own intellectual property.

Informant 2 consistently reminds their students about the responsible use of AI, emphasizing its role as a learning tool rather than a means for cheating. She discussed that;

> *Kanunay ko gyud nga gipahinumdoman ang akong mga estudyante sa klase nga mag- responsable sa paggamit sa teknolohiya. Dapat gamiton nila kini para sa pagkat-on kaysa sa mag cheating.*
> (Every time I had my class, I usually reminded my students to be responsible by using technology so that they can use it for learning rather than cheating.)

Informant 3 integrates discussions on the responsible use of AI into their research classes, guiding students to paraphrase and edit rather than directly copy content from online sources. She explained that;

> *Since nagtudlo ko og research sa senior high, and of course, they will be writing their own research proposals and then completed research, di na gyod ni mawala sa akong discussion ang AI nga hisgutan. So kung maghisgut ko ani, I let them have their online research, but not to the point that they are going to copy what they have read. They are just going to paraphrase, pwede, and then edit what they have read, para dili siya mamahimong ma plagiarize. At the same time, dili gyud ni mawala sa akoang topic ang AI when it comes na magpasulat ko sa mga bata to remind them nga bawal gyod. Let them have their own processing of ideas para ma-practice, mahasa, og ma-develop sila anang butanga.*
> (Since I teach research in senior high, and of course, they will be writing their research proposals and then completing research, I cannot leave out the discussion about AI. So, when I talk about this, I let them do their online research, but not to the point that they are going to copy what they have read. They are just going to paraphrase, yes, and then edit what they have read, so that it would not be plagiarized. At the same time, the topic of AI will not be left out when I ask the children to write, to remind them that it is forbidden to rely on it. Let them have their processing of ideas so that they can practice, hone, and develop themselves in that aspect.)

Informant 4 advocates for the responsible use of AI in their classroom, emphasizing that while AI is helpful, students should not rely on it 100% and must add their personal touch to the work. She mentioned that;

> *I would really say, you know, as a teacher, me and myself, I am using AI. Gamit man ko ug AI, and AI is very helpful. Sabi ko nga in the previous questions, it's fine with me if the students are using AI, pero, pero, i-edit naman, and then somehow i-balance lang ba na. Ikaw ni gamit, pero we do not rely, hopefully, we do not rely in 100%. So that is my advocacy to my class. Yun na class, I would really say, class, it's fine with me to use, I accept AI. However, my advocacy is that not to utilize the AI 100%.*
> (I would say, you know, as a teacher, I am using AI. I use AI, and AI is very helpful. As I said in the previous questions, it is fine with me if the students are using AI, but they should edit it and somehow balance it. You use it, but we do not rely. Hopefully, we do not rely on it 100%. So that is my advocacy in my class. I would say to my class, Class, it's fine with me to use it, I accept AI. It's not destroying the system; it's known to be helpful because it makes our lives easier, our work easier. However, my advocacy is not to utilize AI 100%.)

Informant 5 demonstrates how they promote the responsible use of AI by using examples of good and bad AI use to highlight its capabilities and limitations, fostering critical AI literacy. She discussed that;

> *Pinaagi sa paggamit og mga examples sa maayo ug dili maayo nga paggamit sa AI sa klase, imong gipakita sa mga estudyante ang tinuod nga capability ug mga limitation niini. Ang pagpakita kung gi unsa ang AI makamugna og generic o biased content makatabang kaayo kanila nga masabtan ang panginahanglan sa human critical thinking. Ang inyong panag estorya kung nganong importante ang pag-evaluate sa AI output imbes nga dawaton lang kini, direkta nga nagpalambo sa ilang critical AI literacy. Kini nga matang sa pagtudlo esensyal kaayo karon nga panahon sa digital nga impormasyon.*
>
> (I use examples of both good and bad AI use in class. I show them how AI can produce generic or biased content. This helps them understand AI's limitations and the need for human critical thinking. We discuss why it's important to evaluate AI output, not just accept it. It is about developing their critical AI literacy.)

Informant 10 emphasizes creating a safe space for students to ask questions about AI and admit their struggles, fostering responsible use of AI through open dialogue and trust. He mentioned that;

> *Syempre, ang pag-awhag sa mga estudyante nga mangutana bahin sa AI ug sa paggamit niini, ug ang pag himo og safe space diin sila mobati nga komportable sa pag-angkon kung naglisod sila o dili sigurado bahin sa paggamit sa AI, epektibo kaayo. Kining open dialogue makatabang sa pagpugong sa sayop nga paggamit sa dili pa kini mahitabo. Ang imong*

tinguha asa a teacher nga sila moduol sa imo uban sa ilang mga kabalaka nagpakita sa imong pasalig sa pagpalambo sa komunikasyon. Kini nga pamaagi dili lang makatabang sa paglikay sa mga problema, apan makapalig-on sab sa imong relasyon sa mga estudyante base sa pagsalig ug exchange of ideas.

(I encourage students to ask questions about AI and its use. I create a safe space where they feel comfortable admitting if they're struggling or unsure about using AI. This open dialogue helps prevent misuse before it happens. I want them to come to me with their concerns. It's about fostering communication.)

Into the Lessons and not to Depend on AI Informants emphasized the importance of integrating discussions about AI ethics and responsible technology use directly into lessons, with a consistent reminder for students not to depend solely on AI tools. Teachers actively show examples of AI-generated work and encourage students to reflect on how it compares to their authentic writing. By highlighting the value of originality and critical thinking, educators aim to make students more aware of their academic responsibilities, underscoring that shortcuts can hinder their personal growth and learning.

Informant 1 describes how they incorporate AI ethics and responsible technology use into their lessons, constantly reminding students not to depend on AI tools and emphasizing originality. He emphasized that;

I have started incorporating discussions on AI ethics and responsible use of technology into lessons and constantly reminding them not to depend on AI tools whenever I see someone who no longer does his or her work kay mag salig nalang sa AI mam. I show examples of AI-generated work and let students reflect on how it compares to their authentic writing. By emphasizing the importance of originality and critical thinking, students become more aware of their academic responsibilities and how shortcuts can hinder their growth and learning.

(I have started incorporating discussions on AI ethics and responsible use of technology into lessons and constantly reminding them not to depend on AI tools whenever I see someone who no longer does his or her work because they just rely on AI, ma'am. I show examples of AI-generated work and let students reflect on how it compares to their authentic writing. By emphasizing the importance of originality and critical thinking, students become more aware of their academic responsibilities and how shortcuts can hinder their growth and learning.)

Explain the Importance of Own Learning. The informant highlighted the significance of explaining to students the importance of their learning and effort. They shared their perspectives as teachers, conveying how it feels to suspect AI-generated work and emphasizing their desire to see genuine knowledge and effort. This personal appeal aims to build trust and encourage honesty, creating an open environment where students feel supported to improve their skills authentically rather than resorting to deceptive practices.

Informant 6 shared her approach to explain the importance of her learning by communicating their feelings when suspecting AI-generated work, fostering trust, and encouraging genuine effort. She mentioned that;

> *Akong gina share akong perspective as a teacher ug unsay bation kung na suspect ko nga AI generated ang trabaho sa bata. Akong gina explain na gusto nako makita ang tinood nga kahibalo ug ilang effort. Kay kani nga personal appeal makatabang na mabuild ang trust ug ma encourage na maninood. Mo ana rako nga naa ko ug tabangan nako sila, pero dli gyud nako sila atikon. Kay mag create man gud ni ug open environment.*
> (I share my perspective as a teacher and how it feels when I suspect AI-generated work. I explain that I want to see their genuine learning and effort. This personal appeal helps build trust and encourages honesty. I tell them I am here to help them learn, not just to catch them. This creates a more open environment.)

Discuss Long Term Implications. The informant stressed the crucial need to discuss the long-term implications of relying on AI for learning. By explaining that future academic pursuits, such as college and professional careers, will demand independent thought and writing, teachers aim to illustrate the potential negative effects of current AI dependence on skill development. This approach helps students understand the bigger picture and prepares them for the real-world challenges where genuine critical thinking and independent work are indispensable.

Informant 7 highlighted the importance of discussing the long-term implications of relying on AI for learning, preparing students for future academic and career challenges that require independent thought. She discussed that;

> *Importante gyud nga hisgutan ang long-term implications sa pagsalig sa AI para sa pagkat-on. Pinaagi sa pagpasabot nga sa college o sa umaabot nga mga trabaho, kinahanglan nilang makahunahuna ug makasulat nga independently, imong gipakita kanila ang posibleng effect sa paggamit og AI karon sa ilang skill development alang sa future. Kini nga pamaagi makatabang gyud kanila nga makita ang bigger picture ug maandam sila sa mga real-world challenges.*
> (We talk about the long-term implications of relying on AI for learning. I explain that in college or future jobs, they will need to think and write independently. Using AI now might hinder their skill development for the future. It's about preparing them for real-world challenges. This helps them see the bigger picture.)

Present Ethical Dilemmas on the Use of AI. Informant found it beneficial to present ethical dilemmas related to AI in class and facilitate group discussions among students. By posing questions that challenge their moral understanding of technology, such as the ethics of using AI for personal correspondence or academic essays, teachers encourage deeper reflection on responsibility. This method not only enhances critical thinking skills but also guides students toward making more responsible decisions regarding AI use.

Informant 8 described their method of presenting ethical dilemmas on the use of AI in class discussions, encouraging students to confront the moral aspects of technology and make responsible decisions. She expressed that;

Ang pagpresent og mga ethical dilemmas bahin sa AI sa klase ug ipa-discuss sa mga estudyante sa mga grupo makatabang gyud kanila sa pag-atubang sa mga moral aspects sa teknolohiya. Ang mga pangutana sama sa Okay ra ba ang paggamit og AI sa pagsulat og love letter? o Kung ang AI ang nagsulat sa imong essay, nakakat-on ba gyud ka? makapadasig kanila sa paghunahuna og deep responsibility. Kini nga way sa discussion dili lang makapalambo sa ilang critical thinking skills apan makatabang usab kanila sa paghimo og mas responsable nga mga desisyon sa paggamit sa AI.

(I present ethical dilemmas related to AI in class and have students discuss them in groups. For example, Is it okay to use AI to write a love letter? Or if AI writes your essay, did you learn? These discussions help them grapple with the moral aspects. It encourages them to think deeply about responsibility.)

Put Emphasis on Academic Integrity. The informant underscored the importance of emphasizing academic integrity as the foundation of trust between students and teachers. By explaining that submitting original work strengthens this trust, while unauthorized AI use can erode it, educators directly illustrate the impact of students' decisions. Reinforcing that honesty is valued above all else helps to cultivate a classroom culture of respect and responsibility, which is essential for creating a positive and productive learning environment.

Informant 9 underlined the significance of emphasizing academic integrity as the foundation of trust between students and teachers, reinforcing that original work strengthens this bond. She mentioned that;

Ang paghatag og gibug-aton sa academic integrity isip pundasyon sa pagsalig sa mga estudyante ug magtutudlo usa ka powerful nga message. Pinaagi sa pagpasabot nga ang pagsubmit sa ilang kaugalingong trabaho makapalig-on sa maong pagsalig, samtang ang dili tinugot nga paggamit sa AI makaguba niini, imong gipakita ang direkta nga epekto sa ilang mga desisyon. Ang pagpahayag nga imong gipabilhan ang ilang kamatinud-anon labaw sa tanan nagpalig-on sa usa ka culture sa pagtahod ug responsibilidad sulod sa imong klase. Kining sa pagsalig esensyal kaayo aron makamugna og usa ka positibo ug produktibo nga palibot sa pagkat-on.

(I make sure to emphasize that academic integrity is about trust between students and teachers. When they submit their own work, it builds that trust. If they use AI without permission, it breaks that trust. I tell them I value their honesty above all else. This focus on trust is very important for our classroom.)

Collaborating with Colleagues to Enhance Ability to Identify and Address AI-generated Output

This section further presents the results to the specific research question 3.3: "How do you collaborate with colleagues or seek professional development opportunities to enhance your ability to identify and

address AI-generated language output?" under the third major research question, "How do language teachers cope with the challenges they experience in determining AI-generated language output?" The following themes served as results, which were: Regular Discussion with Colleagues, Help Each Other for Strategies to Identify AI-generated Content, Do Feedbacking with Colleagues, experimenting on AI Tools, Getting Insights from Tech-savvy Students, Looking for AI-resistant Assignments Online, Sharing Videos about AI, and Attendance to Professional Development Programs.

Regular Discussion with Colleagues. Informants emphasized the crucial role of regular discussions and informal collaboration with colleagues in addressing the challenges posed by AI-generated student work. They highlighted the importance of brainstorming, sharing strategies for identifying AI content, and collectively adjusting rubrics and activities to keep pace with new developments. This collaborative approach fosters a strong sense of community support, enabling teachers to feel more equipped and less overwhelmed by AI-related issues. The consensus was that continuous peer interaction and knowledge exchange are vital tools against the rapid evolution of AI in education.

Informant 1 emphasized the importance of regular discussion with colleagues about strategies for identifying AI-generated work and adjusting rubrics, highlighting the strong sense of community support this fosters. He explained that;

> *Ang kanunay nga panag-istoryahanay uban sa imong mga kauban bahin sa mga strategy sa pag-ila sa AI-generated work ug ang pagbahin sa mga pamaagi sa pag-adjust sa inyong mga rubrics ug mga kalihokan, importante kaayo. Kining inyong brainstorming ug sharing aron makasabay sa bag-ong mga kalamboan sa ilang mga pamaagi sa pag-check sa AI-generated outputs nagpakita sa usa ka lig-on nga sense of community support. Kini nakatabang gyud, nga mahimong mas equipped ug dili kaayo overwhelmed sa pag-atubang sa mga hagit nga may kalabotan sa AI. Ang pagtinabangay sulod sa komunidad sa mga magtutudlo usa ka importante kaayo nga hinagiban batok sa paspas nga pag-uswag sa AI.*
>
> (I frequently talk with my colleagues about strategies to detect AI-generated work and share ways we adjust our rubrics and activities. Some of us do brainstorming and sharing to keep up with new developments in order to check AI-generated outputs. This sense of community support has helped us become more equipped and less overwhelmed when facing AI-related challenges.)

Informant 4 affirmed that regular discussion with colleagues, even informally, is an effective approach to addressing the challenges of AI in education. She expressed that;

> *Sa tinuod lang, ang pag-atubang sa mga hagit sa AI sa edukasyon dili lang kinahanglan nga himoon sa pormal nga paagi. Ang impormal nga panaghisgot ug collaboration between teachers usa ka epektibo kaayo nga pamaagi, ug makita gyud nako ang mga benepisyo.*
>
> (To be honest, there are challenges in AI in education, and there is a need for a formal way to address the challenge. Informal discussions between teachers are also an effective way to figure out the benefits of it.)

Help Each Other for Strategies to Identify AI-generated Content. Informants underscored the necessity for teachers to actively help each other in developing strategies to identify AI-generated content and encourage honest student output. They stressed that a collective effort in tackling the AI challenge strengthens the teaching community and provides more effective support for students. This collaborative approach is seen as fundamental for promoting academic integrity and teaching responsible technology use, requiring a unified effort across educators.

Informant 2 highlighted the strength of helping each other for strategies to identify AI-generated content through collaboration with fellow teachers to promote honest student output. She shared that;

> *Ang pagtinabangay gyud uban sa imong mga kauban nga magtutudlo aron mag share ug mga strategies sa pag-ila sa AI-generated content ug aron awhagon ang inyong mga estudyante alang sa usa ka matinuoron nga output usa ka lig-on nga pamaagi. Kining inyong paningkamot nga collective ideas nga sulbaron kining hagit sa AI makapalig-on sa inyong komunidad sa mga magtutudlo ug makahatag og mas effective nga support sa mga estudyante. Ang pagpalambo sa academic integrity ug ang pagtudlo sa responsableng paggamit sa teknolohiya kinahanglan gyud ang hiniusang paningkamot.*
>
> (I collaborate with my co-teachers to share strategies on how to detect AI-written content and to encourage our students for an honest output.)

Do Feedbacking with Colleagues. The informant highlighted the value of informal feedback sessions and collaborative expertise sessions among co-teachers as a crucial method for addressing the challenges posed by AI. These discussions, whether casual conversations about class and student development or more structured sharing times, provide opportunities to openly discuss AI-related struggles and potential solutions. This collaborative feedback loop helps teachers understand each other's strengths and weaknesses in handling AI, enabling them to apply effective strategies and foster a supportive environment for shared learning and problem-solving.

Informant 3 suggested that providing feedback with colleagues, through informal discussions and collaborative expertise sessions, is an effective way to address the challenges posed by AI in language education. She claimed that;

> *I think one of the best ways to address this problem, not necessarily in a formal way, but it can be done in informal ways just like feedbacking with co-teachers, magtabi-tabi mo diha regarding sa klase, sa student development, then you could have inserted the topics about AI or isa gina tawag na itong collaborative expertise session where every teacher has the opportunity to speak out what is the subject is all about sharing that time. Especially that language teachers, isa na sa mga struggle. So mauna through discussions, through feedbacking or through sessions naa tay matawag na kana bitawng ma-address ang problem and at the same time mag tinabangay po og echo or voice out sa possible niya solution kay para pwede po ma-apply sa uban. Human unsa'y mga kana bitawng ginatawag na ug strengths and weaknesses sa uban how they handle this one. Makabalo pud ang other teachers ug mas nindot yun nga activities just like feedbacking, discussions, and collaborative expertise sessions.*

(One of the best ways to tackle this issue, not necessarily in a formal setting, is through informal collaboration and feedback sessions with fellow teachers. By simply chatting with colleagues about our classes and student development, we can naturally introduce topics about AI. We could also hold what I would call collaborative expertise sessions where every teacher gets a chance to share their insights on the subject. This is particularly important for language teachers, as this is a major struggle for them. Through these discussions and feedback sessions, we can address the problem together, helping one another voice possible solutions that others can then apply. It also allows us to learn about the strengths and weaknesses of how others are handling this challenge, making activities like these invaluable for all of us.)

Experimenting on AI Tools. Informant found that hands-on experimentation with AI tools is an effective way to understand their capabilities and limitations. By personally generating text using AI, teachers gain insights into its common patterns and inherent restrictions. This self-learning approach not only enhances their ability to identify AI-generated student work but also equips them to teach students about the responsible and critical use of AI, effectively learning to think like AI to better understand its outputs.

Informant 5 emphasized the effectiveness of experimenting with AI tools personally to understand their capabilities and limitations, which aids in identifying AI-generated student work and teaching responsible AI use. She shared that;

Ang pag-eksperiment sa AI tools mismo ug ang pagkat-on kung giunsa kini molihok usa ka epektibo kaayo nga paagi aron mas masabtan ang mga kapabilidad ug limitasyon niini. Pinaagi sa pag-generate og text gamit ang AI, imong nahibal-an ang kasagarang mga patterns ug limitations uy. Kining hands-on experience makatabang gyud nimo nga mas mailhan ang AI-generated student work. Tinuod, murag nakat-on ka molihok sama sa AI. Kining self-learning important kaayo alang sa epektibo nga detection ug alang usab sa pagtudlo sa imong mga estudyante bahin sa responsable ug kritikal nga paggamit sa AI.

(I have started experimenting with AI tools myself to understand how they work. By generating text with AI, I learn its common patterns and limitations. This hands-on experience helps me better identify AI-generated student work. It's like learning to think like the AI. This self-learning is crucial for effective detection.)

Getting Insights from Tech-savvy Students. Informant recognized the value of seeking insights from tech-savvy students regarding AI tools. They noted that students are often more familiar with how these programs function and how their peers utilize them. This informal feedback from students provides invaluable clues and offers a unique perspective that helps teachers better understand the problem. Leveraging student knowledge is seen as a smart strategy to keep pace with technological advancements in the classroom. Informant 7 highlighted the strategic value of getting insights from tech-savvy students regarding AI tools, as their familiarity with these programs can provide valuable clues for teachers. She shared that;

Ang pagpangayo og insights gikan sa imong mga tech-savvy students bahin sa mga AI tools usa ka utokan kaayong estratehiya. Tinuod, kasagaran mas pamilyar sila sa kung giunsa kini nga mga programa molihok ug kung giunsa kini gigamit sa ilang mga kauban. Kining impormal nga feedback gikan sa mga estudyante makahatag gyud og bililhong mga clues. Usa kini ka lahi nga perspektibo nga makatabang nimo nga mas masabtan ang problema. Kanunay gyud sila nga una sa atong panahon, ug ang pagpahimulos sa ilang kahibalo usa ka maayong paagi aron makasabay kita sa dagan sa teknolohiya.

(Sometimes, I ask my tech-savvy students for their insights on AI tools. They are often very familiar with how these programs work and how their peers might be using them. This informal feedback from students can give me valuable clues. It is a different perspective that helps me understand the problem better. They are often ahead of us.

Looking for AI-resistant Assignments Online. The informant actively sought out examples of AI-resistant assignments online or in educational journals as an effective strategy for generating new ideas. By studying how other educators adapt their pedagogy to encourage originality, they gain proven strategies that can be applied to their own lesson plans. This research and learning from existing successful approaches help teachers stay ahead in addressing the challenges posed by AI in academic submissions.

Informant 8 described the effective strategy of looking for AI-resistant assignments online or in educational journals to gain new ideas and adapt pedagogy to encourage originality. She discussed that;

Kanang, ang pagpangita og mga pananglitan sa AI-resistant assignments online o sa mga educational journals usa ka epektibo kaayo nga paagi aron makakuha og bag-ong mga ideya. Pinaagi sa pagtuon kung giunsa ang ubang mga magtutudlo nag-adapt sa ilang pedagogy aron madasig ang originality, imong makita ang mga proven strategies nga mahimo nimong i-aplay sa imong kaugalingong mga lesson plans. Kining matang sa research ug pagkat-on gikan sa kung unsa na ang naglihok makatabang gyud nimo nga kanunayng abante sa pag-atubang sa mga hagit nga dala sa AI.

(I look for examples of AI-resistant assignments online or in educational journals. I study how other teachers are adapting their pedagogy to encourage originality. This research helps me modify my lesson plans. It is about finding proven strategies from others. I try to learn from what is already working.)

Sharing Videos about AI. The informant found that sharing articles or videos about AI in education with colleagues and discussing them during free time or department meetings is highly valuable. This resource sharing helps everyone stay informed and fosters a collective understanding of the challenges presented by AI. Through active information exchange, teachers learn from each other's discoveries, strengthening their team and promoting a more unified approach to addressing the impact of AI in education.

Informant 9 emphasized the value of sharing videos about AI and articles on AI in education with colleagues, fostering a collective understanding of the challenges and strengthening team approaches. She mentioned that;

> *Ang pag share sa mga articles o video bahin sa AI sa edukasyon ngadto sa imong mga kauban, ug dayon ang paghisgot niini sa inyong libreng oras o sa mga department meetings, importante kaayo. Kining pagshare sa resources makatabang kaninyong tanan nga magpabilin nga informed. Makamugna kini og collective understanding sa mga hagit nga dala sa AI. Pinaagi niini, nagkat-on gyud mo gikan sa mga nadiskobrehan sa usag usa. Kining aktibo nga pagbinayloay sa impormasyon makapalig-on sa inyong team ug makatabang sa paghimo og mas hiniusang pamaagi sa pag-atubang sa epekto sa AI sa edukasyon.*
>
> (When I find an article or a video about AI in education, I share it with my colleagues. We then discuss it during our free time or department meetings. This sharing of resources helps us all stay informed. It creates a collective understanding of the challenges. We learn from each other's discoveries.)

Attendance to Professional Development Programs. The informant emphasized the importance of attending professional development programs related to digital literacy or technology integration, even if not directly focused on AI detection. Gaining foundational knowledge in the broader digital landscape helps prepare teachers for future challenges and enables them to adapt more easily to emerging tools and technologies. This continuous learning in educational technology is considered essential in the rapidly changing world, ensuring educators remain current and well-equipped.

Informant 10 highlighted the importance of attendance to professional development programs related to digital literacy and technology integration, which provides foundational knowledge to adapt to new tools and challenges. He explained that;

> *Mao to, ang pag-apil sa bisan unsang professional development nga gihatag sa Department of Education kalabot sa digital literacy o technology integration bililhon kaayo. Tinuod, bisan kung dili direkta bahin sa AI detection, ang pagkuha og foundational knowledge sa mas lapad nga digital landscape makatabang kaayo. Kini nga kahibalo maoy moprepare nimo alang sa umaabot nga mga hagit ug makatabang nimo nga mas dali maka-adap sa mga bag-ong gamit ug teknolohiya nga mogawas. Ang pagpadayon sa pagkat-on niining aspeto sa edukasyon kinahanglanon gyud sa atong paspas nga pagbag-o nga kalibutan.*
>
> (I try to participate in any professional development offered by the Department of Education related to digital literacy or technology integration. Even if it is not specifically about AI detection, it helps me understand the broader digital landscape. This foundational knowledge is important for adapting to new tools. It prepares me for future challenges.)

What are the insights of language teachers in determining the AI-generated language output?

This section presents the results for 4th major research question, 'What are the insights of language teachers in determining the AI-generated language output?' Three specific questions were asked to gather data from the question.

Key Characteristics Suggestive of AI Involvement in a Piece of Writing

This section also presents the results to the specific research question 4.1: "Based on your experiences, what key characteristics or patterns might suggest AI involvement in a piece of writing?" under the fourth major research question, "What are the insights of language teachers in determining the AI-generated language output?" The following themes served as results, which were: Unnatural Phrasing Sentence Structures, No Specific Classroom References, Lack Personal and Emotional Depth, Lack Contextual Awareness, and Striking Similarities among Outputs.

Unnatural Phrasing Sentence Structures. The informant consistently identified unnatural phrasing and awkward sentence structures as key indicators of AI-generated content. They observed that while grammatically correct, these sentences often felt overly complex, excessively formal, or stiff, lacking the natural flow characteristic of human writing. This includes an overuse of formal transition words and an extreme conciseness that omits the typical human tendency for elaboration and personal anecdotes, making the text sound robotic and devoid of authentic expression.

Informant 6 articulated that unnatural phrasing or awkward sentence structures, even if grammatically correct, are a common indicator of AI-generated content, often resulting in a stiff, robotic flow. She mentioned that;

> *Kining unnatural phrasing o awkward sentence structures, bisan og grammatically correct, usa ka kasagarang timailhan sa AI-generated content. Tinuod, ang mga sentence mahimong overly complex o pormal kaayo alang sa usa ka estudyante. Morag ang AI naningkamot kaayo nga mahimong sophisticated, nga miresulta sa usa ka stiff, robotic flow. Kining talagsaon nga linguistic construction maoy kanunayng makapaduda nimo. Dili gyud kini paminawon nga natural, nga maoy nagpalahi sa tinuod nga sinulat sa tawo gikan sa output sa AI.*
>
> (I have observed unnatural phrasing or awkward sentence structures, even if they are grammatically correct. The sentences might be overly complex or sound too formal for a student. It feels like the AI is trying too hard to be sophisticated, resulting in a stiff, robotic flow. This unusual linguistic construction often makes me suspicious. It just doesn't sound natural.)

Informant 7 observed that the overuse of formal transition words and an overly structured feel contribute to unnatural phrasing and sentence structures, making the writing seem formulaic and lacking natural human flow. She shared that;

> *Mga words sama sa furthermore, consequently, ug in conclusion nga kanunay kaayong makita, o gigamit sa mga lugar diin mas simple nga transition ang angay, makapahimo sa sinulat nga formulaic ug dili kaayo natural. Bisan og sakto sa grammar, kining kalabihan sa pormalidad usa ka subtle apan mamatikdan nga timailhan sa AI generation. Ang teksto mobati nga overly structured, kulang sa natural nga pagdagayday sa ideya nga kasagaran sa sinulat sa tawo.*
>
> (A common pattern is the overuse of formal transition words and phrases. Words like furthermore, consequently, and in conclusion appear too frequently or in places where a simpler transition would suffice. While

correct, this makes the writing feel formulaic and less natural. It is a subtle but noticeable sign of AI generation. The text feels overly structured.)

Informant 10 noted that the absence of natural rambling, personal anecdotes, or extra details, coupled with extreme brevity, indicates unnatural phrasing and sentence structures optimized for efficiency rather than human expression. She shared that;

> *Walay natural nga rambling, personal nga mga anectode, o ang kasagarang extra details nga ilakip sa tawhanong manunulat. Mobati kini nga ang AI gi-optimize alang sa efficiency, dili alang sa human expression. Kining extreme brevity, nga walay tawhanong elaboration, usa ka kasagaran nga timailhan. Mobati lang kini nga sobra ka efficient, nga nakalahi gyud niini gikan sa sinulat sa tawo.*
>
> (The writing is often too concise and direct, almost like a bullet-point summary expanded into paragraphs. There is no natural rambling, personal anecdotes, or the usual extra details that human writers include. It feels like the AI is optimized for efficiency, not for human expression. This extreme brevity, without human elaboration, is a common characteristic. It is just too efficient.)

No Specific Classroom References. The informant noted that AI-generated writing often lacks a personal touch and specific classroom references, instead relying on broad statements, a neutral tone, and generic examples. This absence of localized context and the avoidance of minor grammatical mistakes, which are common in student writing, serve as significant indicators of AI involvement. When the writing voice feels distant or excessively perfect, it naturally leads teachers to suspect AI's hand, as it fails to reflect the unique learning environment or individual student characteristics.

Informant 1 identified that AI-generated writing typically exhibits no specific classroom references or personal touches, often using broad, neutral statements and generic examples. He discussed that;

> *Tinuod gyud nga ang AI-generated writing kasagaran walay personal touch o espesipik classroom references. Kini nag gamit og mga broad statements, adunay balanced ug neutral tone, ug usahay mohatag og generic examples. Ang imong pagmatikod nga kini naglikay sa ginagmay nga grammar mistakes nga kasagaran sa mga estudyante, usa usab ka dakong timailhan. Kung ang tingog sa manunulat mobati nga layo o sobra ka perpekto, normal lang nga magsugod ka og pagduda sa AI involvement.*
>
> (Based on my experience, AI-generated writing often lacks a personal touch or specific classroom references. It uses broad statements, has a balanced and neutral tone, and sometimes offers generic examples. I also notice that it avoids minor grammar mistakes typical of students. When the voice of the writer feels distant or too perfect, I begin to suspect AI involvement.)

Informant 4 highlighted that AI-generated content often contains repetitive words and ideas that are out of context, demonstrating no specific classroom references or connection to the student's personal experience. She mentioned that;

> *So based on your experiences, it is the words and structure, and their ideas being out of context. As I mentioned earlier, the words are repetitive. You would really know, because if you're reading, you would see these words, so you'd change it, right? So, the unedited words are repetitive, and then the scene – I would really know that this AI is involved. You know the person, you know the child, and then this is their output. There's no connection. When it comes to writing, literary writing, you would know that the person's handwriting is connected to the person's life, and then their writing reflects it. The AI, it would never reflect the person's experiences or characteristics.*
>
> (So based on your experiences, words, and structure, and out of context, on their idea, because as I mentioned earlier, the words are repetitive. You would know really, because if you are reading, you would see these words, so you would change them, right? So, the unedited words are repetitive, and then the scene, I would know that this AI is in-hang. You know the person, you know the child, and then this is your output. There's no connection. When it comes to writing, literary writing, you would know that the person's handwriting is connected to the person's life, and then their writing reflects it. The AI would never reflect the person's experiences or characteristics.)

Lack Personal and Emotional Depth. The informant consistently observed that AI-generated texts are deficient in personal input and emotional depth. Such outputs are typically formal, objective, and devoid of local context, making them distinguishable from human writing. Teachers noted that AI-generated content lacks the unique experiences, feelings, and worldviews that infuse human writing with life and color. This absence of individuality and emotional connection is a primary indicator of machine generation, making it challenging to truly assess a student's genuine capability and thought process.

Informant 2 stated that AI-generated texts typically lack personal and emotional depth, appearing overly formal, objective, and devoid of local context, which distinguishes them from human writing. She shared that;

> *Ang AI-generated texts kasagaran kulang sa personal input ug emotional depth. Kanunay silang pormal kaayo, mental ug walay local context. Kining mga kinaiya maoy naghimo sa AI-generated content nga mailhan gikan sa sinulat sa tawo. Ang mga estudyante, isip mga indibidwal, adunay ilang kaugalingong mga kasinatian, pagbati, ug pagtan-aw sa kalibutan. Mao kini ang naghatag og kinabuhi ug kolor sa ilang mga sinulat. Ang pagkawala niini sa AI maoy usa sa mga nag-unang timailhan sa iyang pagka-machine-generated.*
>
> (Based on what I observed, AI-generated texts often lack personal input and emotional depth. They are very formal, mental, and lack local context.)

Informant 3 observed that AI-generated content often lacks personal and emotional depth, appearing generic and without the individuality or passion typically found in student writing. She explained that;

> *Kani diring dapita, makabalo na magyud ka sa abilidad sa bata kung unsay kayan niyang mahatag, labi na magpasulat kasi ilaha. Maliban nalang kung writers na sila, just like campus journalist, so kabalo yun sila muhanay sa*

ilahang thoughts. However, there are tendencies pod na magkamali yun pod na sila sa ilahang grammar. Samot na kaha sa mga bata nga dili hingana kahana sa writing, so na'y tendency sa koang part matingala kung anong hanay ra man gyud kaayo na iyang grammar, anong hanay ra magyud kaayo na iyang thoughts. So, a big possibility is that nagyo AI involvement. And of course, dili mo na siya ingon niya na kaminos tasa ilaha, but just being honest that kung unsay level sa ilahang capability, aware na teachers, mauna, maoro yun po na kaya nilang i-provide. And at the same time, ako nabantayan kay AI is naa sya'y pattern the way it answers your queries or imong gusto na mga tubag. Naa sya'y pattern, plastar kayo siya muhanay sa word. So, as for me, makamatikod ko kung naa na siya'y AI involvement or wala, especially kanang pa-assignment nimo, then I have to double-check it because there are tendencies na mapalaban yun as like AI para lang dili maglisod.

(Here, you can really tell a child's ability, what they can produce, especially when you ask them to write their own work. Unless they are already writers, like campus journalists, then they know how to arrange their thoughts. However, there are also tendencies for them to make mistakes in their grammar. How much more for children who are not very skilled in writing? So, there is a tendency on my part to be surprised if their grammar is so well-arranged, if their thoughts are so well-arranged. So, a big possibility is that there's AI involvement. And of course, you do not say it to belittle them, but just being honest about their capability level, teachers are aware, and that's what they can provide. And at the same time, what I have noticed is that AI has a pattern in the way it answers your queries or the responses you want. It has a pattern; it arranges words very meticulously. So, as for me, I notice if there's AI involvement or not, especially when you give an assignment, then I must double-check it because there are tendencies for them to rely on AI just to make things easier.)

Lack Contextual Awareness. The informants frequently observed that AI-generated content, while factually correct, often lacked contextual awareness, failing to incorporate specific local or nuanced details requested in assignments. Instead, essays would use generic, international examples, demonstrating AI's inability to grasp the specific depth and locality required for a task. This indicates that AI merely summarizes data without true comprehension or synthesis, resulting in superficial content that lacks the expected substance from a human writer.

Informant 5 noted that AI-generated essays often demonstrate a lack of contextual awareness by using generic international examples instead of requested local ones, despite accurately answering the prompt. She discussed that;

Kung mangayo ka og mga example gikan sa inyong lokal nga komunidad sa Monkayo, apan ang essay naggamit og mga generic, international nga example, klaro kining nagpakita og kakulang sa contextual awareness. Bisan og sakto ang impormasyon, ang kawala sa pagsabot sa mga specific

> *nuances sa inyong mga leksyon usa ka lig-ong timaan sa pagkalambigit sa AI. Nagpakita kini nga ang AI kulang sa tinuod nga pagsabot sa gikinahanglan nga giladmon ug lokalidad sa usa ka buluhaton.*
> (The writing sometimes answers the prompt accurately but completely ignores specific instructions I gave. For instance, if I asked for examples from our local community in Monkayo, the essay would use generic, international examples. This lack of contextual awareness, despite correct information, suggests AI involvement. It shows the AI doesn't understand the specific nuances of our lessons.)

Informant 8 observed that AI-generated content, while efficient in providing information, often lacks contextual awareness and fails to explore implications or offer unique interpretations, appearing superficial. She mentioned that;

> *Ang AI mahimong mohatag og impormasyon nga efficient kaayo, apan dili kini maka explore sa mga implication o makahatag og talagsaon nga interpretation. Morag ang AI nag-summarize lang og data nga walay tinuod nga pagsabot o pag-synthesize niini. Kining kawala sa higher-order thinking, bisan pa sa perpekto nga pinulongan, usa ka kusganon nga timaan nga kini gihimo sa AI. Mobati kini nga sobra ka taphaw ug kulang sa substance nga gipaabot gikan sa usa ka tawo nga nagsulat.*
>
> (The content might be factually correct, but entirely lacks critical analysis or deeper insight. It presents information efficiently but does not explore implications or offer unique interpretations. It is as if the AI is summarizing data without truly understanding or synthesizing it. This absence of higher-order thinking, despite perfect language, is a strong clue. It's too superficial.)

Striking Similarities among Outputs. The informant consistently observed striking similarities in sentence patterns or argument structures across multiple student submissions. Despite minor variations in specific words, the underlying framework, overall flow, or presentation of ideas would be nearly identical. This strong pattern suggests that students are likely utilizing the same or very similar AI tools or prompts, leading to a noticeable lack of individual variation and a formulaic approach that makes their outputs appear as if they were generated from the same template.

Informant 9 identified striking similarities among outputs, noting that student papers often share identical overall flow or presentation despite minor word differences, suggesting the use of the same AI tools or prompts. She claimed that;

> *Daghan kaayo ko ug Nakita nga striking similarities o arguments sa mga papel sa students. Bisan pa man sa specific words medyo lahi gyud, labi na ang overall flow o ang pagka present kay identical. This suggests nga ang mga students might be using the same AI tool o kaparehas sila ug prompt. Kani lack na gyud ni ug individual variation kay klaro na kaayo ang pattern sa AI. Murag kaparehas na man gud sila ug template.*
> (I have seen striking similarities in structure or argument across multiple student papers. Even if the specific words are slightly different, the overall flow or the way points are presented is identical. This suggests students

might be using the same AI tool or a very similar prompt. This lack of individual variation is a clear pattern of AI use. It's like they all used the same template.)

Impact to Understanding of Students' Learning and their Language Proficiency of Presence of AI-generated Texts

This section additionally presents the results to the specific research question 4.2: "How is the presence of AI-generated text impacting your understanding of students' learning and their actual language proficiency?" under the fourth major research question, "What are the insights of language teachers in determining the AI-generated language output?" The following themes served as results, which were: Impediment of Students' Critical Thinking, Grammar and Writing Skills, Too Dependent on AI Texts, and Harder to Accurately Assess.

Impediment of Students' Critical Thinking, Grammar and Writing Skills. The informants consistently expressed that the presence of AI-generated texts significantly impedes students' development of critical thinking, grammar, and overall writing skills. They noted that AI's ability to produce flawless papers obscures students' true understanding and hides their weaknesses, making it difficult for teachers to provide targeted support. This reliance on AI prevents students from practicing and honing essential language skills, leading to a decline in genuine language proficiency and a superficial understanding of vocabulary. The concern is that AI is doing the learning for the students, hindering their ability to analyze, synthesize, and express ideas independently, ultimately affecting their overall communicative competence and personal expression.

Informant 2 articulated that AI's influence on students can significantly impede their critical thinking, grammar, and writing skills, contributing to a devaluation of genuine language proficiency. She mentioned that;

Ang AI sa mga estudyante mahimong makababag sa ilang pagpalambo sa critical thinking, grammar, ug writing skills. Kini makatampo sa pagkunhod sa paghatag og bili sa tinuod nga language proficiency. Kining pagbalhin gikan sa personal nga paningkamot ngadto sa automated nga tabang usa ka dakong hagit sa edukasyon karon. Ang imong kabalaka valid tungod kay ang mga kahanas nga gipalambo pinaagi sa pagtudlo sa pinulongan—sama sa pagmugna og ideya, pag-organize sa hunahuna, ug pagpahayag sa kaugalingon nga tin-aw—mahimong dili kaayo mahasa kung ang usa ka himan ang mohimo sa kadaghanan sa trabaho. Ang tinuod nga kahanas sa pinulongan molambo pinaagi sa pagpraktis, paghimo og sayop, ug pagkat-on gikan niini, nga mahimong limitahan sa AI.

(I felt worried because they always rely on AI and it can hinder the student's development of critical thinking, grammar and writing skills, and it can affect how we value true language proficiency.)

Informant 4 expressed concern that students' 100% reliance on AI would impede their critical thinking and language proficiency, as it removes the opportunity for language practice. She discussed that;

The presence of AI-generated texts is part of my understanding of student learning for actual language proficiency. Well, as an AI user as well, gamit ni siya. However, kung maingan na nilang alliance ka nila lang a hundred percent, it would really decline your critical thinking, your language

proficiency. Kasi wala na, you will not be able to practice your language. AI is a very good platform, no? One instruction, one command. Life is easier, mag-deteriorate yun yung language, eh, makakapag practice. That's one, and then, oh, kato siya.

(The presence of AI-generated texts is part of my understanding of student learning for actual language proficiency. Well, as an AI user myself, I use it. However, if you let them rely on it 100%, it would really decline your critical thinking, your language proficiency. Because you would not be able to practice your language anymore. AI is a very good platform, right? One instruction, one command, and it gives you what you need. Life is easier. But what happens is, if you do not allow them to practice, their language will deteriorate, and they won't get to practice. That is one thing, and then, oh, that's it.)

Informant 5 conveyed concern that AI impedes students' learning process by doing the learning for them, making it difficult to fairly grade their actual effort rather than just a polished output. She shared that;

Kung makakita ka og perfect nga papel, natural lang nga magduha-duha ka kung unsa ka dako ang actual nga paningkamot nga gibubo sa estudyante. Kini makapalisud sa paghatag og patas nga grado sa ilang prosess sa pagkat-on, tungod kay mobati ka nga ang AI na ang nagkat-on alang kanila. Ang imong tinguha nga gantihan ang ilang kakugi imbes ang usa lang ka nindot nga output, usa ka valid kaayo nga kabalaka alang sa usa ka magtutudlo.

(If I see a perfect paper, but I do not know how much effort the student put in. This makes it hard to fairly grade their learning process. It feels like the AI is doing the learning for them. I want to reward their hard work, not just a polished output.)

Informant 6 observed that students might use advanced language correctly in essays but fail to define or use it in other contexts, indicating a superficial understanding that impedes genuine vocabulary acquisition. She claimed that;

Ang usa ka estudyante mahimong mogamit og advance nga mga language unya sakto sa usa ka essay, apan unya mapakyas sa define niini o paggamit niini sa laing context. Kini nagpakita nga dili gyud nila nahibal-an ang mga pulong, kondili mikopya lang niini. Makamugna kini og superficial nga pagsabot sa ilang kahibalo sa pulong. Ug mao kana ang nakapalisud nimo sa pagtuo sa ilang sinulat nga vocabulary.

(My understanding of their vocabulary acquisition is severely impacted. A student might use advanced words correctly in an essay, but then fail to define them or use them in another context. This shows they haven't truly learned the words, only copied them. It creates a superficial understanding of their word knowledge. I can't trust their written vocabulary anymore.)

Informant 8 noted that students accustomed to AI-generated sentences struggle with verbal expression and unassisted writing, which impedes their overall communicative competence and fluency. She shared that;

> *Kung na anad sila nga ang AI ang naghimo sa ilang mga sentence, natural lang nga maglisod sila sa pagpahayag sa complicated nga mga ideya sa binaba nga paagi o sa walay tabang nga pagsulat. Kini dako og epekto sa ilang kinatibuk-ang communicative competence. Ang ilang fluency sa pagpahayag og orihinal nga mga hunahuna morag nag-antos tungod kay sobra na silang nagsalig sa mga phrasing sa AI.*
>
> (I have noticed a decline in students' ability to articulate their thoughts spontaneously. If they are used to AI crafting their sentences, they struggle to express complex ideas orally or in unassisted writing. This impacts their overall communicative competence. Their fluency in expressing original thoughts seems to suffer. They rely too much on the AI's phrasing.)

Informant 9 highlighted that AI's influence impedes the understanding of students' personal expression, as the AI can obscure their unique personality and hinder their learning and development. She expressed that;

> *Dako kini og epekto sa imong pagsabot sa ilang personal nga expression. Ang imong tinguha nga makita ang ilang talagsaon nga personalidad nga mosidlak pinaagi sa ilang mga tubag usa ka valid kaayo nga tumong sa pagtudlo. Ang tinuod nga tagsulat magpakita sa iyang kaugalingon sa iyang mga sinulat, ug kung ang AI ang nagtabon niini, mawala ang usa ka importante nga bahin sa pagkat-on ug paglambo sa estudyante.*
>
> (The presence of AI-generated text makes me question the authenticity of their writing voice. I cannot tell if the style, tone, and flow are genuinely theirs or if they are mimicking an AI's output. This impacts my understanding of their personal expression. I want to see their unique personality shine through their words.)

Too Dependent on AI Texts. The informants expressed significant concern that students are becoming overly dependent on AI texts, leading to a decline in their own cognitive processing and language proficiency, particularly in English. They observed that students frequently copy AI-generated content without truly understanding it, driven by a desire for convenience and a lack of motivation to engage in deeper thought. This over-reliance prevents students from practicing and developing their writing skills, as they simply generate answers from AI rather than processing ideas with their own brains. This trend ultimately hinders their ability to learn from mistakes and develop authentic language competence.

Informant 3 asserted that students are becoming too dependent on AI texts, often copying content without processing it, which leads to a decline in language proficiency and hinders their writing enhancement. She elaborated that;

> *Dako kaayo ug epekto ang AI-generated text sa mga bata. Una sa tanan, dili na sila magsalig sa ilahang kaugalingong brain to process. It is because siyempre kahago baya no, mauna magsalig sila sa AI. Makababa gud siya sa ilahang proficiency sa language especially in English. It is because there are tendencies for them niya mag sige na lang ug copya whether they knew*

> *the words or not. As long as naa silay ika-answer, copy lang ng copy, without processing the answers, without giving much time na even though kinopya rani, pero dapat ako po mismo ang kabalo.*
> (The AI-generated text has a huge impact on children. First, they will no longer rely on their brains to process. This is because, of course, it is a lot of effort, right? That's why they rely on AI. Secondly, it can immediately lower their language proficiency, especially in English. This is because there are tendencies for them to just keep copying, whether they know the words or not. As long as they have an answer, they just copy and copy without processing the answers, without giving much time to even think, "Even if I copied this, I should still understand it myself.)

Informant 7 explained that if AI corrects everything, teachers cannot see common student errors, leading to a situation where students become too dependent on AI texts, hindering targeted lesson planning and genuine improvement. She discussed that;

> *Kung ang AI ang mokorek sa tanan, dili nimo makita ang mga komon nga sayop nga gihimo sa imong mga estudyante. Kini nagpasabot nga dili nimo matumong ang imong mga lesson aron matubag ang ilang aktuwal nga mga panginahanglan. Kinahanglan nimong makita ang ilang mga sayop aron matabangan sila nga molambo. Ang ilang tinuod nga grammar level nagpabilin nga tinago, ug kini makapugong kanimo sa paghatag og tukmang suporta sa ilang pagkat-on.*
>
> (It makes it very challenging to identify specific grammatical errors that I need to teach. If the AI corrects everything, I do not see the common mistakes my students are making. This means I cannot tailor my lessons to address their actual needs. I need to see their errors to help them improve. Their real grammar level is hidden.)

Informant 10 expressed concern that students might develop a false sense of proficiency by submitting flawless work, becoming too dependent on AI texts, and preventing them from seeking the help they truly need. He mentioned that;

> *Mahimo silang motuo nga sila sa ilang ka hawud tungod kay makasubmit sila og walay mali nga trabaho, bisan kung ang AI ang naghimo niini. Kining sobra nga pagsalig makapugong kanila sa pagpangita og tabang nga tinuod nilang gikinahanglan. Posible nga dili nila marealize ang ilang aktuwal nga mga limitation, nga moresulta sa usa ka dili realistic nga pagtan-aw sa ilang mga kahanas.*
>
> (It creates a false sense of accomplishment for students. They might believe they are proficient because they can submit flawless work, even if AI did it. This overconfidence can prevent them from seeking the help they truly need. They might not realize their actual limitations. It gives them an unrealistic view of their skills.)

Harder to Accurately Assess. The informants consistently reported that the widespread use of AI-generated text has made it significantly harder to accurately assess students' true understanding and progress. They noted that impressive-looking AI-generated essays often do not reflect a student's actual grasp of the lesson, creating a noticeable gap between written performance and in-class participation. This disconnects leads teachers to question the extent of genuine learning occurring, as the authenticity of student work becomes increasingly difficult to verify.

Informant 1 stated that the use of AI-generated text has made it harder to accurately assess student understanding, creating a gap between written performance and in-class participation. He shared that;

> *Ang paggamit og text nga hinimo sa AI nakapalisud sa pag-assess og tarong kung unsa gyud ang nasabtan sa akong mga estudyante. Naay mga essay nga nindot tan-awon sa gawas lang, apan dili nagpakita sa tinuod nga pag-uswag sa estudyante o sa ilang pagsabot sa leksyon. Mao ni ang nakamugna og gintang tali sa ilang performance sa sinulat nga buluhaton ug sa ilang partisipasyon sa klase, nga naghimo nako nga pangutan-on kung pila gyud ka tinuod nga pagkat-on ang nahitabo.*
>
> (The use of AI-generated text has made it harder to accurately assess what my students understand. Some essays appear impressive on the surface but do not reflect the student's actual progress or grasp of the lesson. This creates a gap between their performance in written work and their in-class participation, leading me to question how much learning is taking place.)

Perspectives on the Long-term Implications of AI Writing Tools for Language Education and Assessment

This section further presents the results to the specific research question 4.3: "What are your perspectives on the long-term implications of AI writing tools for language education and assessment?" under the fourth major research question, "What are the insights of language teachers in determining the AI-generated language output?" The following themes served as results, which were: Need to Balance AI Use, Use of Oral Exam, In-person Writing and Portfolio Assessment, Over-reliance of Students to AI, Problem with Application of Learning, Access to AI Tools Results to Inequality in Education, Writing Output Becoming Unnatural, Schools to Invest on Training of Teachers, Provide Tailored Feedback, Difficulty on Assessing Students' Writing Abilities, and Framework for Responsible AI Use.

Need to Balance AI Use. The informants expressed a strong belief that AI writing tools will continue to shape language education and assessment, emphasizing the critical need to balance their use. While acknowledging AI's potential as a learning aid, they cautioned against over-reliance, which could hinder students' writing development and critical thinking. The consensus is that educators must design assessments that promote independent thought and foster AI literacy, ensuring students understand both the benefits and limitations of these tools to prevent a complete dependence that undermines genuine learning and skill acquisition.

Informant 1 expressed their belief in the need to balance AI use in language education, advocating for its role as a helpful aid while cautioning against overreliance that could weaken students' writing and critical thinking. He mentioned that;

> *I believe that AI writing tools will continue to influence how we teach and assess language. Samtang they can serve as helpful learning aids, sobrahan ug salig may weaken students' writing development and critical thinking.*

> *Kinahanglan sab nato nga i-balance ang ilang pag gamit by designing assessments that encourage independent thinking and by promoting AI literacy that highlights both the benefits and limits of these tools.*
> (I believe that AI writing tools will continue to influence how we teach and assess language. While they can serve as helpful learning aids, overreliance may weaken students' writing development and critical thinking. We need to balance their use by designing assessments that encourage independent thinking and by promoting AI literacy that highlights both the benefits and limits of these tools.)

Use of Oral Exam, In-person Writing and Portfolio Assessment. The informants suggested that the education system should adapt to the long-term implications of AI by increasingly relying on alternative assessment methods. Specifically, they proposed a greater emphasis on oral exams, in-person writing tasks, and portfolio assessments. This shift is seen to ensure that students' true language proficiency and understanding are accurately gauged, moving beyond written submissions that could be heavily influenced by AI tools.

Informant 2 suggested that, in the long term, the education system should shift towards the use of oral exams, in-person writing, and portfolio assessment to ensure genuine student learning. She suggested that;

> *In the long term, siguro ang education system dapat mag rely sa oral exam, in-person writing, ug portfolio assessment.*
> (In the long term, maybe the education system may need to rely more on oral exams, in-person writing, and portfolio assessment.)

Over-reliance of Students to AI. The informants expressed significant concern that AI-generated text is leading to an over-reliance among students, causing them to neglect their own cognitive processes and hindering their language proficiency, particularly in English. They observed a tendency for students to copy AI content without genuine understanding, driven by convenience. This reliance is seen as detrimental to students' ability to practice writing, develop critical thinking, and learn from mistakes, ultimately impeding their long-term skill enhancement and leading to a deterioration of their knowledge proficiency.

Informant 3 articulated that AI-generated text has a significant impact on children, leading to an over-reliance of students to AI that hinders their critical thinking, language proficiency, and ability to process information independently. She explained that;

> *Para sa ako, dako kaayo ug epekto ang AI-generated text sa mga bata. Una sa tanan, dili na sila magsalig sa ilahang kaugalingong brain to process. It is because, siyempre, kahago gudbaya, no? Paano magsalig sila sa AI? Ikaduha, makababa agad siya sa ilahang proficiency sa language, especially in English. It is because there are tendencies for them na mag sige na lang ug kopya whether they knew the words or not. As long as na sila ika-answer, then copy lang ng copy without processing the answers, without giving much time na even though kinopya rani, pero dapat ako po mismo ang kabalo.*
> (For me, AI-generated text has a huge impact on children. First, they will no longer rely on their brains to process information. This is because, of course, it is a lot of effort, right? How can they rely on AI? Second, it can

> immediately lower their language proficiency, especially in English. This is because there are tendencies for them to just keep copying, whether they know the words or not. If they have an answer, they just copy and copy without processing the answers, without giving much time to even think. Even if I copied this, I should still understand it myself.

Problem with Application of Learning. The informants foresee a significant problem with students' ability to apply their learning in real-world contexts if they become overly reliant on AI tools. They expressed concern that students who submit excellent work in school might struggle significantly in practical settings, such as teaching or lesson planning, where independent verbal communication and original thought are crucial. This reliance on AI to carry them through their studies could lead to a deterioration of their knowledge proficiency and a struggle to adapt when faced with tasks that require genuine, unassisted application of skills.

Informant 4 expressed concern about a problem with the application of learning in students who rely heavily on AI, noting a disconnect between their school performance and their ability to apply knowledge in practical settings like practicum. She mentioned that;

> *Our perspectives on the long-term implication of the AI tools for language education and assessment. So, well, in the future, no wonder that there are some students, you know what, I could sometimes, I hear that, kasi sa school, ang galing mo, wag submit ng mga works, maayo kaayo. Pero pag-abot sa practicum, you really cannot hide, di ka manggagawas sa inyong how good you are. Next, when they're making their lesson planning, you cannot command the AI to, because we have our own template, di ba? And then, the AI would suggest the content, but not also our own. So, it would really require you to edit the information that is given by that AI. That's obvious, the deterioration of your knowledge proficiency*
>
> (The long-term implications of AI tools for language education and assessment. So, well, in the future, no wonder that there are some students, you know what, I could sometimes hear that, because in school, you are so good, you submit work, and they are excellent. But when it comes to practicum, you really cannot hide; your true abilities would not come out. Next, when they are making their lesson planning, how will they write in English? You cannot command the AI to, because we have our template, right? And then, the AI would suggest the content, but not necessarily our own. So, it would really require you to edit the information that is given by that AI. That is obvious, the deterioration of your knowledge proficiency.)

Access to AI Tools Results to Inequality in Education. The informants raised concerns that unequal access to sophisticated AI tools and reliable internet connectivity would exacerbate existing educational inequalities. They highlighted that students with access to advanced AI resources will gain a significant advantage over those without, potentially leaving disadvantaged students further behind. This issue is viewed not merely as a technological challenge but as a crucial matter of social justice, emphasizing the importance of policies that ensure equitable access to AI literacy and resources for all students to prevent a widening digital divide.

Informant 5 highlighted that unequal access to AI tools results in inequality in education, potentially widening the digital divide and leaving students without access at a significant disadvantage. She mentioned that;

> *Ang mga estudyante nga adunay access sa mga sophisticated AI tools ug kasaligan nga internet adunay dako kaayo nga bentaha. Kini makapasamot sa kasamtangang inequalities sa edukasyon. Kung dili kini matubag, ang mga bata nga walay access mahimong mabiyaan pa gyud. Mao nga importante kaayo nga maghimo kita og mga polisi aron masiguro ang equitable access sa AI literacy ug resources para sa tanan. Dili lang kini usa ka isyu sa teknolohiya, kundili usa ka crucial social justice issue. Kinahanglan natong paningkamutan nga walay bata nga mabiyaan sa dagan sa teknolohiya, ug nga ang tanan makabaton sa kahibalo ug kahanas nga gikinahanglan sa umaabot nga kalibutan.*
>
> (I am concerned about widening the digital divide. Students with access to sophisticated AI tools and reliable internet will have a huge advantage over those who do not. This could exacerbate existing inequalities in education. We need policies to ensure equitable access to AI literacy and resources for all. It is a crucial social justice issue.)

Writing Output Becoming Unnatural. The informants observed that as AI generates increasingly generic text, the ability to produce writing with genuine emotion and originality will become even more pronounced and valued. They stressed the need for language education to emphasize these uniquely human aspects of language, celebrating what differentiates human expression from machine-generated output. This approach is seen as essential not only for preparing students for an AI-driven world but also for fostering their individuality and creativity, thereby preserving the essence of human expression through writing.

Informant 3 observed that as AI produces generic text, the ability to write with genuine feeling and originality becomes paramount, indicating that writing output is becoming unnatural when AI is involved. She discussed that;

> *Samtang ang AI nag produce ug generic text, ang abilidad sa pagsulat nga adunay tinuod nga pagbati ug pagka-orihinal maoy mobarog ug molutaw. Ang atong pagtudlo kinahanglan nga mopasiugda niining talagsaon nga tawhanong aspeto sa pinulongan. Bahin kini sa pagsaulog kung unsa ang nagpalahi kanato gikan sa mga machine. Kini nga pamaagi dili lang maka prepare sa atong mga estudyante alang sa usa ka kalibutan nga manipulate sa AI, apan makapalambo usab sa ilang pagka-indibidwal ug pagka mamugnaon. Kini usa ka lig-on nga paagi aron ma preserve ang essence sa tawhanong ekspresyon pinaagi sa sinulat.*
>
> (The value of human creativity, unique voice, and emotional expression in writing will become even more important. As AI produces generic text, the ability to write with genuine feeling and originality will stand out. Our teaching should emphasize these uniquely human aspects of language. It is about celebrating what makes us different from machines.)

Schools to Invest on Training of Teachers. The informants strongly advocated for schools to invest in regular training and support for educators to effectively navigate the impact of AI. They emphasized that without such professional development, teachers feel overwhelmed and unprepared to address AI-related challenges. This continuous learning curve is deemed critical for equipping teachers with the necessary skills to manage AI in their classrooms, highlighting that adequate support and learning opportunities are essential for educators to remain effective in a rapidly evolving technological landscape.

Informant 7 emphasized the critical need for schools to invest in the training of teachers to equip them with the necessary skills to manage the impact of AI in education. She claimed that;

> *Ang mga eskwelahan kinahanglang mamuhunan sa regular nga training ug suporta alang sa mga educators. Kung wala kini, mobati gyud ang mga magtutudlo nga overwhelmed ug dili andam. Mao kini ang never-ending learning curve alang kanato. Kini usa ka kritikal nga aspeto sa pag-atubang sa epekto sa AI sa edukasyon. Ang paghatag og igong suporta ug kahigayonan sa pagkat-on sa mga magtutudlo makatabang kanila nga mahimong mas epektibo sa paggamit ug pagdumala sa AI sa ilang mga klase.*
>
> (Teachers will need continuous professional development to keep pace with AI advancements. We cannot just learn about AI once; it is an ongoing process of adaptation. Schools must invest in regular training and support for educators. Without this, teachers will feel overwhelmed and unprepared. It's a never-ending learning curve for us.)

Provide Tailored Feedback. The informants expressed optimism about AI's potential to provide tailored feedback and adaptive exercises for students, thereby addressing individual learning needs more effectively. However, they also acknowledged that realizing this potential requires careful integration and management by teachers. The challenge lies in determining how AI can genuinely support individual student requirements, making it a promising yet complex possibility that demands thoughtful implementation in education.

Informant 8 discussed the potential for AI to provide tailored feedback and adaptive exercises for students, acknowledging that this requires careful integration and teacher management. She explained that;

> *Makahatag gyud sila og tailored feedback o adaptive exercises para sa mga estudyante, nga makatabang kaayo sa pagtubag sa ilang tagsa-tagsa ka panginahanglan sa pagkat-on. Apan, nagkinahanglan kini og amping nga integrasyon ug pagdumala sa magtutudlo. Kinahanglan gyud natong susihon kung unsaon sa AI ang tinuod nga pagsuporta sa indibidwal nga panginahanglan sa estudyante. Usa kini ka malaumon apan komplikado nga posibilidad, ug ang paggamit niini sa tukmang paagi mao ang dakong hagit nga atong giatubang karon sa edukasyon.*
>
> (AI tools could potentially offer incredible opportunities for personalized learning, if used wisely. They might provide tailored feedback or adaptive exercises for students. However, this requires careful integration and teacher oversight. We need to explore how AI can genuinely support individual student needs. It's a hopeful but complex possibility.)

Difficulty on Assessing Students' Writing Abilities. The informants foresee significant challenges for universities in accurately assessing the true writing abilities of incoming students due to the prevalence of AI-generated content. They questioned how higher education institutions can ensure the authenticity of submitted essays. Furthermore, they highlighted that employers will increasingly demand employees who possess critical thinking skills and the ability to write authentically, rather than merely generating AI text, underscoring a potential disconnect between academic performance and real-world readiness.

Informant 9 highlighted the difficulty in assessing students' writing abilities as universities and employers will struggle to verify the authenticity of submitted work in an AI-driven environment. She mentioned that;

> *Ang mga unibersity maglisod sa pag-assess sa tinuod nga writing abilities sa mga incoming students. Unsaon man nila pagseguro nga ang gisumit nga essay tinuod nga buhat sa estudyante? Sa pikas bahin, ang mga employers magkinahanglan og mga empleyado nga makahuna-huna nga kritikal ug makasulat nga tinuod, dili lang basta maka-generate og AI text.*
>
> (The implications for higher education and future careers are significant. Universities will struggle to assess incoming students' true writing abilities. Employers will need employees who can think critically and write authentically, not just generate AI text. This means our students must be prepared for a world where AI is prevalent but not a substitute for human skill.)

Framework for Responsible AI Use. The informants emphasized the critical need for a clear framework that defines the responsible use of AI, addresses plagiarism, and ensures data privacy in educational settings. They argued that without such explicit guidelines, confusion and academic dishonesty will persist as significant problems. Establishing these clear rules is considered essential for maintaining academic integrity within schools and providing a foundational understanding for both students and educators on ethical AI integration.

Informant 10 emphasized the need for a clear framework for responsible AI use, including guidelines on plagiarism and data privacy, to maintain academic integrity in schools. He discussed that;

> *Nanginahanglan kita og usa ka framework nga tin-aw nga naghubit sa responsable nga paggamit sa AI, plagiarism, ug data privacy. Kung wala kining klaro nga mga lagda, ang kalibog ug ang academic dishonesty magpadayon nga mahimong dakong problema. Kini esensyal kaayo alang sa pagmintinar sa academic integrity sa atong mga eskwelahan.*
>
> (There is a long-term need for clear ethical guidelines and policies from national and local education bodies. We need a framework that defines responsible AI use, plagiarism, and data privacy. Without these clear rules, confusion and academic dishonesty will continue to be major problems. It's essential for maintaining academic integrity.)

What guidelines can be crafted based on the findings of the study?

This section presents the results of the 5th major question, 'What guidelines can be crafted based on the findings of the study?' Three specific questions were utilized to gather data that would answer the questions.

Recommendations for Adopting Assessment Methods in Language Education

This section also presents the results to the specific research question 5.1: "Based on language teachers' identified experiences, challenges, and insights regarding AI-generated output, what recommendations can be made for adopting assessment methods in language education?" under the fifth major research question, "What guidelines can be crafted based on the findings of the study?" The following themes served as results, which were: Include Policies on AI Use, Stick to Traditional Assessment, Provide Challenging Assessments, Adopt with Proper Guidance, Use of Project-Based Assessments, and Conduct of One-on-one Conferences.

Include Policies on AI Use. The informants strongly advocated for the formal integration of AI use policies into academic frameworks, such as writing rubrics and syllabi. They emphasized the importance of clearly informing students that unauthorized use of AI tools without proper citation constitutes academic dishonesty. Beyond prohibition, there is a collective call to educate students on ethical AI use, guiding them to leverage AI for tasks like idea generation or grammar checks, rather than for full-text writing. This approach aims to address the abusive use of AI directly and equip teachers with resources to detect AI-generated outputs, even suggesting that schools should provide detection tools.

Informant 1 suggested a recommendation to include policies on AI use in writing rubrics and syllabi, educating students about academic dishonesty and ethical AI integration. He mentioned that;

> *Akong ma recommend kay dapat naay policy sa AI sa rubrics ug syllabi, dapat makabalo sila ang ang dili authorized na paggamit ug tools sama sa ChatGPT or Wikipedia nga walay tarung nga citations o ginatawag natoug academic dishonesty. At the same time, we can teach them how to use AI ethically, such as using it for idea generation or grammar checks but not for full-text writing.*
>
> (One recommendation is to include AI use policies in writing rubrics and syllabi, making students aware that unauthorized use of tools like ChatGPT or Wikipedia without proper citation is academic dishonesty. At the same time, we can teach them how to use AI ethically, such as using it for idea generation or grammar checks but not for full-text writing.)

Informant 4 proposed that education should include policies on AI use to address its abusive application, suggesting that providing detection tools and resources for teachers would be beneficial. She explained that;

> *Siguro ako ang nakita kay the way they identify and insights regarding AI-generated output, what recommendations can be made for adopting assessment methods in language education? I think education now would also start to address this abusive way of using the AI. Kasi I could really see na abusin nito gamit ng AI. So perhaps they could adjust as well. First, they could provide features, kining mga tool na they can use to detect. That's one. And then we go online. Karang ikaw siya kahay. Hard copy ba? It's very difficult to detect hard copy. Picture-picture pa ka. So karang siya. So may gwapo na ko maratong mga nanaman. Siguro ka na. Providing teachers the*

resources that would help them detect AI generated outputs. That's one. Like subscription.

(Perhaps what I have seen is the way they identify and gain insights regarding AI-generated output. What recommendations can be made for adopting assessment methods in language education? I think education now would also start to address this abusive way of using AI. Because I could see that AI is being used abusively. So perhaps they could adjust as well. First, they could provide features, these tools that they can use to detect. That's one. And then we go online. What about hard copies? It's very difficult to detect hard copies. You must take pictures. So that's it. So, I think there are good new developments. Perhaps providing teachers with the resources that would help them detect AI-generated outputs. That's one. Like subscriptions.)

Informant 7 emphasized the necessity to include policies on AI use by developing clear, school-wide policies on AI use in assessment, ensuring consistency and promoting academic integrity. She mentioned that;

Kinahanglan natong i-develop ang klaro nga school-wide nga mga polisiya bahin sa paggamit sa AI sa assessment, ug kinahanglan kining ipahibalo sa mga estudyante ug sa mga ginikanan. Kining polisiya kinahanglang maghubit kung unsa ang madawat ug unsa ang naglangkob sa academic dishonesty gamit ang AI. Ang consistency sa tanang subject ug grade levels importante kaayo. Ang tin-aw nga mga lagda makapamenos sa kalibog ug makapasiugda sa pagkamatarong. Ang pagtakda og klaro nga mga gipaabot (expectations) esensyal kaayo aron mapadayon ang integridad sa akademiko sulod sa eskwelahan.

(We need to develop clear, school-wide policies on AI use in assessment, communicated to both students and parents. This should define what is acceptable and what constitutes academic dishonesty with AI. Consistency across subjects and grade levels is vital. Clear rules reduce confusion and promote fairness. It is important to set expectations.)

Stick to Traditional Assessment. The informants expressed a preference for maintaining traditional assessment methods, emphasizing the value of manual checking of student outputs. This approach involves individually reviewing and correcting errors, providing detailed feedback and comments that students can appreciate and utilize for improvement. While acknowledging that this method is time-consuming, teachers believe it fosters a deeper connection with student learning and ensures a more reliable assessment compared to relying solely on AI detection. They also suggested incorporating frequent formative assessments like short quizzes or exit tickets to monitor understanding before major assignments, thereby reducing the temptation for AI use in final drafts.

Informant 3 stated their personal point of view to stick to traditional assessment methods, preferring to manually check student outputs and provide corrections, even if it is time-consuming. She discussed that;

As a language teacher, ako ang personal point of view gid ani, I'll stick to the traditional way of assessing the student's output. Manually, ako ang mag-check, ako ang mag-isa-isa ug butang sa mga corrections and errors, na dili gud ingun niya na ikatapan kay AI kung mali ba ni o dili, but the very first thing gud, ako gud ang mag-manual nga magtrabaho. If there is a touch of AI, maybe I have to double-check, especially language is dynamic, so basig na i-update na yung mga kabaguhan na, then ay nalibog ko ani, so I have to check AI if there has something to do with what we call the dynamics in the language, basig na yung mga kabaguhan. That's when the time na magamit yung AI, but for me gud, mas nindot nga mag-check manually sa student's output sa mga bata. Though it takes a lot of time, but I'm sure the student can appreciate it, especially kung butangan pag yun yung mag-feedback, butangan yung comments dito, kaya I'm sure students will be touched and will read them. And of course, they will make use of those comments as basis para kung sa ilang buhaton the next time around for their improvement also.

(As a language teacher, my point of view on this is that I will stick to the traditional way of assessing student output. I will manually check, I will individually put in the corrections and errors, not just compare it to AI to see if it's wrong or not, but the very first thing is, I will manually do the work. If there is a touch of AI, maybe I must double-check, especially since language is dynamic, so perhaps there are updates, and then if I get confused, I must check AI if there's something to do with what we call the dynamics in the language, maybe there are new developments. That is when I would use AI, but for me, it is better to manually check the students' output. Though it takes a lot of time, I am sure the student can appreciate it, especially if I put feedback and comments there, because I am sure students will be touched and will read them. And of course, they will make use of those comments as a basis for what they will do the next time around for their improvement also.

Informant 10 suggested the use of short quizzes, quick writes, or exit tickets to stick to traditional assessment methods that verify understanding before major assignments. He mentioned that;

Pinaagi sa mga short quizzes, quick writes, o exit tickets, mahimo nimong masusi ang pagsabot sa mga estudyante sa dili pa ang usa ka dako nga assignment. Kini makatabang sa pag-ila sa mga learning gaps sa sayo pa ug makapamenos sa tentasyon sa paggamit sa AI sa katapusang mga draft. Bahin kini sa padayon nga pagmonitor sa ilang pag-uswag, pagsiguro nga ang pagkat-on mahitabo sa matag lakang.

(I recommend incorporating formative assessments more frequently throughout the writing process. Short quizzes, quick writes, or exit tickets can check understanding before a major assignment. This helps identify

learning gaps early and reduces the temptation for AI use on final drafts. It is about continuous monitoring of their progress.)

Provide Challenging Assessments. The informants emphasized the necessity of designing assessments that challenge students beyond what AI can easily generate. This involves shifting the focus from mere language mechanics to higher-order thinking skills, compelling students to evaluate, synthesize, and argue their points. By requiring students to include a statement on their AI use, teachers aim to foster honesty and encourage deeper reflection on their learning process, ultimately preparing them for more complex real-world challenges that AI cannot readily replicate.

Informant 8 recommended providing challenging assessments that go beyond language mechanics, focusing on critical thinking, evaluation, synthesis, and argumentation to assess students' higher-order thinking. She explained that;

> *Kung ang AI makahimo sa mga mechanics sa language, na ang atong mga assessment kinahanglan nga mohagit sa mga estudyante sa pag-evaluate, pag-synthesize, ug paglalis. Kini makabalhin sa pokus ngadto sa higher-order thinking. Sa laktod, bahin kini sa pag-assess sa ilang utok, dili lang sa ilang mga pulong. Kini nga pamaagi makatabang sa pagpalambo sa mga kahanas nga dili dali mapulihan sa AI, nga nag-andam sa mga estudyante alang sa mas komplikado nga mga hagit sa tinuod nga kalibutan.*
>
> (I suggest focusing the assessment more on critical thinking and analysis skills rather than just factual recall or perfect grammar. If AI can handle basic language mechanics, our assessments should challenge students to evaluate, synthesize, and argue. This shifts the focus to higher-order thinking. It's about assessing their mind, not just their words.)

Informant 9 suggested that providing challenging assessments by requiring students to include a statement on their AI use can encourage honesty and self-reflection on their learning process. She mentioned that;

> *Kung ang mga estudyante moapil og hamubo nga statement kung giunsa (o kung gigamit ba gyud) nila ang mga AI tools para sa usa ka assignment, makapadasig kini sa kamatinud-anon ug makatabang kanila nga hunahunaon ang ilang kaugalingong pagkat-on. Naghatag usab kini sa mga magtutudlo og bililhong insight sa ilang proseso. Kining pamaagi makapalambo og kultura sa transparency sa atong mga klasehanan.*
>
> (We should encourage self-reflection on AI use as part of the submission process. Students could include a short statement on how (or if) they used AI tools for an assignment. This promotes honesty and helps them think about their own learning. It also provides teachers with valuable insight. This fosters a culture of transparency.)

Adopt with Proper Guidance. The informants recognized the pervasive presence of AI in today's educational landscape and suggested that rather than outright banning it, educators should adopt AI with proper guidance for students. This approach acknowledges AI as a tool that can be integrated into learning, provided that clear instructions and ethical considerations are emphasized to prevent misuse and ensure that students understand how to leverage AI responsibly to enhance their learning without compromising academic integrity.

Informant 2 proposed that AI should be adopted with proper guidance for students, acknowledging its prevalence while ensuring responsible use. She emphasized that;

> *Dili gyud ikalimod nga ang AI is very rampant na. Maybe we should adopt it with proper guidance to our students.*
>
> (We cannot deny that AI is very rampant nowadays. Maybe we should adopt it with proper guidance to our students.)

Use of Project-Based Assessments. The informants advocated for the increased use of project-based assessments that demand creativity, collaboration, and multi-modal outputs. This approach is seen as highly effective in the current educational climate, as these types of tasks are not easily replicated by AI. By incorporating such projects, teachers can reduce reliance on traditional written submissions and provide students with diverse avenues to demonstrate their learning, thereby capturing their true abilities more comprehensively and authentically.

Informant 5 advocated for the use of project-based assessments that demand creativity, collaboration, and multi-modal output as an effective strategy in the current educational landscape. She mentioned that;

> *Ang paggamit sa project-based assessments nga nagkinahanglan og creativity, collaboration, ug multi-modal output usa ka epektibo kaayo nga pamaagi sa atong panahon karon.*
>
> (I recommend using project-based assessments that require creativity, collaboration, and multi-modal output. These tasks are often too complex or hands-on for AI to complete independently.)

Conduct of One-on-one Conferences. The informants highlighted the critical importance of conducting more one-on-one conferences with students to discuss their written work. These direct interactions provide a valuable opportunity for teachers to ask probing questions, verify students' understanding, and confirm the originality of their work. Despite being time-consuming, this personal engagement is considered highly effective in building teacher-student relationships and gaining deeper insights into student learning, as it allows for a more nuanced assessment of their ideas and language.

Informant 6 highlighted the importance of the conduct of one-on-one conferences with students about their written work as a highly effective strategy to verify understanding and authorship through direct interaction. She mentioned that;

> *Ang pagpahigayon og daghang one-on-one conferences uban sa mga estudyante bahin sa ilang sinulat nga trabaho usa ka importante kaayo nga strategy. Atol niining mga panaghisgot, makapangutana ka og mga probing questions aron masuta ang ilang pagsabot ug ang pagka-iya sa ilang buhat. Kining direct nga interaksyon makatabang gyud sa pagkumpirma kung ang mga ideya ug pinulongan tinuod ba nga gikan sa estudyante. Bisan og dako kini og panahon, usa kini ka highly effective nga pamaagi tungod kay ang personal nga pag-engage sa estudyante dili gyud mabayran. Kini nga pamaagi makapalig-on sa relasyon sa magtutudlo ug estudyante, ug makahatag og mas lawom nga pagsabot sa pagkat-on sa estudyante.*
>
> (Teachers should conduct more one-on-one conferences with students about their written work. During these discussions, we can ask probing questions to verify their understanding and authorship. This direct interaction helps

confirm if the ideas and language truly belong to the student. It's a time-consuming but highly effective method. This personal engagement is invaluable.)

Practical Guidelines to Promote Academic Integrity and Ethical Use of AI Language Learning Environments

This section additionally presents the results to the specific research question 5.2: "Considering the strategies teachers currently employ to cope with AI-generated text, what practical guidelines can educators develop to promote academic integrity and the ethical use of AI in language learning environments?" under the fifth major research question, "What guidelines can be crafted based on the findings of the study?" The following themes served as results, which were: Develop Clear Classroom Guidelines, Introduce Personalized Writing Tasks, Avail of AI Applications or Resources, Train Students Generic Phrasing, and Integrate Discussion about Curriculum.

Develop Clear Classroom Guidelines. The informants emphasized the critical need for educators to develop clear classroom guidelines regarding AI use, particularly through process-based writing. They advocated for emphasizing outlines, drafts, and revisions to track student development and reduce AI dependence. Setting clear boundaries on when and how AI can be used as an assistance tool for learning concepts rather than for cheating was also highlighted. This includes constant reminders about ethical use, plagiarism, and intellectual property, encouraging students to develop their ideas and fostering honesty through open dialogue about the challenges of AI.

Informant 1 proposed that educators should develop clear classroom guidelines emphasizing process-based writing, including outlines, drafts, and revisions, to track student development and reduce AI dependence. He mentioned that;

> *Para sa akoa, educators can develop clear classroom guidelines that emphasize process-based writing, including outlines, drafts, and revisions. These steps allow us to track students' development and reduce dependence on AI tools. Integrity contracts, writing reflections, and oral defenses are also practical strategies that uphold fairness and encourage honesty.*
> (For me, educators can develop clear classroom guidelines that emphasize process-based writing, including outlines, drafts, and revisions. These steps allow us to track students' development and reduce dependence on AI tools. Integrity contracts, writing reflections, and oral defenses are also practical strategies that uphold fairness and encourage honesty.)

Informant 3 stressed the importance of setting boundaries and developing clear classroom guidelines for students on when and how to use AI, emphasizing ethical use and intellectual property. She claimed that;

> *Para sa ako, kung magsisagutan ang butanga, mag set boundaries. Dapat ipahimutang sa mga estudyante kung kanus-a gamitun si AI. Dili siya pang cheating but instead AI can be useful para pang-assist sa ilahang learning. Kung naa may di masabtan nga mga concepts or topics, then look for AI to assist the understanding nila not to the point that they are going to copy what they have read. Ana bitaw, isa pa, always gyud ipahimangno sa ilaha ang ethical use, especially kanang plagiarism, and at the same time, even in writing natin ginatawag na intellectual property.*

(For me, when discussing this matter, we should set boundaries. Students should be warned about when to use AI. It's not for cheating, but instead, AI can be useful to assist their learning. If there are concepts or topics they do not understand, then they can look to AI to assist their understanding, not to the point that they are going to copy what they have read. Also, always remind them about ethical use, especially plagiarism, and at the same time, what we call intellectual property in writing.)

Informant 7 suggested that a follow-up verbal explanation can confirm authenticity when a written submission is doubtful, advocating for developing clear classroom guidelines that promote deeper learning beyond written output. She explained that;

Kung adunay pagduda sa usa ka sinulat nga submission, ang usa ka follow-up nga binaba nga katin-awan makakumpirma sa pagka authentic sa output. Kining pamaagi makasusi sa tinuod nga pagsabot lapas sa sinulat nga pulong, ug makasiguro nga ang mga estudyante tinuod nga nakasabot sa materyal. Kini nga guideline dili lang makatabang sa pag-ila sa AI-generated content, apan makapalambo usab sa mas lawom nga pagkat-on ug sa abilidad sa mga estudyante sa pagpahayag sa ilang mga ideya sa lain-laing porma.

(Educators should develop a guideline for using oral assessments or student conferences to verify understanding. If a written submission is suspicious, a follow-up verbal explanation can confirm authenticity. This method checks for genuine comprehension beyond the written word. It ensures students truly grasp the material. This guideline promotes deeper learning.)

Introduce Personalized Writing Tasks. The informants advocated for introducing personalized writing tasks and diversifying assessment methods to counter AI-generated content. They highlighted that assignments requiring true understanding, personal experience, critical thinking, and multi-modal outputs (like reflection papers, portfolios, creative projects, presentations, or debates) are difficult for AI to authentically replicate. This approach ensures that student work genuinely reflects their own abilities and promotes a more holistic evaluation of their skills, moving beyond text-based submissions easily generated by AI.

Informant 2 highlighted that assignments like reflection papers and portfolio assessments are difficult for AI to replicate authentically, underscoring the need to introduce personalized writing tasks. She mentioned that;

Ang mga buluhaton sama sa reflection papers, portfolio assessment, ug pipila ka personalized writing tasks lisod gyud kaayo nga buhaton sa AI sa tinuod ug original nga paagi. Kini nga assessment nagkinahanglan og tinuod nga pagsabot, personal nga kasinatian, ug kritikal nga pang huna-huna gikan sa estudyante, nga dili basta-basta ma-replicate sa AI.

(Guidelines should encourage integrity by designing an activity that are hard to outsource to AI such as reflection paper, portfolio assessment, and some personalized writing tasks.)

Informant 5 emphasized that AI struggles to generate authentic content tied to individual lives or cultural nuances, advocating for strategies to introduce personalized writing tasks that force students to rely on their own knowledge and creativity. She claimed that;

> *Ang AI maglisod kaayo sa pag-generate og authentic content nga konektado sa indibidwal nga kinabuhi o sa specific cultural nuances. Kini makapugos sa mga students nga mosalig sa ilang kaugalingong kahibalo ug pagkamamugnaon. Kining pamaagi makapahimo sa mga assignment nga AI-resistant ug dako kaayo ug ikatabang sa pagpalambo sa pagka-orihinal. Kini ang esensya sa tinuod nga pagkat-on ug pagpahayag sa kaugalingon.*
>
> (A practical guideline is to design assignments that require personal voice, unique experiences. AI struggles to generate authentic content tied to individual lives or specific cultural nuances. This forces students to rely on their knowledge and creativity. This approach makes assignments AI-resistant. It promotes originality.)

Informant 6 stated that providing a controlled environment for authentic assessment ensures that the work is genuinely the student's own, aligning with the need to introduce personalized writing tasks. She highlighted that;

> *Kini nga pamaagi makasiguro nga ang trabaho nga gihimo sa tinuod nga ila. Naghatag kini og usa ka controlled environment alang sa authentic assessment, diin makita gyud nimo ang tinuod nga abilidad sa estudyante. Direk usab kini nga nagtubag sa hagit sa AI misuse ug nagpasiugda sa tinuod nga pagpalambo sa kahanas. Mao kini ang usa sa labing klaro nga paagi aron ma preserve ang integridad sa akademiko sa pagsulat.*
>
> (Guidelines should recommend incorporating more in-class writing activities where students have no access to devices. This ensures that the work produced is genuinely their own. It provides a controlled environment for authentic assessment. This method directly addresses the challenge of AI misuse. It promotes true skill development.)

Informant 9 suggested that projects, presentations, debates, or multimedia tasks can reduce reliance on easily AI-generated text, advocating for strategies to introduce personalized writing tasks that emphasize diverse forms of expression. She discussed that;

> *Sa mga proyek, presentasyon, debate, o multimedia tasks maka pa menos sa pagsalig sa mga text nga dali ra ma-generate sa AI. Kini nagtugot sa mga estudyante nga ipakita ang ilang nakat-unan pinaagi sa lain-laing mga mobility, nga nagpasiugda sa usa ka mas holistic nga ebalwasyon sa ilang mga kahanas. Kining maong guideline nagdasig sa nagkalain-laing porma sa pagpahayag, nga importante sa pagpalambo sa ilang tibuok nga abilidad. Kini usab makatabang sa pag-ila sa tinuod nga pagsabot ug pagkamamugnaon sa estudyante nga dili lang limitado sa sinulat nga output.*

(Guidelines should advocate for diversifying assessment methods beyond traditional essays. Incorporating projects, presentations, debates, or multimedia tasks reduces reliance on easily AI-generated text. This allows students to demonstrate learning through various modalities. It promotes a more holistic evaluation of their skills. This guideline encourages varied expression.)

Policy-level Recommendations Educational Institutions Propose to Integrate AI Literacy and Manage AI-generated Work

This section further presents the results to the specific research question 5.3: "What policy-level recommendations can educational institutions propose to integrate AI literacy and manage AI-generated work in language curricula and assessment procedures?" under the fifth major research question, "What guidelines can be crafted based on the findings of the study?" The following themes served as results, which were: Training for Teachers and Students, Invest in Giving School-owned Devices, Conduct of Orientation, Promote Project-based Learning, Provide Clear Guidelines, Conduct of Regular Forum or Meetings, and Provide Flexible Framework and Policy.

Training for Teachers and Students. The informants strongly advocated for comprehensive training programs in digital and AI literacy for both teachers and students. They emphasized that such training is crucial to equip educators with the skills to effectively use and manage AI tools, preventing situations where students are more adept with AI than their teachers. The consensus was that institutions should design modules on responsible AI use, integrate them into language curricula, and update assessment procedures to better monitor authenticity. This proactive approach aims to promote honesty, set clear boundaries for AI use, and ensure that the focus remains on genuine learning rather than merely detecting cheating.

Informant 1 recommended that schools should provide training for both teachers and students on digital and AI literacy, and update assessment procedures to better monitor authenticity. He shared that;

At the policy level, bawat schools providan ug training for both teachers and students on digital and AI literacy. Ang institutions dapat maghimo modules that explore responsible AI use and include them in language curricula. Ang assessment procedures dapat updated unya naay performance tasks, real-time writing, and teacher-student conferences to better monitor authenticity and support learning.

(At the policy level, schools should provide training for both teachers and students on digital and AI literacy. Institutions can design modules that explore responsible AI use and include them in language curricula. Assessment procedures should be updated to include performance tasks, real-time writing, and teacher-student conferences to better monitor authenticity and support learning.)

Informant 2 emphasized that conducting training and setting clear academic honesty policies are crucial for ensuring that students' true skills are measured. She mentioned that;

I suggest nga ang mga eskwelahan dapat mag promote ug AI literacy aron matudluan ang mga Kabataan ug mga magtutudlo ug unsaon siya pag gamit ethically. Mag conduct ug training ug mag set ug academic honesty, policies to ensure the real skills of the students

(I suggest that schools should promote AI literacy by teaching students as well as teachers on how to use AI ethically. They must conduct training and set academic honesty policies to ensure the real skills of the students.)

Informant 3 suggested that training for teachers is essential to equip them with the skills to manage AI, ensuring they are more proficient than students in using these tools. She discussed that;

Ako ang mahuna-hunaan ani kay kuhaan. Yeah, there is a possibility yun na itraining ang teachers para mas hawd ang teachers to use the tools and how to manage AI kay lisud na pod yung mas hawd pa ang estudyante mo gamit sa AI kaysa kay teacher. And of course, promote honesty. Di mangud malikayan na maka-access ang bata sa AI, kaya open man siya. Then, let just them be honest with the use of AI. Teach them maybe the basics of AI, but not to the point niya mag-copya. So, integrity has to be retained and setting boundaries also when and where to use AI. At the same time pod, kanang, i-emphasize yun the focus on learning, not catching them using AI for cheating purposes na.

(What I can think of here is to act. Yeah, there is a possibility that teachers will be trained so that they are more skilled in using the tools and how to manage AI, because it is difficult if the students are more skilled at using AI than the teacher. And of course, promote honesty. It's unavoidable that children can access AI, because it is open. Then, just let them be honest with the use of AI. Teach them maybe the basics of AI, but not to the point of copying. So, integrity must be retained, and setting boundaries also when and where to use AI. At the same time, emphasize the focus on learning, not catching them using AI for cheating purposes.)

Invest in Giving School-owned Devices. The informants highlighted the necessity for schools to invest in providing school-owned devices or subsidized access to reliable AI platforms. This investment is seen as crucial to prevent AI from exacerbating the existing digital divide among students, ensuring that every student can learn and utilize these tools. The consensus was that equitable access to AI literacy and resources is not merely a technological issue but a fundamental matter of fairness and social justice, aiming to leave no child behind in the evolving technological landscape.

Informant 6 asserted the necessity for schools to invest in giving school-owned devices or subsidized access to reliable AI platforms to prevent the widening of the digital divide. She discussed that;

Kini nagpasabot lamang nga kinahanglan gyud kitang mamuhunan sa paghatag og school-owned devices o subsidized access sa kasaligan nga AI platforms. Kinahanglan natong pugngan ang AI gikan sa pagpalapad sa kasamtangang digital divide taliwala sa atong mga estudyante. Matag estudyante angayan nga makabaton sa oportunidad nga makakat-on ug makagamit niining mga himan. Dili lang kini bahin sa teknolohiya; usa kini ka dakong isyu sa pagkamatarong (fairness) ug social justice.

(There needs to be a policy that ensures equitable access to AI tools and resources for all students. This might involve providing school-owned devices or subsidized access to reliable AI platforms. We must prevent AI

from widening the existing digital divide among our students. Every student deserves the opportunity to learn with these tools. This is a matter of fairness.)

Informant 9 highlighted the importance of providing resources and time for teachers to collaborate on creating innovative, AI-resistant tasks, which implicitly requires schools to invest in giving school-owned devices or similar resources. She emphasized that;

> *Paghatag og mga resources ug panahon sa mga magtutudlo aron magtinabangay sa pagmugna og innovative tasks. Kining mga assignment kinahanglang magkinahanglan og talagsaon nga tawhanong pagkamamugnaon, personal nga kasinatian, o kritikal nga panghunahuna. Kining proactive nga pamaagi dako kaayo og ikatabang sa pagmintinar sa academic integrity sa atong mga eskwelahan. Bahin kini sa pagpabilin nga una sa dagan, nga kanunayng mangita og mga paagi aron mapalambo ang tinuod nga pagkat-on sa atong mga estudyante.*
>
> (I recommend that institutions invest in research and development of AI-resistant assignment prompts. This means providing resources and time for teachers to collaborate on creating innovative tasks. These assignments should require unique human creativity, personal experience, or critical thinking. This proactive approach helps maintain academic integrity. It's about staying ahead of the curve.)

Conduct of Orientation. The informants strongly advocated for the conduct of orientations, advocacy programs, and symposiums to promote the ethical use of AI in schools. They emphasized that such initiatives, organized by the school or through groups of teachers and students, are vital to help students understand that AI is a helpful tool but should not be used abusively. The goal is to instill a sense of control over AI's influence, particularly among college students who spend less time in supervised settings, and to prevent the deterioration of knowledge proficiency observed when AI is over-relied upon.

Informant 4 suggested that the conduct of orientation, advocacy, and symposiums by schools can help students understand the ethical use of AI and its implications. She emphazed that;

> *Perhaps naay orientation, advocacy, AI or technology, technology advocacy, AI is helpful but we cannot use it. So I akong masulti kay advocacy, technology, advocacy, like group of teachers or like group of students or organization and that they would advocate the ethical use of AI in school to help them, to help the students understand that it's really good because at the end of the day, we are the ones who suffer. Or we can have symposium, perhaps the school can organize these things so that somehow, if not everyone is listening, at least there are some who can do it because out of control, we are the ones who are the ones who are in control.*
>
> (Perhaps what I'm thinking about is orientation, advocacy, AI or technology advocacy. AI is helpful, but we cannot use it without boundaries. So I would say advocacy, technology advocacy, like groups of teachers or groups of students or organizations that would advocate the ethical use of AI in school to help them, to help the students understand that it is good because at the

> end of the day, we are the ones who suffer. Or we can have symposiums; perhaps the school can organize these things so that somehow, if not everyone is listening, at least there are some who can do it because it's out of control. We are the ones who are in control.

Promote Project-based Learning. The informants advocated for promoting project-based learning, oral presentations, and performance tasks as effective assessment methods in the age of AI. They emphasized that these types of assignments are more AI-resistant because they demand genuine creativity, critical thinking, and practical application of knowledge—skills that AI struggles to replicate. This shift in assessment strategies is considered crucial for authentic evaluation, ensuring that teachers can truly measure student learning and foster a more holistic development of their abilities beyond text-based outputs.

Informant 5 advocated for policies that promote project-based learning, oral presentations, and performance tasks as effective, AI-resistant assessment methods that require genuine creativity and critical thinking. She explained that;

> *Pagdasig sa project-based learning, oral presentations, ug performance tasks maoy epektibo kaayo nga pamaagi. Kining mga matang sa assessment mas AI-resistant tungod kay nagkinahanglan kini og tinuod nga pagkamamugnaon, kritikal nga panghunahuna, ug praktikal nga aplikasyon sa kahibalo – mga kahanas nga lisod pa kaayo kopyahon sa AI. Kining pagbalhin sa mga pamaagi sa assessment importante kaayo alang sa authentic evaluation ug aron masiguro gyud nato nga tinuod natong masukod ang pagkat-on sa estudyante.*
>
> (I propose that policies require diversifying assessment methods beyond traditional essays. Institutions should encourage project-based learning, oral presentations, and performance tasks. These methods are more AI-resistant and assess a broader range of skills. This shift in assessment procedures is vital for authentic evaluation. It ensures we truly measure student learning.)

Provide Clear Guidelines. The informants underscored the necessity of developing clear school-wide policies and guidelines regarding AI use in assessment. They emphasized that these policies must define what is acceptable and what constitutes academic dishonesty when using AI, ensuring consistency across all subjects and grade levels. The goal is to reduce confusion, promote fairness, and set clear expectations for maintaining academic integrity within the school community. This includes acknowledging that human judgment remains paramount over AI detection tools and establishing fair processes for addressing suspected AI misuse.

Informant 7 stressed the importance of policies that provide clear guidelines for AI use in assessment, emphasizing that human judgment remains paramount and outlining a fair process for addressing suspected AI misuse. She discussed that;

> *Ang policy kinahanglang magpahayag nga kining mga klaro nga guidellines, dili alang sa depinitive nga ebidensya, ug nga ang tawhanong paghukom maoy labaw sa tanan. Kinahanglan usab nga ipahayag niini ang usa ka patas nga proseso alang sa pagtubag sa gidudahan nga AI misuse. Kini makapugong sa sayop nga akusasyon ug makapalambo sa pagsalig sulod sa komunidad sa edukasyon dinhi sa Davao Region. Ang paghatag og*

kasiguruhan sa patas nga proseso makapahimo sa mga estudyante ug magtutudlo nga mas komportable sa paggamit ug pagdumala sa AI.
(Institutions should establish clear guidelines for the use of AI detection tools, acknowledging their limitations. The policy should state that these tools are for guidance, not definitive proof, and that human judgment is paramount. It should also outline a fair process for addressing suspected AI misuse. This prevents false accusations and promotes trust.

Conduct of Regular Forum or Meetings. The informants highlighted the importance of conducting regular forums or meetings to discuss the benefits, challenges, and ethical considerations of AI in education. These gatherings are seen as crucial for fostering a shared understanding and a collaborative approach to managing AI's impact. By ensuring that all stakeholders are on the same page, such forums contribute significantly to the successful integration of AI into the educational system, addressing concerns and collectively strategizing for responsible implementation.

Informant 8 suggested that the conduct of regular forums or meetings to discuss AI's benefits, challenges, and ethical considerations can foster a shared understanding and collaborative approach to AI management. She claimed that;

Ang pagpahigayon og regular nga mga forum o miting diin mahisgutan ang mga kaayohan, hagit, ug etikal nga konsiderasyon sa AI sa edukasyon dako kaayo og ikatabang. Kini makapalambo og gipaambit nga pagsabot ug collaborative nga pamaagi sa pagdumala sa AI. Pinaagi niini, masiguro nga ang tanan naa sa parehas nga panid, nga hinungdanon alang sa malampuson nga paghiusa sa AI sa atong sistema sa edukasyon
(A policy should be put in place to promote open dialogue about AI among students, teachers, and parents. Regular forums or meetings can discuss the benefits, challenges, and ethical considerations of AI in education. This fosters a shared understanding and collaborative approach to managing AI. It ensures everyone is on the same page.)

Provide Flexible Framework and Policy. The informants emphasized the necessity of a flexible framework and policy that can adapt to the evolving capabilities of AI. They acknowledged that what works today may not be effective tomorrow, underscoring the need for policies to remain relevant and effective over time. This continuous process of adaptation is considered essential for the educational system to successfully integrate AI, ensuring that guidelines can evolve with technological advancements and remain responsive to new challenges.

Informant 10 emphasized the necessity for educational institutions to provide a flexible framework and policy that can adapt to the evolving capabilities of AI, ensuring policies remain relevant and effective over time. He discussed that;

Tinuod gyud, ang mogana karon posibleng dili na mogana ugma. Ang usa ka flexible nga framework nga makahimo sa pag-adapt sa mga bag-ong kapabilidad sa AI esensyal kaayo. Kini makasiguro nga ang atong mga polisi magpabilin nga relevant ug epektibo sa paglabay sa panahon. Usa gyud kini ka padayon nga proseso sa pag-adap alang sa atong sistema sa edukasyon.

(Policies should include provisions for regular review and updates to AI guidelines as technology rapidly evolves. What works today might not work tomorrow. A flexible framework that can adapt to new AI capabilities is essential. This ensures our policies remain relevant and effective over time. It's a continuous process of adaptation.)

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION

Discussions

The identified themes and the insights derived from them served as the foundation for broadening the discussion of the study's findings. Each theme was thoroughly discussed and aligned with relevant literature and existing studies to provide a comprehensive understanding.

Specific Instances of Suspicion of AI-generated Student Work. The emerging themes in this structured theme are oftentimes in essays, on compositions, reviews, book reviews and literature reviews, on sentence construction, and on creative piece. This structured theme focuses on the concrete situations and observable patterns that led language teachers to suspect or confirm that a student's work was AI-generated. The responses reveal that teachers often noticed deviations from a student's typical writing abilities and style, prompting further investigation.

Furthermore, teachers often notice specific signs when they suspect a student's work was generated by AI. These include text that lacks a clear logical flow, contains information that seems made up, doesn't go into enough detail on important points, or fails to offer new ideas. Such writing might also seem unoriginal, lack facts, or not encourage deep thought. Additionally, AI-generated content can have incorrect references, with wrong titles, authors, or publication details, making careful checking necessary. Other clues include factual mistakes, poor logical connections, and a general lack of originality or critical thinking in the content itself (Kővári, 2025).

In addition, teachers often suspect that essays are written by AI when they see a sudden change in how well a student writes, their writing style, or the words they use. For example, essays from students who

usually have trouble writing might suddenly look 'perfect' with hard words. Some teachers have seen essays that are 'too short' and read more like a list than a proper story, which suggests AI made them efficient but without personal style. Also, if a student's essay talks about complex ideas not taught in class, and the student cannot explain these ideas when asked, it points to AI being involved. This shows how teachers notice AI's impact on student writing (Lukianenko & Kornieva, 2024).

Moreover, teachers might find it hard to tell if student work was written by a human or by AI, as both people and AI detection tools struggle with this difference. This can lead to mistakes where human-written work is wrongly thought to be AI-generated. Even though AI detection tools are better at finding AI text than human judges, they are not perfect and can still make false errors. Because of this uncertainty, it is suggested that teachers respond to suspected AI use in a way that helps students learn and grow, rather than just punishing them (Fisk, 2024).

Furthermore, teachers noticed that students might be using AI tools for tasks like compositions, reviews, book reviews, and literature reviews. They also had similar titles and structures, especially in poems. Another teacher thought student writing seemed too clean or sterile because it did not have the usual mistakes, making it hard to give specific help. Also, when students gave general, philosophical answers to reflective questions without personal stories, it made teachers suspicious because it did not match the student's usual writing style (Barrett & Pack, 2023).

Similarly, what AI-made literature means for writing in the future, like new kinds of writing, new ways for people to be authors and work together, and new challenges to old ideas of being original and creative. It ends by suggesting more research, saying that people from different fields need to work together and find new ways to study and judge AI-made literature (Prabowo & Asmarani, 2025).

Therefore, teachers, both new and experienced, found it difficult to tell the difference between texts written by students and those made by AI programs like ChatGPT. Even though more experienced teachers sometimes made slightly better guesses, both groups thought they were much better at spotting AI than they were. This shows that current AI can create texts that teachers cannot easily detect, which creates a problem for schools when grading student work (Fleckenstein et al., 2024).

Similarly, English teachers face challenges when trying to figure out if students' creative writing was helped by AI. Even though AI can be useful for things like checking grammar, teachers worry that it might stop students from thinking deeply and creating original ideas on their own. This makes it hard for teachers to know if the creative work truly comes from the student's own mind or if AI played a big role in making it (Lukianenko & Kornieva, 2024).

Types of AI-generated Language Output Encountered. Emerging themes include entire essay output and creative writing pieces.

The looks at how AI makes literature and what that means for writing. It explores what AI-made texts are like, how working with AI changes the writing process, and the problems these new tools bring for old ideas about who wrote something, if it's new, and what creativity really is. The research found special ways AI-made literature looks, what it talks about, and how it's built, by checking out some AI-made books and a project called 'Pharmako-AI'. It also showed how complicated it is when humans and AI work together to create. The study says that AI can be a strong tool for trying new things in writing, but it's not perfect. It sometimes struggles with keeping things steady, making sense, and showing deep feelings, so people still need to put in a lot of effort to make the final writing good. This work helps us understand what AI can and cannot do in creative writing, and it points out that we need new ways to think about who is truly creative when AI is involved (Prabowo & Asmarani, 2025).

Moreover, English teachers are encountering new challenges in determining whether students' essays are AI-generated, raising concerns about the impact of AI on critical thinking and originality. While some educators permit AI for basic functions like grammar checks, they remain apprehensive about its broader influence on student writing. Consequently, it has become difficult for them to ascertain the true authorship of entire essays, or the extent of AI's involvement (Lukianenko & Kornieva, 2024)

In addition, a teacher focuses on students' perspectives and experiences with GenAI-assisted academic writing. It explores how students perceive the benefits and challenges of using AI for their writing tasks. However, the study does not provide information about teachers' experiences in identifying AI-generated language, particularly in creative writing pieces. Therefore, based on the provided text, there is no direct information available regarding teachers' methods or challenges in determining if a student's creative writing output was generated by AI (Kim et al., 2024).

Change in Assessing Student Work as a Result of Accessibility to AI Writing Tools. Emerging themes include tedious and complex, more difficult, assessment becoming easier, time consuming in checking outputs, change in giving feedback, use detection tools for accuracy, changing assessments to oral, and more time to discuss academic integrity.

Furthermore, teachers have noted several changes in assessing student work due to the accessibility of AI writing tools. Some teachers find the assessment process has become more tedious and complex, and even more difficult overall. However, others report that assessment is becoming easier. A common challenge is that checking student outputs is now more time-consuming. This has led to changes in how feedback is given, with some teachers needing to use detection tools to ensure accuracy. There's also a trend towards changing assessments to oral formats, and teachers are spending more time discussing academic integrity with their students (Ybyrayeva et al., 2024).

Teachers faced challenges in recognizing when students used AI for their language tasks. While they recognized the benefits of AI, they also noted the need for human checking to make sure the AI-generated content was correct and made sense in the right situation. This explains that even with AI tools, teachers still had to carefully review student work to ensure its quality and authenticity (Yatri et al., 2023).

In addition, assessing student work has become more difficult as outputs are harder to assess for authenticity. Teachers are facing increasing worries because students are using AI tools to help with their schoolwork. This makes it harder for teachers to grade student assignments, especially when they need to tell the difference between what a student wrote themselves and what an AI tool might have created (Koh et al., 2023).

Furthermore, despite the challenges, one participant noted that AI can make assessment easier by helping with the checking of sentences, paragraphs, or essays, especially when it takes a long time manually. Teachers found that using AI tools like ChatGPT was helpful because it made their administrative tasks, such as creating assignments, less burdensome. This allowed them to save time and effort while still making sure that the quality of the work and the honesty of the students' efforts remained high (Dhamija & Dhamija, 2024).

Conversely, checking outputs can become time-consuming for teachers. Teachers often find providing feedback to students very time-consuming, especially for complex tasks like writing. This can lead to students not getting enough feedback on their work. Because of this, generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools, such as Large Language Models (LLMs) like ChatGPT 3.5-Turbo, are being considered to help reduce the time teachers spend on feedback. However, even with AI, teachers still need to check the quality

of the AI-generated feedback, which can also take time, especially since AI feedback may not always meet the same quality standards as feedback from human experts (Jansen et al., 2024).

Similarly, the approach to giving feedback has also changed. Instead of merely correcting grammar, teachers now focus more on critical thinking, originality of ideas, and the student's unique voice. When it comes to giving feedback, teachers are valued for their ability to understand students, offer personal help, and show emotional intelligence. This means they can connect with students on a deeper level and tailor their advice. However, feedback from AI, like ChatGPT, is seen as more thorough and complete, offering many details. This highlights a key difference. While AI can give lots of information, teachers provide a special touch that includes empathy and personalized support (Solak, 2024).

In addition, teachers sometimes use AI detection tools for accuracy, but they acknowledge that these tools are not 100% accurate. Teachers are worried about students using AI tools like ChatGPT to create text that is not their own, which can lead to plagiarism. To help with this, many AI detection tools have been made to check if text was written by a human or an AI. However, a study found that these tools might not be very good at their job. In this study, text was made by ChatGPT and then changed until it looked original. All the AI detection tools tested, including Turnitin, could not tell that the text was still AI-generated in the end. This means teachers should not rely on these tools to set strict rules or percentages for what counts as acceptable AI-generated work, because the tools have big limitations (Halaweh & El Refae, 2024).

In the same manner, oral assessments have become more important. English teachers are facing new challenges because students can use AI tools to write essays. To make sure students are doing their own work and thinking critically, some teachers are changing how they assess essays. One way they are doing this is by using oral defenses. This means students must talk about their essays, which helps teachers see if the students truly understand what they wrote, especially when AI might have been involved in creating the text. This method helps teachers check for originality and critical thinking that might be missing if only written work is assessed (Lukianenko & Kornieva, 2024).

Teachers are now spending more time discussing academic integrity with their students. Teachers have various experiences and concerns when it comes to AI-generated content and academic honesty. A major worry is that students might use AI tools like ChatGPT to create their assignments, leading to plagiarism or over reliance on AI instead of truly learning the material. This issue is especially noticeable in classes where students are also trying to improve their language skills, as teachers are concerned that students might use AI to write essays without understanding the subject or developing their language abilities. To handle this, educators believe it is important to have clear rules for using AI in school and to teach students how to use these tools responsibly and ethically. Some suggest using AI for ongoing feedback during the writing process, rather than just for final grades, to help students learn and improve their writing skills, which might also lessen the temptation to misuse AI for cheating (Wang, 2024).

Ways to Know AI-generated Output. Emerging themes include no mistakes in outputs, sophisticated vocabulary, no personal or unique insights, improvement in writing quality, lack of contextual awareness, difficulty breaking down output, lacking critical analysis, and strikingly similar sentence patterns.

Teachers find it hard to tell the difference between text written by a student and text made by AI, even though students are submitting AI-generated work as their own. It's tough to spot AI writing, and even special software designed to do so does not always work well (Drisko, 2024).

Moreover, one of the most immediate indicators of AI-generated content is the absence of mistakes in outputs. Teachers have found that even when using AI tools like ChatGPT, they still need to carefully check and change the content that the AI creates. This is important to make sure the information is correct

and fits what is being taught. So, while AI can help make things like test questions and feedback, it does not mean there will be no mistakes, and teachers must look over it to ensure it is accurate and useful for students (Zhang, 2024).

In addition, AI-generated texts often use sophisticated vocabulary. This study focuses on how teachers use generative AI in college English listening classes. It looks at their experiences, what they think, and the problems they face. The paper explains that AI tools help students learn better by giving them special learning paths and quick feedback. It also mentions that AI helps teach different students in different ways, makes students more interested, and gives them chances to practice that fit their needs (Huang et al., 2024).

Another indicator is the absence of personal or unique insights. Teachers found that while AI, like ChatGPT, was helpful for creating ideas and materials, they were aware that it lacked a human-like understanding. This meant that the AI's output might not have personal or unique insights that a human teacher could provide (Nernere & Kastuhandani, 2024).

Furthermore, teachers also notice a sudden and significant improvement in writing quality from one assignment to the next. Teachers face new challenges when students use AI to help with writing, as it can be hard to tell if students are truly learning or if the AI is doing most of the work. This makes it difficult for teachers to properly assess and support student learning in AI-assisted writing. The study suggests that actively revising AI-generated text helps improve writing quality, meaning teachers should encourage students to engage deeply with the AI output rather than just accepting it as is. This active engagement leads to better vocabulary, sentence structure, and text flow. Therefore, educators need to focus on how students interact with AI, not just the final written product, to ensure meaningful learning occurs (Yang et al., 2024).

On the other hand, a lack of contextual awareness is another key giveaway. Teachers found that even though AI tools like MagicSchool AI could help them plan lessons faster and come up with many ideas, the things the AI created were often not ready to be used right away. This means the AI's outputs needed to be changed or fixed by the teachers to make sure they fit the classroom well and were good for teaching. This shows that the AI did not always understand the specific needs or situations of the classroom, requiring teachers to add their own knowledge and judgment to make the AI's suggestions useful (Setyaningsih et al., 2024).

Consequently, when asked to explain a complex sentence or elaborate on an argument from their paper, students who used AI often show difficulty breaking down their output. They struggle to articulate the reasoning behind their writing. It highlights how AI helps provide personalized and timely feedback by analyzing student logbooks, which are important for reflective learning. The study suggests that this approach has positive effects on student engagement and learning outcomes, fostering a growth mindset. However, the text does not specifically detail any difficulties the teacher or learning coach faced in breaking down or interpreting the AI-generated output itself. Instead, it focuses on the positive impact and the potential for revolutionizing learning feedback (Coenen & Pfenninger, 2024).

Moreover, AI-generated content, while factually correct, often lacks any critical analysis or deeper thinking. Teachers' professional lives are full of different experiences that shape how they teach. These experiences include important moments called critical incidents. When teachers use tools like AI, they need to carefully check what the AI creates. If they do not look at the AI's output with a critical eye, they might miss mistakes or information that is not quite right. This is important because their experiences, including how they handle new tools, directly affect their teaching (Akdağ, 2022).

Furthermore, teachers observe strikingly similar sentence patterns or argument structures across multiple student submissions. Teachers might notice that many student papers have very similar ways of writing sentences or organizing their ideas. This happens because students might be using AI tools to help them, and these tools often produce text with common patterns. This can make it hard for teachers to see what students truly understand or how they think on their own (Moorhouse & Kohnke, 2023).

Difficulty in Identifying AI-generated Text. Emerging themes include quite difficult to detect, when students edit it, difficult with well-crafted work, AI outputs becoming contextualized, a need for careful judgments for outputs of good writers, and no consistent AI style.

Conversely, teachers face significant challenges in identifying text created by artificial intelligence (AI). It is often quite difficult to detect AI-generated content, especially when students edit it, making it harder to spot its origins. This difficulty increases with well-crafted work, as AI outputs are becoming more contextualized and less obviously machine-made. Therefore, teachers need to make careful judgments, particularly for outputs from good writers, because there is no consistent AI style that makes detection straightforward (Gupta, 2024).

However, it is quite difficult to detect AI-generated works, as teachers are familiar with their students' capabilities and what they can or cannot produce. Previous studies have shown that it was hard for teachers to tell when students used AI to write in a second language. Even in a recent study, while some new teachers were good at spotting AI writing, others found it much harder. This means that detecting AI-generated text can be quite a challenge for educators (De Wilde, 2024).

Furthermore, one of the primary difficulties in identifying AI-generated text arises when students edit it. It is hard to tell if the text was made by AI, especially when students change it to make it look like their own work. This makes it tricky for teachers to know what is truly a student's original writing (Drisko, 2024).

Moreover, it is particularly difficult with well-crafted work because the answers submitted can appear natural or humanized. Teachers face a significant challenge in telling the difference between student work created by artificial intelligence (AI) and work that students have done themselves, especially when the AI-generated content is well-made. This difficulty arises because AI tools like ChatGPT can produce text that looks very much like it was written by a human. This makes it hard for educators to know if students are truly learning and understanding the material, or if they are just using AI to get their assignments done (Rane, 2024).

In addition, AI outputs are becoming contextualized, making them harder to spot. When students use AI to create their work, teachers face new challenges in figuring out what is truly the student's effort and what was made by AI. This can be tricky because AI tools can produce very good content. Teachers need to understand how AI is changing learning and assessment, and they also need to think about the good things and the problems that come with using AI in classrooms. However, teachers must learn how to tell the difference between AI-generated content and a student's original thought, and how to make sure that AI use helps, rather than harms, real learning (Damaševičius & Sidekerskienė, 2024).

Similarly, there is a need for careful judgments of the outputs of good writers. Teachers need to be very careful when judging student work that might have been made with AI. This is especially true for good writers. The study found that AI grading can be different from how human teachers score essays. This means that if a student is a strong writer, AI might give them a lower score than a teacher would, even if the work is excellent. Because of these differences, teachers must use their own experience and judgment

to decide if a student's work is truly their own and to give fair grades, especially when dealing with advanced writing assignments that need deep thought or critical thinking (Wetzler et al., 2024).

Thus, the absence of a consistent AI style also makes detection difficult. One of the difficulties teachers face when trying to figure out if a student's work was made by AI is that there is not a single, clear style that all AI-generated content follows. This makes it hard for educators to consistently spot AI outputs, as the AI doesn't always produce work in a way that's artificial (Ahmed et al., 2024).

Reliability and Practicality of Current AI Detection Tools. Emerging themes include not efficient, not quite reliable and practical, not always dependable, not totally accurate, reliable but impractical, and confusing and unreliable.

The study primarily focuses on empirically examining the accuracy of AI detection tools in identifying AI-generated texts, finding that the tools failed to detect AI-generated text in the final iteration. While educators' concerns about plagiarism and AI-generated text the educators should not set specific thresholds for acceptable AI-generated text due to the limitations of current algorithms (Halaweh & El Refae, 2024).

In addition, current AI detection tools are not efficient for teachers, as they add an extra layer of work to the assessment process. Teachers find that current tools for detecting AI-generated work are not helpful. These tools create more work for teachers when they are checking student assignments that might have been made with AI. This makes the assessment process harder and less efficient for them (Cram et al., 2023).

Many teachers find AI detection tools not quite reliable and practical. Many teachers find it hard to tell if students' work is made by AI, even with special tools. These tools are often not very good at it, meaning they are not accurate or dependable. This makes it difficult for teachers to use these tools to decide if a student has cheated, as the results are often mixed and not trustworthy. Some tools even have a bias, tending to classify text as human-written rather than AI-generated. This lack of reliability means teachers cannot easily use these tools to fairly judge student work (Weber-Wulff et al., 2023).

Moreover, AI detection tools are not always dependable, particularly for teachers with limited resources. Teachers face difficulties in telling if student work is made by AI, especially because the tools meant to help them are not always reliable. Research shows that even when text is clearly generated by AI, detection tools can fail to spot it, making it hard for educators to know what is truly original. This means teachers should not rely on a specific percentage from these tools to decide if something is AI-generated, as their current technology has limits (Halaweh & El Refae, 2024).

In addition, most AI detection tools are not 100% accurate, and investing in them is often deemed impractical. This lack of complete accuracy undermines their utility for definitive identification. Teachers often find it hard to tell if student work was made by AI because the study shows that there's a general lack of readiness in schools and among teachers to deal with GenAI tools. This means that educators might not have the right training or tools to accurately spot AI-generated content, making it difficult for them to be sure about the originality of student submissions. This situation highlights a need for clearer rules and more training for teachers on how to handle AI in education (Barrett & Pack, 2023).

Moreover, some teachers view AI detection tools as reliable but impractical. While they might be effective in detection, their practicality is questioned due to costs and time. Subscriptions are often required, adding a financial burden. Moreover, teachers have concerns about students using AI for cheating and not thinking critically. The study found that teachers were worried about students' bad habits when using AI, like cheating. This suggests a need for teachers to be more ready for AI and to help students use it properly,

rather than relying solely on detection tools that might be seen as reliable but hard to use in practice (Munni & Rafique, 2025).

Time and Resource Implications of Determining Authenticity of Student Work. Emerging themes include demanding extra time, need for AI literacy and detection strategy, need for stable internet connection, and huge emotional and mental toll.

Teachers face significant challenges when trying to figure out if student work is truly their own, especially with new AI tools. This process often demands a lot of extra time from them. They also need to learn about AI and how to spot AI-generated work, which requires new skills and detection methods. A good, stable internet connection is also crucial for these tasks. All these factors can lead to a big emotional and mental strain on teachers (Rane et al., 2024).

Additionally, determining the authenticity of student work in the age of AI demands extra time from educators. Teachers are finding it harder to tell if students' work is truly their own or if it was made by AI. This means they must spend more time checking assignments to make sure they are real and not generated by artificial intelligence. This challenge comes from a big difference between what teachers think students know about AI and how much students are using it in their schoolwork, which causes problems in judging what students truly know and if their work is authentic (Alharbi, 2024).

Moreover, there is a pressing need for AI literacy and detection strategies among teachers. Teachers face challenges when trying to figure out if student work was made by AI. This means teachers need to learn more about AI themselves, which is called AI literacy. They also need ways to check for AI-generated content in student assignments (Prilop et al., 2024)

Also, a significant resource implication is the need for a stable internet connection. Teachers face challenges when using AI tools, especially the need for a stable internet connection. One teacher noted that sometimes the internet cuts out, which causes some applications to freeze or close. This can make it difficult for teachers to rely on AI tools to determine student outputs, as a consistent connection is essential for the tools to work properly (Montiel-Ruiz & López Ruiz, 2023).

Furthermore, the challenge of detecting AI-generated content imposes a huge emotional and mental toll on teachers. Many teachers have noted that students are using AI tools like ChatGPT for their schoolwork. This has made teachers change how they teach to help students think more deeply and not rely too much on AI. The hard part of figuring out if student work was made by AI can be very stressful for teachers, affecting their feelings and minds (Delello et al., 2025).

Problems Encountered in Determining AI-generated Output. Emerging themes include perfect AI output, unreliable AI detection tools, no unique AI signature, difficult to prove the source of idea, time constraint, generic nature of other AI output, fast evolution of detection methods, and students becoming aware of detection methods.

Teachers both new and experienced, found it hard to tell the difference between texts written by AI and those written by students. Even though some experienced teachers made slightly better guesses, both groups were too sure of their ability to spot AI, which shows a general difficulty in recognizing AI-generated content. This challenge is made worse by several factors. AI can create very good text that seems flawless, current AI detection tools are often not dependable, and AI-generated content does not have a clear, unique style that makes it stand out. It is also tough to prove where an idea came from, and teachers often do not have enough time to investigate every text, and some AI output can be very general. Furthermore, AI detection methods are changing quickly, and students are becoming aware of how these

detection methods work, making it even harder for teachers to keep up and accurately identify AI-generated work (Fleckenstein et al., 2024).

In connection, one significant problem teachers face when dealing with AI in education is the challenge of determining if student work is truly their own or if it has been generated by AI. This difficulty arises because AI can produce highly polished, perfect outputs, making it hard for teachers to tell the difference between a student's original effort and an AI-produced response (Ramakrishnan et al., 2024).

Additionally, teachers consistently face the problem of unreliable AI detection tools. Teachers often struggle to figure out if students' work was made by AI because the tools meant to find AI writing do not always work well. This study looks at how dependable these tools are when checking student assignments, trying to see how good they are at telling the difference between writing done by a person and writing done by a computer. This is important for keeping schoolwork honest and fair (BENARAB, 2024).

Moreover, the fact that there is no unique AI signature makes detection harder. Teachers are trying to figure out if student work was created by a human or by artificial intelligence (AI). This is because there is currently no special mark or signature that AI tools leave behind to show that they generated the content. This makes it hard for teachers to tell the difference between text written by a student and text written by an AI, leading to concerns about plagiarism and the need for new ways to guide students on using AI ethically (Owan et al., 2023).

Furthermore, it is difficult to prove the source of an idea when AI is involved. Teachers often find it hard to tell if a student's idea came from them or from an AI tool. This makes it tough to know if the student truly understood the material or if an AI just gave them the answer. It is also hard to prove where the idea really came from, which creates problems for teachers trying to assess student learning fairly. This difficulty is part of the broader challenge of teacher preparedness in using AI tools and understanding AI literacy in the classroom (Meylani, 2024).

Moreover, a significant practical problem is the time constraint. Teachers often face difficulties when trying to use assessment data generated by artificial intelligence (AI) to make choices about teaching. Even though these AI tools can score student work and create helpful reports, it is hard for teachers to use this information to decide what to teach next or how to help students. This problem is especially clear when the data comes from assessments that follow certain science standards in classrooms (He et al., 2024).

In addition, even when not perfectly crafted, the generic nature of other AI output is a problem. Teachers often find that some AI-generated work from students can seem very similar or generic. This can make it hard for teachers to tell if a student truly understands the material or if they simply used an AI tool to create the output. The paper mentions studying the experiences of educators with AI integration, which would include challenges like identifying the originality of student work when AI is involved. This generic quality means the work might lack unique insights or personal touches that show a student's learning (Taufikin et al., 2024).

However, another problem is the fast evolution of detection methods on both sides. Teachers face challenges in telling if students' work is created by AI because the ways to detect AI are always changing and getting better. It is like a constant race. As AI gets smarter at writing, the tools designed to spot AI writing also improve quickly. This means teachers need to stay updated on the latest detection methods to accurately identify AI-generated content from students (Nikitina & Ishchenko, 2024).

Finally, students are becoming aware of detection methods and actively trying to bypass them. Teachers face a challenge when trying to figure out if students are using AI tools like ChatGPT for their work. As

students become more familiar with how teachers might try to detect AI-generated content, they may learn ways to make their AI outputs less obvious. This makes it harder for teachers to tell the difference between a student's work and something created by an AI, highlighting the ongoing debate about the role of algorithms versus human teachers in shaping students' learning and values (Istrate, 2024).

Adopted Pedagogical Strategies to Mitigate Potential for Students AI-generated Work. Emerging themes include adopted more in-class writing tasks, manual reading of students' outputs, teach students responsible use of AI, assignments composed of specific questions, divide big writing tasks into small ones, encourage peer review sessions, develop individual writing style, and use of different assessment methods.

Teachers are using various methods to handle the possibility of students using AI for their work. These strategies include having more writing done in class, carefully reading student assignments themselves, and teaching students how to use AI tools responsibly. They also design assignments with very specific questions, break large writing tasks into smaller parts, and encourage students to review each other's work. Furthermore, teachers aim to help students develop their own unique writing styles and use different ways to grade assignments. These approaches highlight the ongoing need for clear guidelines and training for teachers on how to integrate AI into education (Barrett & Pack, 2023).

Similarly, to mitigate AI-generated work, many educators have adopted more in-class writing tasks. To figure out if students are using AI for their essays, teachers have started using more in-class writing tasks. This is one way they try to make sure the work is original and done by the student, not by a computer program. This helps them see what students can do on their own without AI help (Lukianenko & Kornieva, 2024).

Moreover, teachers are increasingly relying on the manual reading of students' outputs to identify AI-generated content. While AI helps with things like processing data and learning that adapts to each student, teachers still have a very important job. They are needed to build emotional connections with students, teach them good values, and help them grow as people. Teachers also guide and motivate students, making learning fun and interactive. This means AI should work with teachers, not replace them, to help students develop completely. The paper does not specifically discuss teachers' experiences in manually reading student outputs to determine if they are AI-generated (Septiani & Ramadani, 2025).

Another strategy is to teach students responsible use of AI. Teachers are thinking about how to use AI in their lessons, and they are also considering the right way for students to use it. This includes thinking about ethical issues and making sure AI is used responsibly (Karina & Kastuhandani, 2024).

Furthermore, teachers are adapting by creating assignments composed of specific questions that require personal experience, local context, or critical thinking. Teachers are changing how they give assignments to deal with students using AI. They are making tasks that ask for students' own experiences, details about their local area, or deep thinking skills. This helps teachers see what students truly know and understand, rather than just what an AI might generate (Silva et al., 2025).

In addition, to make AI less effective for large assignments, teachers now divide big writing tasks into small ones. This strategy involves breaking down a major essay or research paper into smaller, manageable components like outlines, annotated bibliographies, or individual paragraphs. Teachers face challenges in telling the difference between student work and AI-generated text. Research shows that neither new nor experienced teachers can reliably tell AI-generated texts apart from student-written ones. Even though experienced teachers are slightly better at it, both groups are too confident in their judgments. The way teachers judge the quality of a text can be influenced by whether they think it is human-made or AI-

generated. This highlights that AI can create texts that are hard for teachers to recognize, which makes it tough for schools to assess student work accurately. As AI tools get better, with fewer mistakes, it will become even harder to spot the difference between human and AI writing. This indicates that teachers cannot simply rely on their intuition or simple detection methods to determine if a large writing task was completed using AI. Instead, breaking down larger assignments into smaller, more manageable steps and focusing on the process rather than just the final product can help teachers better understand the student's genuine effort and learning. This approach encourages authentic student engagement and makes it harder for students to rely solely on AI for their work, as it requires them to show their thinking and progress at various stages (Elstad & Eriksen, 2024).

Moreover, educators increasingly encourage peer review sessions to foster a collaborative and authentic writing environment. In these sessions, students review each other's work, providing constructive criticism and engaging with the text in a way that helps identify unnatural phrasing or a lack of personal voice. This not only improves writing skills but also promotes a sense of shared responsibility for academic integrity. Teachers can use AI-generated outputs from students' work to help them learn from each other. This helps students understand what the AI is looking for and how to give helpful advice to their classmates, making learning more personal and effective. This approach supports ongoing growth for both teachers and students (Meylani, 2024).

Additionally, a pedagogical approach gaining traction is to actively develop individual writing styles among students. One English teacher shared her journey in developing her writing style through extensive reading. She explained that to improve her writing, especially for academic papers, she needed to understand different authors' ways of writing. This meant reading many articles from various sources to gain more information and different viewpoints. It also found that reading widely helped her to better express thoughts and ideas in written form, making her more comfortable with different writing styles (Rizal, 2023).

Finally, teachers are adopting the use of different assessment methods that are more resistant to AI. More experienced teachers generally show better skills in how they assess students. This means that the longer a teacher has been teaching, the better they tend to be at using different ways to check what students have learned and how well they are doing in class. This shows that the time spent teaching helps teachers get better at evaluating students (Apostol et al., 2023).

Incorporating Discussions on Academic Integrity and Ethical Use of AI into Teaching Practice. Emerging themes include responsible use of AI, into the lessons and not to depend on AI, explain the importance of own learning, discuss long term implications, present ethical dilemmas on the use of AI, and put emphasis on academic integrity.

Teachers are actively incorporating discussions about academic integrity and the ethical use of AI into their teaching. Key themes emerging from their experiences include promoting the responsible use of AI, integrating these discussions directly into lessons, and emphasizing the importance of not becoming overly reliant on AI tools. Educators also explain to students the value of their learning, discuss the long-term consequences of AI misuse, present ethical dilemmas related to AI, and consistently stress the importance of academic integrity in all student work (Cong-Lem et al., 2023).

Furthermore, teachers are increasingly focusing on the responsible use of AI in their teaching practice. Teachers in the study found that using AI in English language teaching and learning brought up important issues, especially regarding ethical considerations. While they saw how AI could help make learning more personal and teaching more efficient, they also faced challenges like needing more training and better tech

skills to use AI properly and responsibly. This means that for AI to be used well in schools, educators and those who make rules need to help teachers get the right support and make sure everyone can use these new tools fairly (Ghimire & Neupane, 2024).

Discussions about AI are being integrated into the lessons, emphasizing not to depend on AI. Teachers believed that AI should be woven into existing science lessons instead of being taught as a separate subject. This approach helps students connect AI to what they already learn and understand its real-world importance, rather than seeing it as something distinct from their studies. This method allows teachers to integrate AI content directly into their subject matter, making it more relevant for students (Park et al., 2023).

Moreover, educators are trying to explain the importance of their own learning. Just as an AI system continuously updates its algorithms to improve performance, teachers also recognize the critical need for ongoing self-learning. Many teachers feel their initial training is not enough, prompting them to seek out new data and models for professional growth. They act like adaptive learning agents, constantly processing new information from various inputs such as in-service training, social media, professional courses, and experts to enhance their skills. This continuous self-improvement, much like an AI's iterative learning process, boosts their confidence scores and motivation levels, making them more effective in their profession (Arı & Yavuz, 2024).

Moreover, teachers are beginning to discuss the long-term implications of over-reliance on AI. This study looked at how international professional experience (IPE) affects teachers over a long time. It found that IPE helps shape a teacher's sense of who they are and how they teach. It also influences their approach to learning and education in general. Furthermore, this experience impacts the choices teachers make about their future jobs and career paths Fitzgerald & Cooper, 2022).

Moreover, to deepen understanding, some educators present ethical dilemmas on the use of AI. When teachers use artificial intelligence in schools, there are important ethical issues they need to think about. The paper points out that there are 'risks and negative trends' that must be considered to make sure AI is used in a fair and safe way in education. This means teachers must consider these ethical aspects to improve how they teach and to develop new, smart ways of teaching, all while making sure students learn in a good environment (Haidamaka, 2024).

Similarly, a core strategy is to put emphasis on academic integrity as a foundational principle. To keep learning fair and honest, teachers made sure to give clear instructions and help to students. They also avoided showing favor to anyone and used specific rules when grading work. This helped them maintain academic integrity during the modular distance learning (Visto et al., 2024).

Collaborating with Colleagues to Enhance Ability to Identify and Address AI-generated Output. Emerging themes include regular discussion with colleagues, help each other for strategies to identify AI-generated content, do feedbacking with colleagues, experimenting on AI tools, getting insights from tech-savvy students, looking for AI-resistant assignments online, sharing videos about AI, and attendance to professional development programs.

The findings support that teachers can improve their ability to identify and address AI-generated output by working together. This collaboration can involve regular discussions with colleagues, helping each other find strategies to spot AI-generated content, and giving feedback to one another. Teachers might also experiment with AI tools themselves, learn from tech-savvy students, and look for assignments online that are harder for AI to complete. Sharing videos about AI and attending professional development programs

are other ways teachers can enhance their skills in this area. This teamwork helps teachers adapt to new challenges posed by AI in education and supports their ongoing role in guiding students (Mujiono, 2023). In addition, many teachers engage in regular discussions with colleagues to address AI-generated content. Teachers often have regular discussions with their colleagues, which are seen as a vital part of their work. These talks allow them to share ideas and support each other in various ways, including professional advice, and sometimes even personal or emotional help. While these discussions are generally positive, teachers also admit that disagreements can arise, but they usually work through these issues because their main goal is to help their students learn and grow. This open communication and mutual support are key to their ongoing development and help create a good school environment (Ramona & de Guzman, 2005). Moreover, teachers actively help each other with strategies to identify AI-generated content. Teachers can work together and share ideas to figure out ways to spot content made by AI. This helps them deal with the fast changes happening with AI tools in education. Sharing experiences and strategies informally and collaboratively is important because AI is developing so quickly, and it helps educators stay updated and manage its impact (Prilop et al., 2024).

Additionally, feedback with colleagues is seen as a beneficial approach. Student-teachers found that giving feedback to their peers helped them improve their skills and understanding. They learned how to give good feedback and saw how important it is for helping others learn. This experience also made them better at thinking critically and understanding the subject matter more deeply. They realized that giving feedback is a big responsibility and requires careful thought to be helpful and accurate. This process helped them develop important teaching skills they will use in their future careers (Quirke-Bolt, 2020).

Furthermore, some teachers are experimenting with AI tools themselves to better understand their capabilities and limitations. Teachers have different opinions about how AI tools affect students. Some teachers think AI helps students get more involved in learning, making it supportive for engagement. However, other teachers worry that students might become too reliant on AI, seeing a risk of dependency. This shows a mix of views among teachers regarding AI's impact on student independence (Talgatov et al., 2024).

Moreover, a practical strategy is getting insights from tech-savvy students. When the instructors taught the Teaching with Technology course, they learned a lot from their students. The students showed they could use software in smart ways for teaching. They also paid attention to important rules like copyright and making things easy for everyone to use. This experience helped both the students and the teachers explore many ideas about how technology can be used in classrooms (Murphy & Hirai, 2003).

In addition, teachers are actively looking for AI-resistant assignments online from various educational resources and communities. Educators are trying to find types of assignments that are hard for AI tools like ChatGPT to solve. This is so students cannot just use AI to do their work. The goal is to find problems that AI cannot easily answer, so teachers can use these kinds of tasks in their classes to help students learn better and truly participate, rather than just relying on AI help (Popescu & Joyner, 2024).

Sharing Videos about AI To raise awareness and facilitate discussion, some educators are sharing videos about AI with their colleagues. To help everyone understand AI better and talk about it, some teachers are sharing videos about AI with their co-workers. This method can make learning about new technologies like AI more accessible and encourage important conversations among educators (Gunawardena & Chaturvedi, 2024).

Finally, attendance at professional development programs is crucial. This document primarily focuses on why teachers attend professional development (PD) programs. The study looks at the reasons science teachers repeatedly participate in university-based PD programs, examining their motivations and experiences. It highlights how these programs help teachers grow professionally and personally, and how they use what they learn to improve their teaching in the classroom. The text does not provide information or findings regarding student attendance at professional development programs (Bokor et al., 2018).

Key Characteristics Suggestive of AI Involvement in a Piece of Writing. Emerging themes include unnatural phrasing sentence structures, no specific classroom references, lack personal and emotional depth, lack contextual awareness, and striking similarities among outputs.

The findings support that teachers noted several key characteristics that suggested AI involvement in a piece of writing. These included unnatural phrasing and sentence structures, a lack of specific classroom references, an absence of personal and emotional depth, a general lack of contextual awareness, and striking similarities among different outputs. The study on in-service English teachers' experiences with ChatGPT, however, primarily focused on their perceptions, emotions, pedagogical activities, decision-making, and teaching transformations when using the AI for teaching preparation, rather than on their observations of AI-generated student writing characteristics (Nernere & Kastuhandani, 2024).

Additionally, one of the most immediate indicators of AI involvement is unnatural phrasing and sentence structures. Students often create sentences with unnatural phrasing because they struggle with correct word order and how words relate to each other in a sentence. This issue is especially common for those learning English as a foreign language, as they might try to use their native language's sentence patterns, which don't always match English rules. These mistakes, like placing words in the wrong spot, can make sentences unclear and hard to understand, showing a need for better teaching methods to help students learn proper sentence construction (Julaika et al., 2025).

Moreover, AI-generated content often contains no specific classroom references. Students' AI-generated content often lacks specific references to classroom discussions or materials, meaning it might not connect well with what was taught in class. This happens because AI models, while good at creating human-like text, do not truly understand the meaning behind the words or the specific context of a classroom setting. Therefore, AI-produced answers can be superficial and lack the depth that comes from genuine understanding and engagement with specific learning experiences. This highlights a key challenge for educators, as such content may not reflect the student's actual learning or critical thinking related to the course material (Elstad, 2024).

Additionally, AI-generated writing frequently lacks personal and emotional depth. Many students today are not well-prepared to handle their feelings, form good relationships, or make smart choices. This is because schools have often focused mainly on school subjects and grades, rather than on helping students grow emotionally and socially. This can lead to problems like more anxiety, sadness, and behavior issues among young people. Modern life is also more complex, making it even more important for students to have strong emotional and people skills (Martínez & Gómez, 2024).

Moreover, a clear characteristic is a lack of contextual awareness. Some students had trouble fitting in and interacting with others in social situations. This suggests they might need more help, like training to improve their social skills, to better understand and act within different social settings (Kadhafi, 2024).

Furthermore, teachers often observe striking similarities among outputs from different students. Researchers observed a very strong similarity in how student grades were spread out over time and across different subjects. This pattern was so consistent that it was hard to see any differences just by looking at

the data. This consistent pattern in grade distribution was seen for each subject over many years, raising questions about what causes this regularity. The study found that not only did the average grades stay about the same, but other features of the grade spread, like how spread out they were or where the peaks were, also remained unchanged. This suggests a stable way students learn, and teachers evaluate, especially since final grades reflect a teacher's overall view of a student's learning throughout the year, which is more reliable than a single test score (Ferreira, 2023).

Impact to Understanding of Students' Learning and their Language Proficiency of Presence of AI-generated Texts. Emerging themes include impediment of students' critical thinking, grammar and writing skills, too dependent on AI texts, and harder to accurately assess.

The finding support that teachers have observed that AI tools can both help and hinder students' learning and critical thinking. While AI can improve critical thinking by encouraging flexible thinking, deep analysis, and comparing AI results with theories, there's also a concern that relying too much on AI can lead to students understanding things only on the surface and accepting information without questioning it. This over-reliance can make students skip the important mental work needed for critical thinking, using AI as a quick fix instead of a tool for deeper learning. Therefore, instructors must carefully guide how AI is used to avoid negative effects on critical thinking and ensure students truly engage with the material (Panit, 2025).

Moreover, the presence of AI-generated text acts as an impediment to students' critical thinking, grammar, and writing skills. Many students face problems when writing. These include issues with grammar and making their ideas flow together well. These difficulties can make students feel less sure about their writing and less motivated to write (Aulia & Rizal, 2025).

Furthermore, students are becoming too dependent on AI texts, which severely impacts their learning. Students are increasingly relying too much on AI writing tools, which can cause problems for their learning and honesty in school. This is a big worry because it means students might lose their own unique voice and ideas, as more of them are turning in AI-made texts as if they wrote them themselves. This trend is especially concerning in places like Africa, where students' critical thinking is seen as very important for social change (Coetzer & van Aardt, 2024).

In connection, the presence of AI-generated text makes it harder to accurately assess students' true learning and language proficiency. When students use AI to create text, it becomes more difficult to truly know what they have learned and how good their language skills are. This is because AI language models bring up problems with how students are tested and evaluated (Ozer, 2024).

Perspectives on the Long-term Implications of AI Writing Tools for Language Education and Assessment. Emerging themes include need to balance AI use, use of oral exam, in-person writing and portfolio assessment, over-reliance of students to AI, problem with application of learning, access to AI tools results to inequality in education, writing output becoming unnatural, schools to invest on training of teachers, provide tailored feedback, difficulty on assessing students' writing abilities, and framework for responsible AI use.

The findings support that teachers and researchers are grappling with the effects of AI writing tools, such as ChatGPT, on education, especially for second language learners. While these tools offer benefits like helping students communicate effectively, they also present challenges. Key concerns and emerging themes include the need to find a balance in how AI is used, the potential for students to rely too much on AI, and issues with how well students apply what they learn when using these tools. There are also worries that access to AI tools could create unfairness in education and that student writing might become less

natural. Educators face difficulties in checking students' writing skills and providing personalized feedback, highlighting the importance of schools training teachers on AI use and developing a framework for responsible AI use. The paper suggests that rather than banning AI, educators should teach students how to use these tools effectively and ethically, preparing them for a future where AI is common (Warschauer, 2023).

Furthermore, there is a clear need to balance AI use in language education. Students should use AI carefully and make sure to mix it with traditional ways of learning. This means not relying too much on AI, but instead using it as a tool to help, while still engaging with regular study methods (Satria & Saputra, 2025).

Moreover, the long-term implications suggest an increased use of oral exams, in-person writing, and portfolio assessment. When looking at how well students perform over time, different assessment methods show varying strengths. For example, a study found that a student's cumulative grade point average (GPA) was more closely related to their clerkship portfolio grades than to their grades from a final structured oral exam. This suggests that portfolios might better reflect a student's overall performance and development compared to a single oral test. While the paper specifically discusses oral exams and portfolios, it does not detail the use of 'in-person writing' as a separate assessment method (Isbej et al., 2021).

.

In addition, a significant long-term implication is the over-reliance of students on AI. Students relying too much on artificial intelligence can lead to serious problems. When AI is used excessively in education, it can stop students from truly understanding things and developing their thinking skills. This over-dependence might also harm their ability to learn new knowledge on their own (Cui & Alias, 2020).

Similarly, AI use introduces a problem with the application of learning. This study looked at how using Problem-Based Learning (PBL) strategies can help students with their learning problems, especially in Biology for the Respiratory System topic in Class XI. The research aimed to show how well PBL works to fix these difficulties (Tanjung et al., 2022).

In addition, the unequal access to AI tools results in inequality in education. When some students have access to advanced AI tools for learning and others do not, it can make the gap between them wider. This is because ethical concerns like algorithmic bias, where the AI might not be fair due to how it was taught, can make existing differences worse instead of making things equal. It's important to pay close attention to these issues so that AI helps everyone learn better and doesn't create more unfairness in schools (Kohnke & Zaugg, 2025).

Moreover, concerning long-term implication is that the writing output becomes unnatural. When students are taught to write like published academic works, their natural writing style can change and become less clear. This happens because academic writing often uses complex words and jargon that are hard for everyday people to understand. As students continue their studies, they might start to use this difficult style, which makes it harder for them to explain ideas simply to a general audience. This shift means that even though young people are good at communicating clearly in other ways, their academic writing can become unnatural and less effective for a wider public (Brown, 2018).

In addition, schools need to invest in the training of teachers. Schools should invest in training their teachers because current training methods often have problems. Also, teachers in poorer, rural areas, especially in central and western China, get fewer chances for training and face more financial costs for it. To fix these issues and improve teaching quality, it is important to set up better training systems, ensure financial support, and improve the overall quality of training (Chen, 2013).

Furthermore, there will be a greater need to provide tailored feedback. Teachers play a crucial role in checking AI-generated language output, especially when it comes to giving personalized feedback. While AI can offer quick, tailored learning help, it can also make mistakes or create incorrect information, particularly with longer texts. Therefore, teachers must carefully review the AI's feedback to make sure it is correct and helpful for students (Naz & Robertson, 2024).

Similarly, the difficulty in assessing students' writing abilities persisted. Assessing students' writing skills can be tricky, especially when trying to figure out if the work was done by the student or by a computer program. Teachers face several challenges when evaluating writing in online settings. These difficulties include making sure students are honest in their work, managing the time needed for assessment, ensuring assignments are turned in on time, dealing with varying internet access, and providing helpful guidance and feedback (Dewi et al., 2023).

Finally, the long-term outlook necessitates a comprehensive framework for responsible AI use. A new framework for Responsible AI (RAI) has been introduced to help manage the fast growth of AI. This framework looks at four main areas. How AI works (technical), how it helps the world grow in a good way (sustainable development), how companies manage new ideas responsibly (responsible innovation management), and the rules and laws around AI (legislation). The parts about managing new ideas responsibly and the laws are the most important starting points for this framework. For example, companies should think ahead and be flexible in their approach to AI, and new laws for AI from places like the European Union and the United States are important to consider. This framework aims to help businesses, developers, and lawmakers use AI in a safe and fair way (Haidar, 2023).

Recommendations for Adopting Assessment Methods in Language Education. Emerging themes include policies on AI use, stick to traditional assessment, provide challenging assessments, adopt with proper guidance, use of project-based assessments, and conduct one-on-one conferences.

The findings support that teachers involved in language education have shared various insights regarding the adoption of new assessment methods, especially concerning the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI). Their experiences highlight several key areas for consideration. Some educators' express concerns about the ethical use of AI by students, particularly regarding academic integrity and potential over-reliance on AI tools for assignments. This leads to a recommendation to maintain traditional assessment methods alongside new approaches. There is also an emphasis on providing challenging assessments that encourage deeper learning, not just basic queries. For effective adoption, teachers stress the need for proper guidance and support in using AI tools, advocating for policies on AI use to ensure fair and appropriate integration. Furthermore, there is a recognized value in using project-based assessments and conducting one-on-one conferences to ensure personalized learning and to maintain the essential human element in language education, which AI alone cannot replicate. Overall, teachers seek a balanced approach that leverages AI's benefits while addressing its challenges and preserving core pedagogical values (Cohen et al., 2024).

Moreover, a key recommendation is to include policies on AI use within assessment methods. It is very helpful for students if universities have clear rules and guidelines about how to use AI in their schoolwork. This helps everyone understand what is allowed and what is not when writing papers and assignments (Hussain, 2024).

Additionally, teachers generally see traditional assessment methods, like tests and exams, as more accurate for checking student learning than non-traditional methods. This perception is supported by research showing a significant difference in how teachers view the accuracy of traditional activities compared to

non-traditional ones, with traditional methods being rated higher on average. Despite this, some non-traditional activities are also considered effective ways to measure student understanding (Al-Anqoudi et al., 2023).

Moreover, a significant recommendation is to provide challenging assessments that AI struggles to complete authentically. Assessing complex 21st-century skills like creativity, problem-solving, communication, and collaboration is quite difficult because these skills involve many different parts, including feelings and motivation. Even though there is a lot of interest in using technology to measure these skills, their complex nature means that technology-based methods will likely need to be combined with older, more traditional ways of assessment, like those done by teachers and peers, for a long time. Therefore, students, teachers, and school leaders must learn how to handle the many kinds of feedback they get and how to deal with feedback that does not always agree (Webb et al., 2018).

In addition, AI should be adopted with proper guidance in language education. AI is becoming very popular around the world for making education smarter and more lasting. It can change how we teach and learn, making things more personal and effective. AI helps learning programs understand what students are good at and what they need help with, so lessons can be made just for them. AI-powered virtual helpers can give quick feedback and special advice. Also, AI can do tasks like making learning materials, checking work, and giving grades automatically. By using AI in education, we can create a learning space that includes everyone and is easy to get to, helping all students do well in our modern world (Aggarwal et al., 2023).

Furthermore, the use of project-based assessments is highly recommended. Project-based tasks and rubrics are different from old-fashioned tests. They give students chances to use what they have learned in real ways, instead of just saying facts they memorized. In these tasks, students investigate topics or problems that they find interesting and that fit their age. These newer ways of checking learning can help students show what they know, make them more excited to learn, and improve their thinking skills (*Project-Based Assessments*, 2022).

Moreover, a powerful recommendation is the conduct of one-on-one conferences with students. These one-on-one conferences are important for clear communication and feedback. They help people talk directly about their work or ideas, making sure everyone understands each other. These meetings can make relationships stronger and help solve problems quickly (Sharma et al., 2025).

Practical Guidelines to Promote Academic Integrity and Ethical Use of AI Language Learning Environments. Emerging themes include develop clear classroom guidelines, introduce personalized writing tasks, avail of AI applications or resources, train students generic phrasing, and integrate discussion about curriculum.

The findings support that teachers are finding ways to promote academic honesty and good AI use in language learning. Some key ideas include setting clear rules for the classroom, giving students writing assignments that are unique to them, using AI tools and resources, teaching students how to write in a general way, and talking about how AI fits into the school's lessons. This helps keep learning fair and ethical in the age of AI (Evangelista, 2024).

Furthermore, educators should develop clear classroom guidelines regarding AI use. When using AI in the classroom, it is important to set clear rules. The paper suggests that students should learn about AI and how to think carefully about it. This helps make sure that technology is used wisely. Also, it's key to create strong rules about what is right and wrong, and how to keep private information safe. This helps balance new technology with good teaching practices, which can make education better overall (Pan, 2024).

Moreover, a key guideline is to introduce personalized writing tasks that are difficult for AI to complete authentically. To help students learn better, we can give them writing tasks that are made just for them. This means the tasks fit their specific needs and help them improve their English writing skills. Using a system powered by deep learning can make these personalized tasks possible, making the learning process more convenient and focused on each student's needs. This approach can make students more excited about writing, help them write better and faster, and allow them to learn more on their own (Zhen, 2023). In addition, educators should avail themselves of AI applications or resources to better understand and manage AI-generated text. AI is used in many areas like shopping, supply chains, and healthcare. These uses need a lot of data. When AI is combined with smart scanners, it can automatically check images for problems, lower repair costs, make fewer human mistakes, help with robot surgery, and manage data better (Sagar & Sahgal, 2024).

Similarly, a practical guideline is to train students to recognize generic phrasing commonly found in AI outputs. A good way to help students is to teach them how to spot common ways that AI systems phrase things. This helps them understand the risks and ethical aspects of using AI tools, which is important for getting jobs (Wilkinson, 2024).

Another practical guideline is to integrate discussions about AI and academic integrity directly into the curriculum. Thus, it is becoming very important for schools to add artificial intelligence (AI) topics into their regular lessons. This helps prepare students for the future by giving them the skills they will need. The goal is to close the gap between what students learn and what the world needs, making sure they understand AI, machine learning, and how to use data. This also includes teaching them about the right ways to use AI and thinking about what is fair and ethical (Jowallah, 2023).

Policy-level Recommendations Educational Institutions Propose to Integrate AI Literacy and Manage AI-generated Work. Emerging themes include training for teachers and students, invest in giving school-owned devices, conduct of orientation, promote project-based learning, provide clear guidelines, conduct of regular forum or meetings, and provide flexible framework and policy.

The findings support that educational institutions are proposing several policy-level recommendations to help teachers integrate AI literacy and manage AI-generated work. These include training for both teachers and students, investing in school-owned devices, conducting orientations, promoting project-based learning, providing clear guidelines, holding regular forums or meetings, and establishing flexible frameworks and policies. These steps are seen as crucial for navigating the challenges and opportunities presented by AI tools like ChatGPT in educational settings, particularly given the current lack of specialized guidelines and the need to address issues like student privacy and algorithmic transparency (Ghimire & Edwards, 2024).

Moreover, a primary policy-level recommendation is to mandate training for teachers and students on AI literacy. A primary policy-level recommendation is to mandate training for teachers and students on AI literacy. This is important because governments should put plans in place to improve teachers' AI knowledge, offering different learning plans, full information, new ways of teaching, and useful tools for special training. This makes AI literacy a key part of how educators can keep growing in their jobs (Singh & Absar, 2024).

In addition, educational institutions should invest in giving school-owned devices to students. Giving students school-owned devices can help them learn anywhere, both inside and outside of school. These devices let students finish their schoolwork more easily. However, a study found that devices given out by schools often have many rules that make it hard for students to get information, learn on their own, or

learn with a teacher's help. This means that schools and libraries need to work on fixing these problems so students can use the devices better for learning (Kammer, 2024).

Furthermore, a policy should include the conduct of orientation programs for all stakeholders regarding policy should include the conduct of orientation programs for all stakeholders regarding AI. This is important because using AI has risks that need to be reduced through clear rules and processes, such as avoiding non-transparent decisions, protecting personal rights, and preventing bias or data distortion. Each institution must create its specific guidelines based on general principles, as the presented templates only offer a general framework that needs to be filled with industry and company-specific details (Lukas, 2023).

In addition, policies should promote project-based learning as a core pedagogical approach. Policies should encourage project-based learning (PjBL) as a main teaching method because it helps students learn better. This approach is good for improving how well students use language and helps them think more deeply. It also lets students use what they learn in real-life situations, making their education more practical. Even though there can be issues like not enough time or problems with group work, the benefits of PjBL show it's a strong way to teach that makes learning more effective and engaging for students (Nappu, 2024).

Similarly, institutions must provide clear guidelines on AI use. Schools need to create clear rules for using AI tools. This is because AI tools are becoming very common in schools, and it is important to use them in a good and right way. These rules should be updated often because AI technology changes quickly (Ullah et al., 2024).

Moreover, the conduct of regular forums or meetings is also a key policy recommendation. One important suggestion for making good policies about AI is to have public engagement initiatives. This means setting up regular forums or meetings where people can talk about how AI is used in government. Such discussions are key to making sure AI policies are fair and work well for everyone (Saxena, 2024).

Finally, institutions should provide a flexible framework and policy. It is important for institutions to create rules and guidelines for AI that are flexible. This helps to reduce dangers to people's safety and protect human rights. At the same time, these rules should allow for new ideas and growth in AI technology. This balance ensures that AI can develop and be used in helpful ways without causing harm (Mendes et al., 2023).

Implications for Practice

The research findings on the various challenges posed by AI-generated student works present four major implications for practitioners and educational institutions. The implications address strategies that, to the highest degree, are very comprehensive, while agile strategies are needed to provide for academic integrity and authentic learning in favor of students operating in a digital environment. The following recommendations correspond to the aim of incorporating a stronger factor for the assessment practices of teachers. To establish boundaries for students concerning fair borderline work using AI possible and to steer the schools in a route towards becoming AI literate instead of merely policing against AI improprieties. Only thus can a concerted effort make AI valid educational technology for empowerment rather than a means for developing shortcuts to filth learning.

Based on the findings, the following implications for practice are offered.

On Instances of Suspicion of AI-generated Student Work. When teachers suspect AI-generated work, they may trust their instincts, especially if a student's writing quality suddenly shifts or seems too perfect. It's important to look for subtle cues like an overly formal tone or vocabulary not typical for the student.

Teachers can follow up with oral questions or in-class writing tasks to confirm the student's true understanding. These proactive steps help verify authenticity beyond what a digital tool might show.

On Types of AI-generated Language Output Encountered. Teachers often encounter AI outputs that are grammatically flawless but lack personal voice, specific classroom references, or emotional depth. These too perfect or generic responses should raise a red flag, as they differ from authentic human writing. Educators may train themselves to recognize these unique AI characteristics to better identify non-original work. Understanding these patterns is key to adapting assessment methods effectively.

On Change in Assessing Student Work as a Result of Accessibility to AI Writing Tools. The easy access to AI tools means teachers may change how they assess student work to ensure it's original. This involves moving beyond traditional take-home essays to include more in-class writing, oral exams, or project-based assessments. Designing assignments that require personal experience, local context, or critical thinking, which AI struggles with, is now essential. Such changes help to genuinely evaluate a student's skills rather than their ability to use AI.

On Ways to Know AI-generated Output. To identify AI-generated output, teachers may look for unnatural phrasing, a lack of specific details discussed in class, and the absence of a unique student voice. Striking similarities among different students' papers can also suggest AI involvement. Manual review remains critical, as teachers know their students' typical writing styles and can spot inconsistencies. Combining these observations with follow-up discussions can confirm suspicions.

On Difficulty in Identifying AI-generated Text. Identifying AI-generated text is genuinely difficult because AI is constantly improving and often leaves no unique digital fingerprint. Current AI detection tools are unreliable and can give false positives, adding to the challenge for teachers. This means educators cannot solely rely on technology and may develop their own keen eye for subtle stylistic clues. Schools should acknowledge this difficulty and provide ongoing support and resources for detection.

On Reliability and Practicality of Current AI Detection Tools. Current AI detection tools are often unreliable and impractical for definitive proof, frequently producing false positives. Relying solely on these tools can lead to unfair accusations and create distrust between students and teachers. Therefore, educators may use these tools only as a starting point for suspicion, not as the final verdict. Human judgment, combined with other verification methods, remains crucial for fair assessment.

On Time and Resource Implications of Determining Authenticity of Student Work. Determining the authenticity of student work in the AI era demands significant extra time and resources from teachers. It requires scrutiny, often involving cross-referencing and follow-up discussions, which adds to an already heavy workload. Schools may acknowledge this increased burden and provide teachers with adequate time, training, and access to necessary resources like stable internet. Without this support, teacher burnout will likely increase.

On Problems Encountered in Determining AI-generated Output. Teachers may face multiple problems in identifying AI-generated output, including the perfect nature of some AI texts and the generic style of others. The lack of a unique AI signature and the difficulty in proving the source of an idea (especially if AI was used for brainstorming) further complicate matters. These issues, combined with time limits, make definitive identification a constant struggle. As AI evolves and students learn to bypass detection, these problems will only grow.

On Adopted Pedagogical Strategies to Mitigate the Potential for Students' AI-generated Work. Teachers may have adopted various strategies to lessen AI use, like assigning more in-class writing tasks and manual reading of student work. They are also teaching students about the responsible use of AI and designing

assignments with specific, personal questions. Breaking down large tasks into smaller steps and encouraging peer reviews also helps. These changes are vital to ensuring students produce original work and genuinely develop their skills.

On Incorporating Discussions on Academic Integrity and Ethical Use of AI into Teaching Practice. It is vital for teachers may talk openly about academic integrity and the ethical use of AI directly in their lessons. These discussions should stress the importance of students' learning and the long-term consequences of relying too much on AI. Presenting ethical dilemmas related to AI can help students think critically about its appropriate use. Continuously emphasizing academic honesty as a core value helps to guide students' choices.

On Collaborating with Colleagues to Enhance the Ability to Identify and Address AI-generated Output. Teachers may regularly talk with colleagues to share strategies for spotting AI-generated content and encourage honest student work. "Feedbacking with colleagues" and experimenting with AI tools themselves can enhance their detection skills. Learning from tech-savvy students and looking for AI-resistant assignments online are also helpful approaches. Schools should create more opportunities for this kind of collaborative professional development.

On Key Characteristics Suggestive of AI Involvement in a Piece of Writing. Key characteristics that may suggest AI involvement include unnatural phrasing, a lack of specific classroom references, and an absence of personal or emotional depth. Writing that is overly formal or uses complex vocabulary inappropriately can also be a sign. Striking similarities between different student outputs are a major red flag. Teachers may be trained to identify these patterns to better assess authenticity.

On the Impact on Understanding of Students' Learning and their Language Proficiency of the Presence of AI-generated Texts. The presence of AI-generated text may hinder students' critical thinking, grammar, and overall writing skills, as they become too dependent on AI. This makes it much harder for teachers to accurately assess a student's true learning and language proficiency. When students submit AI-generated work, teachers cannot genuinely identify their strengths or weaknesses, which impacts effective feedback and targeted instruction. This over-reliance risks creating a generation with underdeveloped core academic skills.

On Perspectives on the Long-term Implications of AI Writing Tools for Language Education and Assessment. In the long term, AI writing tools may force language education to adapt significantly, requiring a balance in AI use. This will likely involve a greater emphasis on oral exams, in-person writing, and portfolio assessments to verify authentic learning. Schools may invest in teacher training and develop a clear framework for responsible AI use. Over-reliance on AI risks students' critical thinking and can worsen educational inequality if access is uneven.

On Recommendations for Adopting Assessment Methods in Language Education. To adapt assessment methods, schools may include clear policies on AI use and consider sticking to traditional, AI-resistant assessment formats when appropriate. Providing challenging assignments that require personal insight or local context is crucial. Project-based assessments and one-on-one conferences with students are also highly recommended to gauge true understanding. These changes aim to ensure genuine skill demonstration.

On Practical Guidelines to Promote Academic Integrity and Ethical Use of AI Language Learning Environments. Practical guidelines to promote academic integrity include developing clear classroom rules about AI use and introducing personalized writing tasks that demand original thought. Educators may also explore available AI applications to understand their capabilities. Training students to recognize generic

AI phrasing helps them avoid submitting similar content. Integrating ongoing discussions about AI ethics directly into the curriculum reinforces these guidelines.

On the Policy-level Recommendations, Educational Institutions Propose to Integrate AI Literacy and Manage AI-generated Work. At a policy level, educational institutions may propose mandatory training for teachers and students on AI literacy and ethical use. They should also consider investing in school-owned devices to promote equitable access. Conducting regular orientations and forums about AI is vital for all stakeholders. Promoting project-based learning and providing clear, flexible guidelines on AI use are essential for managing AI's impact effectively.

Implications for Future Research

As this study is conducted in Monkayo District and this is limited to schools within the Municipality of Monkayo. Based on your study about English teachers' experiences with AI-generated language, and aiming for a similar structure to your example, here are some implications for future research:

For future research, it would be helpful to select other groups of teacher participants, perhaps from other schools, to see how they are affected by AI. Another study with the same focus could be done in other locations, like different regions in the Philippines or even other countries, to see if the challenges and strategies for AI in education are similar or different. Also, researchers could re-interview the same teachers after some time to see if their understanding of AI and their methods for dealing with it have changed.

Second, future research could investigate the same issues among private secondary schools. This would help understand if school type or resources change how teachers and students deal with AI-generated content. Additionally, while this study looked at teachers' views, another research could be done to find out students' understanding and use of AI-generated work. This would give a fuller picture of the situation from their perspective.

Finally, this study focused on how teachers identify and manage AI. Future research could explore how AI tools themselves are changing and how these changes impact language teaching methods and student learning over time. It would also be valuable to investigate the long-term effects of AI on students' actual writing skills and critical thinking to better understand the more profound implications for education. This continued research will help educators and policymakers adapt to the fast-changing world of AI.

Concluding Remarks

This study explored how English teachers are navigating the new world of AI-generated content in their classrooms. It found that teachers often suspect AI use when student writing seems too perfect, lacks a personal touch, or doesn't include details discussed in class. Identifying these AI outputs is very hard, partly because AI tools are always getting better, and current detection tools aren't always reliable. This challenge means teachers must spend a lot more time checking student work, which adds a significant burden to their daily tasks. The rise of AI makes it difficult to truly know what students have learned and their actual writing skills.

In response, teachers are actively changing their teaching methods to encourage original work. They are giving more writing tasks in class, breaking down big assignments, and creating questions that need personal answers or local details that AI can't easily fake. A big part of their work now involves talking to students about academic honesty and how to use AI responsibly, not just for cheating. Teachers are also trying to learn from each other and seek training to get better at spotting AI-generated text.

Overall, the study shows that AI tools are changing language education forever. While they can be helpful, there's a real risk of students becoming too reliant on them, which could hurt their thinking and writing

skills in the long run. To deal with this, schools need clear rules about AI, teachers need more training and support, and assessment methods must continue to evolve to truly measure student learning. The future of language education will require everyone to work together to use AI wisely and fairly.

References

a. Aggarwal, D., Sharma, D., & Saxena, A. B. (2023). Adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) For Development of Smart Education as the Future of a Sustainable Education System. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning and Neural Network*. https://doi.org/10.55529/jaimlnn.36.23.28

b. Ahmed, Z., Shanto, S. S., Khanom Rime, Most. H., Morol, Md. K., Fahad, N., Hossen, J., & Abdullah-Al-Jubair, Md. (2024). The Generative AI Landscape in Education: Mapping the Terrain of Opportunities, Challenges and Student Perception. *IEEE Access*, 1. https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2024.3461874

c. Akdağ, E. (2022). Exploring experienced teachers' attitudes to critical incidents. *Reflective Practice*, *23*(1), 103–117. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2021.1983422

d. Al-Anqoudi, M., Bikanga Ada, M., McQuistin, S., Ntarmos, N., Parkinson, J., & Moshfeghi, Y. (2023). *Traditional Vs Non-Traditional Assessment Activities as Learning Indicators of Student Learning: Teachers' Perceptions*. 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/lwmoocs58322.2023.10305928

2. Alharbi, W. (2024). Mind the Gap, Please! *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*. https://doi.org/10.4018/ijcallt.351245

3. Alawneh, Y. J. J., Radwan, E. N. Z., Salman, F. N., Makhlouf, S., Makhamreh, K., & Alawneh, M. S. (2024). *Ethical Considerations in Using AI in Primary Education: Privacy, Bias, and Inclusivity*. *15*, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/ickecs61492.2024.10616986

4. Alasgarova, R., & Rzayev, J. (2024). The changing role of educators in the age of artificial intelligence: Molding minds at the digital dawn. *Ubiquity Proceedings*, 6. https://doi.org/10.5334/uproc.128

5. Al-Badarneh, A., Daradkah, A. M., Telf, E. A., Haggag, H. M., Ghawanmeh, F. F., Al-Shunnaq, Y. A., Tawalbeh, M. S., Mahmoud, A. M. A., Shahine, K., & Daradkah, H. S. (2024). Integrating Artificial Intelligence-Powered Large Language Models in English as a Foreign Language EFL Teacher Education Programs. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences*, *22*(1). https://doi.org/10.57239/pjlss-2024-22.1.00219

6. Al-khresheh, M. H. (2024). The Future of Artificial Intelligence in English Language Teaching: Pros and Cons of ChatGPT Implementation through a Systematic Review. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, *43*, 54–80. https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2024.43.04

7. Alioğulları, E., Tüylü, D., & Sağıroğlu, A. (2025). Examining Artificial Intelligence and Ethics in Education With Bibliometric Analysis. *Advances in Educational Technologies and Instructional Design Book Series*, 1–30. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-7949-3.ch001

8. Alshammari, J. (2024). Revolutionizing EFL learning through ChatGPT: A qualitative study. *Revista Amazonía Investiga*, *13*(82), 208–221. https://doi.org/10.34069/ai/2024.82.10.17

9. Apostol, E. L., Reponte-Sereño, R. R., Cuevas, G. C., Sumicad, R. P., & Pinatil, M. (2023). Evaluating Educators: A Comprehensive Study of Teachers' Assessment Skills and Practices. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices*. https://doi.org/10.32996/jweep.2023.5.3.5

10. Arı, K., & Yavuz, M. (2024). Professional Development Experiences of Autodidactic Teachers. *Research on Education and Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.54535/rep.1441532
11. Aryal, M. (2024). Exploring the Impact of ChatGPT in English Language Teaching-Learning Pedagogy. *Journal of NELTA Gandaki 246 33 JoNG*, *7*(1–2), 137–150. https://doi.org/10.3126/jong.v7i1-2.70236
12. Aulia, L., & Rizal, D. (2025). Analysis of Students Difficulty in Essay Writing Course. *Journal of English Education Forum*, *4*(4), 224–227. https://doi.org/10.29303/jeef.v4i4.805
13. Barrett, A., & Pack, A. (2023). *Not quite eye to A.I.: student and teacher perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence in the writing process*. *20*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00427-0
14. Baskara, FX. R. (2023). *AI-Driven Dynamics: ChatGPT Transforming ELT Teacher-Student Interactions*. https://doi.org/10.26714/lensa.13.2.2023.261-275
15. Baule, S. M., & O'Connell, J. S. (2024). Harnessing Generative AI for Educator Professional Development. *Advances in Educational Technologies and Instructional Design Book Series*, 77–114. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-1017-6.ch003
16. Beckford, W. (2024). *Revisit from 2024: The current Status and Future of Pretrained Large Language Models (LLMs) for Education Revolution*. https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/7ds4a
17. BENARAB, I. H. (2024). *Detection of AI-generated Writing in Students' Assignments: A Comparative Analysis of Some Tools' Reliability*. *5*(3), 271–286. https://doi.org/10.70091/atras/ai.17
18. Bigoulaeva, I., Madabushi, H. T., & Gurevych, I. (2025). *The Inherent Limits of Pretrained LLMs: The Unexpected Convergence of Instruction Tuning and In-Context Learning Capabilities*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2501.08716
19. Bird, W. H. (2024). *Faceless Adversary, Feckless Colleague: The Many Sides of ChatGPT*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3660650.3660656
20. Bokor, J., Crippen, K. J., & Koroly, M. J. (2018). *Science teacher motivations for repeat attendance at university outreach center professional development programs*. *1*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.15695/JSTEM/V1I1.9
21. Bongcac, G. J., & Pabalan, A. P. (2024). POTENTIALS, RISKS, AND ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS IN THE UTILIZATION OF AI-POWERED TOOLS IN EDUCATION. Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 2(8), 413–432. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13285255
22. Boyd, A. S. (2023). English Education in the United States. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.1925
23. Bran, R., & Grosseck, G. (2024). Addressing the challenges of generative AI in English language teaching. *Scientific Bulletin of the Politehnica University of Timişoara: Transactions on Modern Languages*, *23*, 82–93. https://doi.org/10.59168/jjyx7321
24. Brown, S. C. (2018). *Nurturing students' natural writing style to better communicate research to the public*. *4*(1), 43–54. https://doi.org/10.1037/STL0000103
25. Bukar, U. A., Sayeed, S., Razak, A., Yogarayan, S., & Sneesl, R. (2024). Prioritizing Ethical Conundrums in Utilizing ChatGPT in Education through an Analytical Hierarchical Approach. *Education Sciences*, *14*(9), 959. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14090959

26. Busso, A., & Sanchez, B. (2024). Advancing communicative competence in the digital age: A case for AI tools in Japanese university EFL programs. *Technology in Language Teaching & Learning*, *6*(3), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v6n3.1211
27. Cao, Y. C., Li, S. H., Liu, Y., Yan, Z., Dai, Y., Yu, P. S., & Sun, L. (2024). A Survey of AI-Generated Content (AIGC). *ACM Computing Surveys*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3704262
28. Caporusso, N. (2023). Generative Artificial Intelligence and the Emergence of Creative Displacement Anxiety. *Research Directs in Psychology and Behavior*. https://doi.org/10.53520/rdpb2023.10795
29. Chan, S. T., Lo, N., & Wong, A. (2024). Leveraging generative AI for enhancing university-level English writing: comparative insights on automated feedback and student engagement. *Cogent Education*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2024.2440182
30. Cheeli, B. P. (2024). *Process of Phenomenology as a Qualitative Research Method in English*. *3*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.21467/ijm.3.1.7400
31. Chen, X. (2013). A Study on the Training of Teachers for the Compulsory Education. *Open Education Research*.
32. Chiu, T. K. F. (2024). *A Framework for Using GenAI to Support Student Engagement in Interdisciplinary Learning from Self-determination Theory*. https://doi.org/10.14742/apubs.2024.1053
33. Choi, W., Jang, S., Park, S., & Kim, H. Y. (2024). The Intrinsic Motivation for Continuous Usage Intention of Generative AI In the Fashion Design Field : A Self-Determination Theory Perspective. *Journal of Art & Design Research*, *27*(1), 269–278. https://doi.org/10.59386/jadr.2024.27.1.269
34. Cohen, S., Mompelat, L., Mann, A. M., & Connors, L. J. (2024). The linguistic leap: Understanding, evaluating, and integrating AI in language education. *Journal of Language Teaching*, *4*(2), 23–31. https://doi.org/10.54475/jlt.2024.012
35. Coenen, C., & Pfenninger, M. (2024). Transforming learning experiences and assessments through AI-empowered cocreation of quality feedback. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.2062
36. Coetzer, Z., & van Aardt, P. (2024). Unsilencing the Student Voice: Detecting and Addressing ChatGPT-Generated Texts Presented as Student-Authored Texts at a University Writing Centre. *International Journal of Critical Diversity Studies*, *6*(2). https://doi.org/10.13169/intecritdivestud.6.2.00151
37. Cong-Lem, N., Tin Nghi, T., & Tất Thắng, N. (2023). Vietnamese EFL teachers' views and responses to generative AI in the context of academic integrity https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/9r5ac
38. *Common Elements of Qualitative Research Reports* (pp. 129-C8P172). (2023). Oxford University Press eBooks. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197639757.003.0008
39. Contreras, M. R., & Jaimes, J. O. (2024). *AI Ethics in the Fields of Education and Research: A Systematic Literature Review*. 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/icacit62963.2024.10788651
40. Cram, A., Raduescu, C., Zeivots, S., Huber, E., & Kizilcec, R. F. (2023). Educator and Student Perspectives on the Impact of Generative AI on Assessments in Higher Education. *ACM Conference on Learning @ Scale*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3573051.359619
41. Creely, E. (2024). *Exploring the Role of Generative AI in Enhancing Language Learning: Opportunities and Challenges*. https://doi.org/10.47852/bonviewijce42022495

42. Cui, P., & Alias, B. S. (2020). Opportunities and challenges in higher education arising from AI: A systematic literature review (2020–2024). *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*. https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd.v8i11.8390
43. Curtis, F. (2015). *Challenge: Always a good thing?* https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/65913/
44. Da, X. (2024). A Study of Audience Moral and Ethical Attitudes Toward AIGC-Generated News Content. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, *45*, 332–340. https://doi.org/10.54097/jst7w151
45. Dai, D. W., Suzuki, S., & Chen, G. (2024). Generative AI for professional communication training in intercultural contexts: Where are we now and where are we heading? *Applied Linguistics Review*, *0*(0). https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2024-0184
46. Damaševičius, R., & Sidekerskienė, T. (2024). *AI as a Teacher* (pp. 1–24). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-2728-9.ch00
47. Daruhadi, G. (2024). Phenomenological Method as A Theoretical Basis of Qualitative Methods. *International Journal of Social Health*, *3*(9), 599–613. https://doi.org/10.58860/ijsh.v3i9.238
48. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macro theory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology / Psychologie canadienne, 49*(3), 182–185. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012801
49. Delello, J. A., Sung, W., Mokhtari, K., Hebert, J., Bronson, A., & De Giuseppe, T. (2025). AI in the Classroom: Insights from Educators on Usage, Challenges, and Mental Health. *Education Sciences*, *15*(2), 113. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15020113
50. Dewi, G. P. R., Santosa, M. H., Dewi, N. L. P. E. S., & Nitiasih, P. K. (2023). Assessing students' writing skills in virtual classroom: strategies and challenges in EFL context. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, *13*(1), 147–170. https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v13i1.5288
51. De Wilde, V. (2024). Can novice teachers detect AI-generated texts in EFL writing? *ELT Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccae031
52. Dhamija, A., & Dhamija, D. (2024). Understanding Teachers' Perspectives on ChatGPT-Generated Assignments in Higher Education. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education*, *13*(2). https://doi.org/10.32674/ptf9yd75
53. Drisko, J. W. (2024). AIgiarism: Computer Generated Text, Plagiarism, and How to Address it in Teaching. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, *45*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2024.2433795
54. Dwivedi, Y. K., Malik, T., Hughes, L., & Albashrawi, M. (2024). Scholarly Discourse on GenAI's Impact on Academic Publishing. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2024.2435386
55. Elstad, E., & Eriksen, H. M. (2024). *Harnessing AI in Secondary Education to Enhance Writing Competence*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2412.12117
56. Erdogan, N., & Kitson, C. (2025). Integrating AI in Language Learning: Boosting Pragmatic Competence for Young English Learners. *LatIA*, *3*, 115. https://doi.org/10.62486/latia2025115
57. Embracing generative artificial intelligence: The perspectives of English instructors in Thai higher education institutions. (2024). *Knowledge Management & E-Learning: An International Journal*, 653–670. https://doi.org/10.34105/j.kmel.2024.16.030

58. Ernst, C. (2020). *Artificial Intelligence and Autonomy: Self-Determination in the Age of Automated Systems* (pp. 53–73). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-32361-5_3
59. Eslit, E. R. (2025). *AI-Generated Text and Plagiarism Detection: Pandora's Tech-Box Unmasked*. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202501.0060.v1
60. Ethical Concerns in Qualitative Research (pp. 331–352). (2024). SAGE Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-2414-1.ch009
61. Evangelista, E. (2024). Ensuring academic integrity in the age of ChatGPT: Rethinking exam design, assessment strategies, and ethical AI policies in higher education. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, *17*(1), ep559. https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/15775
62. Fan, C. (2023). Towards Applying Powerful Large AI Models in Classroom Teaching: Opportunities, Challenges and Prospects. *arXiv.Org*, *abs/2305.03433*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.03433
63. Faruqe, F., Watkins, R., & Medsker, L. R. (2021). Competency Model Approach to AI Literacy: Research-based Path from Initial Framework to Model. *arXiv: Artificial Intelligence*. https://dblp.uni-trier.de/db/journals/corr/corr2108.html#abs-2108-05809
64. Ferreira, P. M. (2023). Similarities and Dissimilarities in Student Grades Distributions, Over Time and by Gender. *European Journal of Educational Research*, *12*(3), 1495–1508. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.12.3.1495
65. Ferreira, T. M. (2024). *A New Educational Reality: Active Methodologies Empowered by Generative AI*. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202408.1933.v1
66. Fisk, G. D. (2024). AI or Human? Finding and Responding to Artificial Intelligence in Student Work. *Teaching of Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1177/00986283241251855
67. Fitzgerald, A., & Cooper, R. (2022). The Longer-Term Influences of International Professional Experience on Teachers' Professional Practice and Growth. *International Education Studies*, *15*(5), 1. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v15n5p1
68. Fleckenstein, J., Meyer, J., Jansen, T., Keller, S. D., Olaf Köller, & Jens Möller. (2024). Do teachers spot AI? Evaluating the detectability of AI-generated texts among student essays. *Computers & Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *6*(100209), 100209–100209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100209
69. Gabriel, S. (2024). Generative AI in Writing Workshops: A Path to AI Literacy. *Proceedings of the International Conference on AI Research*, *4*(1), 126–132. https://doi.org/10.34190/icair.4.1.3022
70. Ghimire, A., & Edwards, J. (2024). From Guidelines to Governance: A Study of AI Policies in Education. *arXiv.Org*, *abs/2403.15601*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2403.15601
71. Ghimire, P. R., & Neupane, B. P. (2024). Teachers' Perception and Experiences on Artificial Intelligence (AI) Integration in English Language Teaching and Learning. *Lumbini Journal of Language and Literature*, *4*(1), 104–116. https://doi.org/10.3126/ljll.v4i1.73918
72. Giannakos, M. N., Azevedo, R., Brusilovsky, P., Cukurova, M., Dimitriadis, Y., Hernández-Leo, D., Järvelä, S., Mavrikis, M., & Rienties, B. (2024). The promise and challenges of generative AI in education. *Behavior & Information Technology*, 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929x.2024.2394886
73. Goldman, S. R., Carreon, A., & Smith, S. J. (2024). Exploring the Integration of Artificial Intelligence into Special Education Teacher Preparation through the TPACK Framework. *Journal of Special Education Preparation*. https://doi.org/10.33043/6zx26bb2

74. Goswami, A., Kaur, G., Tayal, S., Verma, A., & Verma, M. (2024). *Analyzing the efficacy of Deep Learning and Transformer models in classifying Human and LLM-Generated Text*. 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1109/iccubea61740.2024.10775153
75. Gou, W., Li, X., Shao, T., & Zhang, Y. (2024). The Dilemma and Transformation of Teacher Roles in the Context of ChatGPT. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, *38*, 180–186. https://doi.org/10.54097/regcfw05
76. Gunawardena, A., & Chaturvedi, N. (2024). *AI Enhanced Learning: Powering Curated Videos with Generative Intelligence*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3626253.3633418
77. Gupta, L. (2024). Unmasking artificial intelligence (AI): Identifying articles written by AI models. *Indian Journal of Clinical Anaesthesia*, *11*(2), 122–124. https://doi.org/10.18231/j.ijca.2024.028
78. Haidamaka, I. (2024). Ethical Aspects of Using Artificial Intelligence in the Educational Process of Secondary Schools. *Problemi Osvìti*, *1(100)*, 56–67. https://doi.org/10.52256/2710-3986.1-100.2024.04
79. Haidar, A. (2023). An Integrative Theoretical Framework for Responsible Artificial Intelligence. *International Journal of Digital Strategy, Governance, and Business Transformation*. https://doi.org/10.4018/ijdsgbt.334844
80. Halaweh, M., & El Refae, G. A. (2024). *Examining the Accuracy of AI Detection Software Tools in Education*. 186–190. https://doi.org/10.1109/idsta62194.2024.10747004
81. He, P., Shin, N., Zhai, X., & Krajcik, J. (2024). *A Design Framework for Integrating Artificial Intelligence to Support Teachers' Timely Use of Knowledge-in-Use Assessments*. 348–370. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198882077.003.0016
82. Huang, X., Han, X., & Dou, A. (2024). Generative AI in College English Listening Instruction: Exploring Teacher Experiences and Pedagogical Integration. *Region - Educational Research and Reviews*, *6*(12), 183. https://doi.org/10.32629/rerr.v6i12.3027
83. Humeniuk, I. (2024). AI-GENERATED CONTENT AS A TOOL FOR IMPROVING THE LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE OF STUDENTS. *Mountain School of Ukrainian Carpathy*, (30), 73–77. https://doi.org/10.15330/msuc.2024.30.73-7
84. Hussain, Z. (2024). *Forming Policies for Ethical AI Use in Academic Writing*. 480. https://doi.org/10.54389/ooaw2024
85. Huynh, Q. Q. (2024). A Literature Review on EFL Students' Integration of AI-Based Tools in English Learning and The Perceived Impact on Autonomy. *International Journal of AI in Language Education*, *1*(2), 30–51. https://doi.org/10.54855/ijaile.24123
86. Ironsi, C. S. (2024). *Exploring the Potential of Generative AI in English Language Teaching* (pp. 162–185). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-0487-7.ch007
87. Isbej, L., Cantarutti, C., Fuentes-Cimma, J., Fuentes-Cimma, J., Fuentes-López, E., Montenegro, U., Ortuño, D., Oyarzo, N., Véliz, C., & Riquelme, A. (2021). The best mirror of the students' longitudinal performance: Portfolio or structured oral exam assessment at clerkship? *Journal of Dental Education*. https://doi.org/10.1002/JDD.12823
88. Istrate, O. (2024). AI Agents in Education: An Early Systematic Review of Emerging Roles, Potential, and Limitations. *Revista de Pedagogie Digitală*, *3*(1), 24–30. https://doi.org/10.61071/rpd.2496
89. Jansen, T., Höft, L., Bahr, L., Fleckenstein, J., Möller, J., Köller, O., & Meyer, J. (2024). Empirische Arbeit: Comparing Generative AI and Expert Feedback to Students' Writing: Insights from Student

Teachers. *Psychologie in Erziehung Und Unterricht*, *71*(2), 80–92. https://doi.org/10.2378/peu2024.art08d

90. Ji, Z. (2025). An Interdisciplinary Exploration of Concept and Application of Large Language Models. *Applied and Computational Engineering*, *133*(1), 8–15. https://doi.org/10.54254/2755-2721/2025.20594
91. Jochim, J., & Lenz-Kesekamp, V. K. (2024). Teaching and testing in the era of text-generative AI: exploring the needs of students and teachers. *Information and Learning Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.1108/ils-10-2023-0165
92. Jowallah, R. (2023). *Integrating Artificial Intelligence (AI) Into the Curriculum* (pp. 355–368). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-0074-9.ch015
93. Julaika, S., Hasanah, N., Aswatdi, H., Sari, K., Gani, L. F., & Ismahani, S. (2025). Exploring Student Awareness of Sentence Construction: The Role of Misplaced Words and Phrases in One-Clause Sentences. *Deleted Journal*, *2*(1), 144–151. https://doi.org/10.62335/mj5bjg98
94. Kadhafi, M. (2024). Menilai kesadaran sosial siswa melalui pembelajaran kontekstual mata pelajaran ips. *Dinamika Sosial Jurnal Pendidikan Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial*, *3*(3), 314–323. https://doi.org/10.18860/dsjpips.v3i3.13167
95. Kammer, J. (2024). An Exploratory Study of Information Access and 1:1 Devices. *Journal of Information Policy*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.5325/jinfopoli.14.2024.0010
96. Karina, B. D., & Kastuhandani, F. C. (2024). Pre-Service English Teachers' Lived Experience in Using AI in Teaching Preparation. *Edunesia*. https://doi.org/10.51276/edu.v5i1.767
97. Kenthapadi, K., Lakkaraju, H., & Rajani, N. F. (2023). *Generative AI meets Responsible AI: Practical Challenges and Opportunities*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3580305.3599557
98. Kim, J., Yu, S., Detrick, R., & Li, N. (2024). Exploring students' perspectives on Generative AI-assisted academic writing. *Education and Information Technologies*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12878-7
99. Kim, S. W. (2024). Development of a TPACK Educational Program to Enhance Pre-service Teachers' Teaching Expertise in Artificial Intelligence Convergence Education. *International Journal on Advanced Science, Engineering and Information Technology*, *14*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.18517/ijaseit.14.1.19552
100. Koh, J., Cowling, M., Jha, M., & Sim, K. N. (2023). The Human Teacher, the AI Teacher, and the AIed-Teacher Relationship. *Journal of Higher Education, Theory, and Practice*. https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v23i17.6543
101. Kohnke, L. (2024). How GenAI impacts technostress among secondary school English teachers. *Proceedings of the International CALL Research Conference, 2024*, 109–114. https://doi.org/10.29140/9780648184485-17
102. Kohnke, S., & Zaugg, T. (2025). Artificial Intelligence: An Untapped Opportunity for Equity and Access in STEM Education. *Education Sciences*, *15*(1), 68. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15010068
103. Kordel, S., & Gruber, M. (2024). *4. Data analysis*. 69–78. https://doi.org/10.5771/9783748939412-69
104. Kotsis, K. T. (2024). Artificial Intelligence Creates Plagiarism or Academic Research? *European Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, *1*(6), 169–179. https://doi.org/10.59324/ejahss.2024.1(6).18

105. Kővári, A. (2025). Ethical use of ChatGPT in education—Best practices to combat AI induced plagiarism. *Frontiers in Education*, *9*.https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1465703
106. Kristiawan, D., Bashar, K., & Pradana, D. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in English Language Learning: A Systematic Review of AI Tools, Applications, and Pedagogical Outcomes. *The Art of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)*, *5*(2), 207–218. https://doi.org/10.36663/tatefl.v5i2.912
107. Li, H., Xiao, R., Nieu, H., Tseng, Y.-J., & Liao, G. (2024). *From Unseen Needs to Classroom Solutions: Exploring AI Literacy Challenges & Opportunities with Project-based Learning Toolkit in K-12 Education*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2412.17243
108. Li, J., Zhu, S., Yang, H. H., & Xu, J. (2024). *What does Artificial Intelligence-generated content bring to Teaching and Learning? A literature review on AIGC in Education*. 18–23. https://doi.org/10.1109/iset61814.2024.00013
109. Liu, D. (2024). The Impact and Prospects of AI-Generated Content in Educational Environments. *Transactions on Computer Science and Intelligent Systems Research*, *6*, 64–71. https://doi.org/10.62051/7mewnb62
110. Liu, X. (2024). Research on the English Writing Teaching Model in the AI Era. *Modern Management Science & Engineering*, *6*(3), p111. https://doi.org/10.22158/mmse.v6n3p111
111. Lobok, A. M. (2014). *Education/obrazovanie as an experience of an encounter*. *2*. https://doi.org/10.5195/DPJ.2014.84
112. Lu, G., Hussin, N., & Sarkar, A. (2024). *Navigating the Future: Harnessing Artificial Intelligence Generated Content (AIGC)for Enhanced Learning Experiences in Higher Education*. https://doi.org/10.1109/amathe61652.2024.10582123
113. Lukas, A. J. F. (2023). Corporate Policies for the responsible use of Artificial Intelligence (Leitlinien für den verantwortungsbewußten Einsatz Künstlicher Intelligenz in Unternehmen). *Social Science Research Network*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4565195
114. Lukianenko, V., & Kornieva, Z. (2024). Generative AI in Student Essays: English Teachers' Perspectives on Effective Assessment Methods. *XLinguae*, *17*(4), 235–250. https://doi.org/10.18355/xl.2024.17.04.14
115. Ma, Y., & Chen, M. (2024). AI-empowered applications affect EFL learners' engagement in the classroom and academic procrastination. *BMC Psychology*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-02248-w
116. Marlina, E., Purwaningsih, M., Siagian, A. H. A. M., Hakim, S., & Maryati, I. (2024). Ensuring Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research. *Advances in Library and Information Science (ALIS) Book Series*, 347–376. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-3069-2.ch012
117. Martínez, M. E., & Gómez, V. (2024). The Importance of Social-Emotional Learning in Schools. *Acta Pedagogia Asiana*, *3*(2), 101–112. https://doi.org/10.53623/apga.v3i2.468
118. Matarazzo, A., & Torlone, R. (2025). *A Survey on Large Language Models with Some Insights on Capabilities and Limitations*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2501.04040
119. Mendes, L. S., Doneda, D., & Almeida, V. (2023). On the Development of AI Governance Frameworks. *IEEE Internet Computing*, *27*, 70–74. https://doi.org/10.1109/MIC.2022.3186030
120. Meylani, R. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in the Education of Teachers: A Qualitative Synthesis of the Cutting-Edge Research Literature. *Journal of Computer and Education Research*, *12*(24), 600–637. https://doi.org/10.18009/jcer.1477709

121. Mishra, P., Warr, M., & Islam, R. (2023). TPACK in the age of ChatGPT and Generative AI. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, *39*(4), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2023.2247480
122. Mohamed, S. P. (2024). Exploring ethical dimensions of AI-enhanced language education: A literature perspective. *Technology in Language Teaching & Learning*, *6*(3), 89–99. https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v6n3.1813
123. Montiel-Ruiz, F. J., & López Ruiz, M. (2023). Inteligencia artificial como recurso docente en un colegio rural agrupado. *Revista Interuniversitaria de Investigación En Tecnología Educativa*. https://doi.org/10.6018/riite.592031
124. Moorhouse, B. L., & Kohnke, L. (2023). *The Effects of Generative Ai on Initial Language Teacher Education: The Perspectives of Teacher Educators*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4532479
125. Mozelius, P., Håkansson Lindqvist, M., Martha, C., Jaldemark, J., & Sundgren, M. (2024). Educating the Educators on Generative Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education. *Proceedings of the International Conference on AI Research*, *4*(1), 296–302. https://doi.org/10.34190/icair.4.1.3026
126. Mubofu, C., & Kitali, L. (2024). Artificial Intelligence In Education: Ethics & Responsible Implementation. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education*, *13*(2). https://doi.org/10.32674/9rjyjp52
127. Mujiono, M. (2023). Educational Collaboration : Teachers and Artificial Intelligence. *Jurnal Kependidikan*, *9*(2), 618. https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v9i2.7801
128. Munni, B. E., & Rafique, R. (2025). Teachers' Experiences of Using AI-powered Technologies in Bangladeshi English Language Classrooms. *Spectrum*, *18*, 89–100. https://doi.org/10.3329/spectrum.v18i1.76362
129. Murphy, T., & Hirai, M. (2003). Teaching with technology, setting an example. *SIGUCCS: User Services Conference*, 208–212. https://doi.org/10.1145/947469.947523
130. Nyaaba, M. (2024). *Transforming Teacher Education in Developing Countries: The Role of Generative AI in Bridging Theory and Practice*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2411.10718
131. Najjar, A. A., Ashqar, H. I., Darwish, O., & Hammad, E. (2025). *Detecting AI-Generated Text in Educational Content: Leveraging Machine Learning and Explainable AI for Academic Integrity*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2501.03203
132. Nappu, S. (2024). Exploring Students' Perspective on Project Based Learning Approach. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, *7*(06). https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v7-i06-90
133. Naz, I., & Robertson, R. (2024). Exploring the Feasibility and Efficacy of ChatGPT3 for Personalized Feedback in Teaching. *Electronic Journal of E-Learning*. https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.22.2.3345
134. Nernere, R. P., & Kastuhandani, F. C. (2024). In-Service English Teacher's Lived Experience in Using ChatGPT in Teaching Preparation. *SALEE*. https://doi.org/10.35961/salee.v5i1.1115
135. Nguyen, P. A. (2024). Evaluating AI-Generated Language as Models for Strategic Competence in English Language Teaching. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, *12*(3), 325–349. https://doi.org/10.22492/ije.12.3.13
136. Nikitina, I. P., & Ishchenko, T. (2024). The impact of ai on teachers: support or replacement? *Scientific Journal of Polonia University*. https://doi.org/10.23856/6511

137. Osipov, D. (2024). Ethics of AI Technologies in "Sensitive" Content Creation and Evaluation. School Shooting Cases. *Galaktika Media: Žurnal Media Issledovanij*, *6*(3), 44–65. https://doi.org/10.46539/gmd.v6i3.530
138. Owan, V. J., Idika, D. O., & Bassey, B. A. (2023). Exploring the potential of artificial intelligence tools in educational measurement and assessment. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, *19*(8), em2307. https://doi.org/10.29333/ejmste/13428
139. Ozer, O. (2024). *AI language models: A breach of academic integrity in online language learning?* https://doi.org/10.58379/ezys5680
140. Özdere, M. (2025). AI in Academic Writing: Assessing the Effectiveness, Grading Consistency, and Student Perspectives of ChatGPT and You.com for EFL Students. *International Journal of Technology in Education*, *8*(1), 123–154. https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.1001
141. PAN, J. (2024). AI-driven English Language Learning Program and Academic Writing Integrity in the Era of Intelligent Interface. *English Language Teaching and Linguistics Studies*, *6*(4), 120. http://www.scholink.org/ojs/index.php/eltls/article/view/41687/10227
142. Pan, Y. (2024). The Application of Artificial Intelligence in Classroom: Advantages, Challenges, and Suggestions. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, *45*, 211–216. https://doi.org/10.54097/zmgq6m15
143. Panit, N. M. (2025). Can critical thinking and AI work together? Observations of science, Mathematics, and language instructors. *Environment & Social Psychology*, *9*(11). https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i11.3141
144. Park, J., Teo, T. W., Teo, A., Chang, J., Huang, J. S., & Koo, S. (2023). Integrating artificial intelligence into science lessons: teachers' experiences and views. *International Journal of STEM Education*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-023-00454-3
145. Partadiredja, R. A., Serrano, C. E., & Ljubenkov, D. (2020). *AI or Human: The Socio-ethical Implications of AI-Generated Media Content*. https://doi.org/10.1109/CMI51275.2020.9322673
146. Pedro, L. (2024). Teacher professional development for a future with generative artificial intelligence – an integrative literature review. *Digital Education Review*, *45*, 151–157. https://doi.org/10.1344/der.2024.45.151-157
147. Phalaguna, I. bagus, Kaewsaeng, K., & Worabuttara, T. (2024). Exploring Teachers' Perceptions of AI-Generated English Lesson Plans for Students with Intellectual Disabilities. *Deleted Journal*, *2*(2), 19–28. https://doi.org/10.25078/ijils.v2i2.4251
148. Pitychoutis, K. M., & Rawahi, A. A. (2024). Smart Teaching: The Synergy of Multiple Intelligences and Artificial Intelligence in English as a Foreign Language Instruction. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, *6*(6), 249–260. https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i6.7297
149. Popescu, D. M., & Joyner, D. (2024). *Novelty, Rigidity, and Complexity: Toward Developing AI-Resistant Assessments in an Introductory Computer Science Class*. 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/democon63027.2024.10748200
150. Prabowo, B., & Asmarani, R. (2025). Generative Literature: The Role of Artificial Intelligence in the Creative Writing Process. *Allure Journal*, *5*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.26877/allure.v5i1.19959
151. Prilop, C. N., Mah, D.-K., Jacobsen, L. J., Hansen, R. R., Weber, K. E., & Hoya, F. (2024). *Generative AI in teacher education: Using AI-enhanced methods to explore teacher educators' perceptions*. https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/szcwb

152. *Project-Based Assessments* (pp. 175–194). (2022). Routledge eBooks. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003285991-15
153. Pudasaini, S., Miralles-Pechu'an, L., Lillis, D., & Llorens-Salvador, M. (2024). Survey on Plagiarism Detection in Large Language Models: The Impact of ChatGPT and Gemini on Academic Integrity. *arXiv.Org*, *abs/2407.13105*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2407.13105
154. Quirke-Bolt, N. (2020). *The Effects of Peer Feedback, within an "Assessment as Learning" Approach, on the Learning and Development of Student-Teachers. 13*(1), 27–36. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1267735.pdf
155. Rafikova, A., & Воронин, A. H. (2024). *AI as a Research Proxy: Navigating the New Frontier of Social Science Inquiry through Language Models*. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-5425532/v1
156. Rajak, L., Chauhan, S., & Bara, S. (2024). *Transforming English Pedagogy with Artificial Intelligence: Enroute to Enhanced Language Learning*. 216–241. https://doi.org/10.2174/9789815305180124010013
157. Ramakrishnan, S., Bishnoi, M. M., Joghee, S., Jijitha, S., & Kumar, A. (2024). *Social Engineering:Role of Teachers in Cohabitation of AI with Education*. 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1109/iccr61006.2024.10532897
158. Ramona, O. P. Sr., & de Guzman, A. B. (2005). Filipino Teachers' Experiences of Supportive Relationships with Colleagues: A Narrative-Biographical Inquiry. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, *6*(2), 137–142. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03026781
159. Rane, N. (2024). Enhancing the quality of teaching and learning through ChatGPT and similar large language models: Challenges, future prospects, and ethical considerations in education. *TESOL and Technology Studies*, *5*(1), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.48185/tts.v5i1.1000
160. Rane, N. L., Shirke, S., Choudhary, S. P., & Rane, J. (2024). *Education Strategies for Promoting Academic Integrity in the Era of Artificial Intelligence and ChatGPT: Ethical Considerations, Challenges, Policies, and Future Directions*. *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.48185/jes.v1i1.1314
161. Raza, M. (2024). AI in Education: Balancing Benefits and Challenges Through Professional Development of Teachers. *Qlantic Journal of Social Sciences.*, *5*(4), 168–174. https://doi.org/10.55737/qjss.v-iv.24071
162. Rajak, L., Chauhan, S., & Bara, S. (2024). *Transforming English Pedagogy with Artificial Intelligence: Enroute to Enhanced Language Learning*. 216–241. https://doi.org/10.2174/9789815305180124010013
163. Risi, E., Briziarelli, M., & Mohammad, Y. (2024). Unpacking the Outputs of Generative AI Platforms and Revealing Gender and Social Re-Presentations. *Advances in Human and Social Aspects of Technology Book Series*, 299–330. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-7235-7.ch012
164. Rizal, D. (2023). EFL Teacher Experiences in Developing Writing Proficiency for Scientific Journal Publication Through Extensive Reading. *Ta'dib*, *26*(1), 157. https://doi.org/10.31958/jt.v26i1.8809
165. S, R. (2024). *Writing Proficiency Development through AI-Powered Tools: The Impact of AI-Driven Feedback System in Language Learning*.
166. Sahli, N., Boughena, K., & Abdelhadi, A. (2024). A systematic review of empirical studies on the impact of artificial intelligence on university students' writing skills. *Analele Universităţii Din Craiova. Psihologie, Pedagogie*, *46*(2), 285–297. https://doi.org/10.52846/aucpp.2024.2.21

167. Shahzad, T., Mazhar, T., Tariq, M. U., Ahmad, W., Ouahada, K., & Hamam, H. (2025). A comprehensive review of large language models: issues and solutions in learning environments. *Discover Sustainability*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-025-00815-8
168. Satria, F., & Saputra, R. H. (2025). *Analysis of Student Perceptions of the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Learning in the Digital Age*. *2*(1), 299–308. https://doi.org/10.47352/3032-503x.80
169. Saxena, A. (2024). AI in Governance and Policy Making. *International Journal of Science and Research*, *13*(5), 1218–1223. https://doi.org/10.21275/sr24519015426
170. Septiani, R. A., & Ramadani, A. N. (2025). AI: Apakah Guru Masih Punya Peran di Masa Depan. *Inspirasi Dunia*, *4*(1), 263–272. https://doi.org/10.58192/insdun.v4i1.2947
171. Setyaningsih, E., Asrori, M., Sumardi, S., Zainnuri, H., & Hariyanti, Y. (2024). Exploring High School EFL Teachers' Experiences with Magic School AI in Lesson Planning: Benefits and Insights. *VELES (Voices of English Language Education Society)*, *8*(3). https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v8i3.27700
172. Sharma, S., Mukherjee, B., Shastri, R. G., Prasad, S., & Gaddi, A. A. (2025). AI-Powered Question Management in Conferences. *Indian Scientific Journal Of Research In Engineering And Management*, *09*(01), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.55041/ijsrem40439
173. Silva, S., De Lara, M., Muhammad Salama Muhammad, I., Cerón Silva, D. J., da Silva, A. L., & Salazar Rodríguez, R. R. (2025). Artificial Intelligence as a Co-Teacher: The Future of Personalized Teaching. *Latam*, *5*(6). https://doi.org/10.56712/latam.v5i6.3283
174. Singh, P., & Absar, S. (2024). Mapping AI Literacy Among Punjab's Teachers Using Structural Equation Modelling. *Journal of Communication and Management*, *3*(04), 374–381. https://doi.org/10.58966/jcm20243410
175. Singha, S., & Singha, R. (2024). *Revolutionizing Content Creation and Curriculum Development Through Generative AI* (pp. 261–280). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-1351-0.ch013
176. Solak, E. (2024). Examining Writing Feedback Dynamics from ChatGPT AI and Human Educators: a Comparative Study. *Pedagogika*, *96*(7), 955–969. https://doi.org/10.53656/ped2024-7.05
177. Song, N. (2024). Higher education crisis: Academic misconduct with generative AI. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12532
178. Talgatov, Y., Kassymova, G. K., & Nurtanto, M. (2024). *AI in the Classroom: A Boon or a Threat to Pedagogical Practices?* 128–134. https://doi.org/10.31643/2024.19
179. Tanjung, I. F., Arilla, M. S., Sari, P. P. P., & Fadhilah, V. P. (2022). Application of Problem Based Learning Strategies to Overcome Students Learning Difficulties. *Edumaspul : Jurnal Pendidikan*, *6*(2), 1867–1871. https://doi.org/10.33487/edumaspul.v6i2.3542
180. Tarab, S. (2019). *Becoming Familiar With Qualitative Research* (pp. 1–24). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-5366-3.CH001
181. Taufikin, M. S. I., Supaat, S., Azifah, N., Nikmah, F., & Kuanr, J. (2024). *The Impact of AI on Teacher Roles and Pedagogy in the 21st Century Classroom*. *21*, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1109/ickecs61492.2024.10617236
182. Theodoratou, M. (2023). *Coping Strategies in Clinical Psychology and Neuropsychology*. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202310.1932.v1

183. Tram, N. H. M. (2024). Unveiling the Drivers of AI Integration Among Language Teachers: Integrating UTAUT and AI-TPACK. *Computers in The Schools*, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/07380569.2024.2441155
184. Tyack, A., & Mekler, E. D. (2020). Masterclass: Rethinking Self-Determination Theory in Player-Computer Interaction. *Annual Symposium on Computer-Human Interaction in Play*, 1–2. https://doi.org/10.1145/3383668.3419848
185. Ullah, M., Naeem, S. B., & Kamel Boulos, M. N. (2024). *Assessing the Guidelines on the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools in Universities: Results of a Survey of the World's Top 50 Universities*. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202411.1411.v1
186. van den Ham, A.-K. (2024). *KI-Textgeneratoren: Eine neue Ära des Unterrichts?* (pp. 467–480). De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111351490-030
187. Varghese, M. (2024). *TRANSFORMING EDUCATION WITH AI: EMBRACING CHATGPT AND ADDRESSING CHALLENGES FOR THE FUTURE*. 91–100. https://doi.org/10.58532/v3bhma17p2ch4
188. Vashishth, T. K., Sharma, V., Sharma, K. K., & Kumar, B. (2024). *Enhancing Literacy Education in Higher Institutions With AI Opportunities and Challenges* (pp. 198–215). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-2728-9.ch009
189. Vassel, F.-M., Shieh, E., Sugimoto, C. R., & Monroe-White, T. (2024). *The Psychosocial Impacts of Generative AI Harms*. https://doi.org/10.1609/aaaiss.v3i1.31251
190. Visto, J., Zaluaga, Z. A. R., & Bucar, J. D. (2024). Maintaining Academic Integrity and Validating Student Outcomes. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary*, *5*(6), 2142–2150. https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.06.17
191. Wali Khan Monib, Qazi, A., Rosyzie Anna Apong, Azizan, M. T., Silva, L. D., & Yassin, H. (2024). Generative AI and future education: a review, theoretical validation, and authors' perspective on challenges and solutions. *PeerJ Computer Science*, *10*, e2105–e2105. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.2105
192. Wang, R. (2024). Exploring Teachers Perceptions of Generative AI (ChatGPT) Use on Undergraduate Teaching in EMI Context: A Literature Review. *Lecture Notes in Education Psychology and Public Media*, *74*(1), 144–150. https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7048/2024.bo17885
193. Wang, S. (2024). Research on Innovative Application and Practical Challenges of Generative Artificial Intelligence in English Teaching. *Journal of Education and Educational Research*, *10*(1), 248–252. https://doi.org/10.54097/xpvhh246
194. Wang, Y., Pan, Y., Yan, M., Zhou, S., & Luan, T. H. (2023). A Survey on ChatGPT: AI–Generated Contents, Challenges, and Solutions. *IEEE Open Journal of the Computer Society*, *4*, 280–302. https://doi.org/10.1109/ojcs.2023.3300321
195. Warschauer, M. (2023). AI-writing tools in education: if you can't beat them, join them. *Journal of China Computer-Assisted Language Learning*, *0*(0). https://doi.org/10.1515/jccall-2023-0008
196. Wasswa, S. (2024). *An Overview of Artificial Intelligence-Enhanced Teaching Methods* (pp. 132–159). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-2728-9.ch006
197. Ward, A., Manoharan, S., & Ye, X. (2024). *Exploring Academic Integrity in the Age of Generative AI*. 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1109/ithet61869.2024.10837603
198. Webb, M., Prasse, D., Phillips, M., Kadijevich, D., Angeli, C., Strijker, A., Carvalho, A. A. A., Andresen, B. B., Dobozy, E., & Laugesen, H. (2018). Challenges for IT-Enabled Formative

Assessment of Complex 21st Century Skills. *Technology, Knowledge, and Learning*, *23*(3), 441–456. https://doi.org/10.1007/S10758-018-9379-7

199. Weber-Wulff, D., Anohina-Naumeca, A., Bjelobaba, S., Foltýnek, T., Guerrero-Dib, J., & Popoola, O. (2023). Testing of Detection Tools for AI-Generated Text. *arXiv.Org*, *abs/2306.15666*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.15666
200. Wetzler, E. L., Cassidy, K. S., Jones, M. J., Frazier, C. R., Korbut, N., Sims, C. M., Bowen, S. S., & Wood, M. B. (2024). Grading the Graders: Comparing Generative AI and Human Assessment in Essay Evaluation. *Teaching of Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1177/00986283241282696
201. Wilkinson, G. G. (2024). Enhancing Generic Skills Development in Higher Education in the Era of Large Language Model Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Higher Education, Theory, and Practice*, *24*(3). https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v24i3.6832
202. Wiredu, J. K., Abuba, N. S., & Zakaria, H. T. R. (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
203. Xin, J. J. (2024). Investigating EFL teachers' use of generative AI to develop reading materials: A practice and perception study. *Language Teaching Research*. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688241303321
204. Yang, X., & Aurisicchio, M. (2021). Designing Conversational Agents: A Self-Determination Theory Approach. *Human Factors in Computing Systems*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445445
205. Yang, K., Raković, M., Liang, Z., Yan, L., Zeng, Z., Fan, Y., Găsević, D., & Chen, G. (2024). *Modifying AI, Enhancing Essays: How Active Engagement with Generative AI Boosts Writing Quality*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2412.07200
206. Yao, J. (2024). The Application of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Education: Potential, Challenges, and Strategies. *SHS Web of Conferences*, *200*, 02008. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202420002008
207. Yatri, D., Anugerahwati, M., & Setyowati, L. (2023). Artificial intelligence (ai) in language learning (english and arabic class): students' and teachers' experience and perceptions. *TRANSFORMATIONAL LANGUAGE LITERATURE AND TECHNOLOGY OVERVIEW IN LEARNING (TRANSTOOL)*, *3*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.55047/transtool.v3i1.1338
208. Ybyrayeva, K. N., Adilkhanova, B., & Zhunissova, M. (2024). Adapting Assessment Tools: Teachers' Perceptions on the Integration of AI Tools in Student Homework Assignments. *International Advanced Research Journal in Science, Engineering and Technology*. https://doi.org/10.17148/iarjset.2024.11511
209. Yuan, C., Zheng, X., & Li, G. (2024). English Classroom in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: The Transformation and Reshaping of Teachers' Role. *Region - Educational Research and Reviews*, *6*(10), 64–64. https://doi.org/10.32629/rerr.v6i10.2701
210. Zainuddin, N., Suhaimi, N. A., Jaffar, M. N., Sahrir, M. S., Ab, W., Daud, A. W., Taufiq, M., & Ghani, A. (2024). Responsible and Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence in Language Education: A Systematic Review. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i5.7092
211. Zhang, J. (2025). Generative AI in Higher Education: Challenges and Opportunities for Course Learning. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, *12*(01), 11–18. https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.1201.18121

212. Zhang, S. (2024). Chatgpt Assisted Teachers in Improving Formative Assessment. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.54097/qz3kbj17
213. Zhai, X. (2024). *Transforming Teachers' Roles and Agencies in the Era of Generative AI: Perceptions, Acceptance, Knowledge, and Practices*. ArXiv.org. https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.03018
214. Zhao, T. (2024). Challenges and Role Transformation of College Foreign Language Teachers in the AI Era. *Adult and Higher Education*. https://doi.org/10.23977/aduhe.2024.060614
215. Zheldibayeva, R., Nascimento, A. K., Castro, V., Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2025). *The Impact of AI-Driven Tools on Student Writing Development: A Case Study From The CGScholar AI Helper Project*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2501.08473
216. Zhen, J. (2023). *The Construction of Personalized English Writing Platform Driven by Deep Learning*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613944.3613945