Volume 2 Issue 1 Year 2026 Pages 47-68
e–ISSN 3090–9406 | DOI: 10.70152
https://journal.akademimerdeka.com/ojs/index.php/duites

Deciding When and How to Use AI in EFL Speaking Instruction: Evidence from Surveys and Teacher Interviews

Samikshya Bidari[1], Muhammad Aulia Taufiqi[2*]

[1] Kathmandu University, Nepal
[2] Institut Pesantren Babakan Cirebon, Indonesia
[*]Corresponding author's email: auliataufiqi@ipeba.ac.id

DOI: https://doi.org/10.70152/duties.v2i1.309

Abstract: The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction has expanded rapidly, yet little is known about how teachers make pedagogical decisions regarding AI use in speaking classrooms. This study investigates how EFL teachers explain and justify their decisions about when and how to use AI tools in speaking instruction, employing a convergent mixed-methods design. Quantitative data were collected through a survey of 24 teachers, analysed using descriptive statistics, while qualitative insights were obtained from semi-structured interviews with 12 teachers, analysed thematically. Findings reveal that teachers adopt a selective, context-sensitive approach, exercising professional agency in prioritizing AI for pronunciation practice and fluency exercises, where immediate feedback and structured practice are most effective. Teachers exercise professional judgment to balance AI affordances with pedagogical objectives, contextual constraints, and ethical considerations, ensuring that AI supplements rather than replaces human interaction. The study highlights the multidimensional nature of teacher agency in AI-supported speaking instruction and provides practical implications for professional development and curriculum design. Future research could examine AI integration across other language skills, diverse educational contexts, and longitudinal impacts on learners' speaking proficiency and autonomy.

Keywords: AI integration, EFL speaking, mixed-methods research, teacher agency, technology-enhanced learning

INTRODUCTION

The digital age has profoundly reshaped language education, with Artificial Intelligence (AI) emerging as a transformative force. From speech recognition software to AI-powered conversational chatbots, AI tools are increasingly integrated into English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom, offering novel opportunities for learners to enhance their speaking proficiency (Zou et al., 2023). This growing shift necessitates a deeper understanding of how teachers and learners interact with these evolving technologies. Traditional EFL speaking instruction often faces challenges in providing individualized practice and timely feedback, particularly in large classes where opportunities for

meaningful oral interaction are limited (Chen, 2022). While AI tools are often promoted as solutions to these challenges, empirical understanding of how teachers pedagogically decide when and how to use AI in speaking instruction remains limited.

Despite the growing adoption of AI in EFL speaking instruction, existing research has primarily focused on technical efficacy (Memarian & Doleck, 2023), learner outcomes (Tapalova & Zhiyenbayeva, 2022), or teachers' general perceptions of AI usefulness (Choi et al., 2023), leaving a gap in understanding teachers' pedagogical decision-making processes. Speaking differs from other language skills, such as writing, in requiring real-time interaction, spontaneity, and oral communication skills. Teachers must consider whether AI tools are suitable for individual practice, paired activities, or group interaction, and whether these tools enhance fluency, pronunciation, or communicative competence (He, 2024). Furthermore, teachers must balance AI integration with opportunities for human interaction, peer collaboration, and real-time corrective feedback, which are essential for developing authentic speaking skills

Teacher decision-making in AI-mediated speaking instruction is influenced by multiple factors, including instructional objectives, student proficiency, classroom resources, and ethical considerations. While AI can provide instant feedback and simulate conversational practice, excessive reliance on AI may undermine learners' autonomy, creativity, and critical thinking (Xiao & Zhi, 2023). Teachers must exercise professional judgment to determine the conditions under which AI is pedagogically appropriate (Alharbi, 2023), how to scaffold its use effectively (Ng et al., 2022), and how to align AI-supported activities with curriculum requirements (Walter, 2024). Ethical considerations, such as maintaining the authenticity of student work and avoiding over-dependence on technology, further complicate these decisions. Thus, integrating AI into speaking instruction, as stated by Fitriati and Williyan (2025), is not simply a matter of availability but requires deliberate, context-sensitive decision-making by teachers who must navigate both the affordances and limitations of AI.

The concept of teacher agency is critical to understanding AI integration in EFL speaking instruction. Teacher agency refers to the capacity of educators to make reflective, autonomous, and contextually informed decisions about their instructional practice (Yli-Pietilä et al., 2024). In AI-supported speaking classes, exercising agency involves determining not only which AI tools to use but also when, how, and to what extent they are incorporated into classroom activities (Qiao & Zhao, 2023). Teachers' decisions are shaped by professional expertise, pedagogical knowledge, and situational constraints, allowing them to regulate the balance between technological assistance and human-mediated instruction. By exercising agency, teachers ensure that AI enhances learning rather than supplanting pedagogically valuable interactions (Ling & Jan, 2025), thereby maintaining instructional integrity and promoting meaningful learner engagement.

Speaking, as a productive skill, presents unique challenges for AI integration. Teachers must consider interactive authenticity, communicative spontaneity, and feedback immediacy when deciding on AI-supported activities (Wei, 2023). For example, a speech

recognition tool may help beginners improve pronunciation, but advanced learners may require open-ended, conversational practice to develop fluency and pragmatic competence. Similarly, AI-powered chatbots can simulate dialogues (Samuel et al., 2023), but teachers must decide when human-facilitated discussions are more appropriate for promoting negotiation of meaning and interactive competence. These decisions are influenced by contextual factors such as class size, students' digital literacy, available technology, and institutional support (Huang & Yip, 2021). Such considerations highlight the complexity of pedagogical decision-making in AI-supported speaking instruction and underscore the need to investigate teachers' rationales and justifications.

Contextual factors play a significant role in shaping teachers' decisions about AI integration. Variability in access to devices, internet connectivity, and institutional support can limit the feasibility of certain AI applications (McCarthy & Yan, 2024). Cultural and educational norms may also influence teachers' willingness to integrate AI into speaking instruction, particularly regarding the balance of teacher authority and student autonomy (Samuel et al., 2023). Furthermore, ethical concerns, such as ensuring the authenticity of oral practice and avoiding over-reliance on AI-generated feedback, are integral to teachers' decision-making processes (Jose & Jayaron Jose, 2024). These contextual and ethical dimensions demonstrate that the integration of AI in speaking instruction is neither uniform nor automatic but is mediated by teachers' professional judgment and pedagogical awareness.

To examine these decision-making processes comprehensively, a convergent mixed-methods design is appropriate. Quantitative surveys using Likert-scale items can identify general patterns in teachers' reported decisions regarding AI use in speaking instruction, including factors influencing their choices and the frequency of AI-mediated activities. Semi-structured interviews provide complementary qualitative insights, allowing teachers to elaborate on their reasoning, justifications, and contextual considerations. By converging survey and interview data, this study captures both broad trends and in-depth explanations, offering a holistic understanding of how teachers make pedagogical decisions about AI integration in speaking classes.

Investigating teachers' decision-making in AI-mediated speaking instruction is significant for both theory and practice. The findings contribute to research on teacher agency and technology-enhanced language teaching, shedding light on how educators balance innovation with pedagogical responsibility. Understanding the criteria and justifications that guide teachers' decisions can inform professional development programs, equipping teachers to integrate AI tools effectively while maintaining pedagogical integrity. Moreover, the study provides evidence for policymakers and curriculum designers on how AI can be strategically incorporated into speaking instruction to enhance oral proficiency, learner engagement, and autonomy.

Despite the increasing prevalence of AI in EFL classrooms, research remains scarce regarding how teachers decide when and how to use AI tools in speaking instruction. Exploring both the patterns of teachers' decisions and the reasoning behind them provides

critical insights into pedagogical judgment, ethical considerations, and contextual influences in AI-mediated speaking instruction. Addressing this gap is essential for advancing theoretical understanding of teacher agency and for developing practical guidelines that optimize the use of AI in language classrooms.

Therefore, this study aims to investigate how EFL teachers exercise professional judgment in deciding when and how to integrate AI tools in speaking instruction. Using a convergent mixed-methods approach, this research examines survey data capturing patterns of AI use alongside interview data providing in-depth explanations of teachers' reasoning. The study seeks to illuminate the factors that guide pedagogical decision-making in AI-supported speaking instruction, contributing to theory, practice, and policy in technology-enhanced EFL teaching.

Research Question:

How do EFL teachers explain and justify their decisions about when and how to use AI tools in teaching EFL speaking skills?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Analytical Lens

The concept of teacher agency serves as a critical analytical lens for understanding decision-making in AI-mediated EFL speaking instruction. Teacher agency refers to the capacity of educators to act purposefully and reflectively within the constraints of their professional, institutional, and sociocultural contexts (Koh et al., 2023). In language education, teacher agency encompasses the ability to make informed pedagogical choices, adapt instructional strategies, and negotiate the integration of technological tools to meet learners' needs (Yusra et al., 2022). Within AI-supported classrooms, agency becomes particularly salient as teachers are confronted with decisions about when and how to deploy AI tools effectively, balancing technological affordances with pedagogical objectives (Ling & Jan, 2025). This study adopts the teacher agency framework to explore how educators exercise professional judgment in selecting AI tools for speaking instruction, considering factors such as learner readiness, task appropriateness, ethical implications, and contextual constraints.

Teacher agency is often conceptualized as a multidimensional construct involving iterative reflective practice, autonomy, and contextual responsiveness (Emans et al., 2025; Nezhad & Stolz, 2024). Iterative reflective practice enables teachers to critically evaluate the outcomes of instructional decisions (Novoa-Echaurren et al., 2025), including the effectiveness of AI-mediated speaking activities, and to adjust their approaches accordingly. Autonomy reflects teachers' capacity to make independent judgments about the pedagogical appropriateness of AI tools (Kolho, 2024), resisting the tendency to adopt technology uncritically. Contextual responsiveness highlights the influence of institutional policies, classroom resources, student diversity, and cultural norms on teachers' decision-making processes (Morman et al., 2025). By examining AI integration through this lens, the study foregrounds teachers' deliberative choices rather

than mere adoption or usage frequency, highlighting the ethical, professional, and pedagogical considerations that shape instructional decisions in speaking classrooms.

Within AI-enhanced EFL contexts, teacher agency is particularly relevant due to the complexity of speaking instruction, which involves real-time interaction, communicative competence, and oral fluency development (Kemelbekova et al., 2024). AI tools, such as chatbots, pronunciation analyzers, and speech recognition applications, offer innovative affordances for speaking practice, but their effectiveness is contingent upon strategic deployment by teachers (Srinivasan & Murthy, 2021). Agency, therefore, involves deliberate decisions regarding which tools to use, for what tasks, under which conditions, and with what level of student autonomy. This framework also accommodates ethical considerations, including ensuring equitable access, preventing over-reliance on AI, and maintaining the authenticity of learning experiences (Williyan et al., 2025; Williyan et al., 2025). Employing teacher agency as the analytical lens allows the study to capture the dynamic interplay between technological possibilities, pedagogical goals, and contextual realities, providing a nuanced understanding of how teachers exercise judgment in AI-supported speaking instruction.

Previous Studies

Empirical studies on AI integration in EFL instruction have predominantly focused on adoption, learner outcomes, and technology perceptions. A growing body of research has examined AI tools for speaking instruction, highlighting their potential to enhance fluency, pronunciation, and communicative competence. For example, Nguyen Huu (2025) investigated the use of AI chatbots in EFL speaking classes and found that learners engaged more actively in oral practice when interacting with automated conversational partners, particularly in low-stakes environments. Similarly, Moxon (2024) explored speech recognition software in pronunciation training, reporting that real-time feedback improved learners' accuracy and confidence in producing target sounds. These studies collectively indicate that AI tools can serve as valuable supplements to speaking instruction, providing opportunities for individualized practice and feedback that are difficult to achieve in traditional classroom settings.

While AI's pedagogical affordances are well-documented, research on teachers' decision-making regarding AI use in speaking instruction remains limited. Most studies examine teacher perceptions rather than the reasoning behind pedagogical choices. For instance, Zhou and Hou (2024) surveyed EFL teachers on their attitudes toward AI tools, finding high levels of perceived usefulness and willingness to integrate technology. However, the study did not explore how teachers decide which tools to use, under what conditions, or how they balance AI with human-mediated instruction. Similarly, Crompton et al. (2024) reported that teachers recognized AI's potential in promoting speaking fluency, but the research focused on adoption rates rather than reflective judgment or professional agency. These gaps highlight the need for research that examines the why and how of AI integration from the perspective of teacher decision-making.

Research on teacher agency and technology integration provides valuable insights into the dynamics of instructional decision-making. Herrera-Seda and Pantić (2025) argue that teachers' exercise of agency involves deliberate reflection, professional judgment, and negotiation of contextual constraints, including institutional policies, resource availability, and learner diversity. In language classrooms, agency is manifested when teachers decide how to scaffold tasks, select instructional tools, and mediate learner interaction (Banegas et al., 2024). Applying this lens to AI-supported speaking instruction suggests that teachers' decisions are influenced by both pedagogical goals, such as promoting fluency, accuracy, and communicative competence, and contextual realities, including class size, technology access, and student readiness.

Several studies have also addressed the ethical and pedagogical considerations associated with AI in speaking instruction. Ling and Jan (2025) noted that teachers often express concerns about over-reliance on AI, potential reduction of authentic interaction, and equity issues related to digital access. Celik et al. (2024) highlighted that teachers' professional judgment is critical in mediating these risks, ensuring that AI serves as a facilitator rather than a replacement for meaningful oral practice. These findings reinforce the importance of examining not only AI's technological affordances but also the reasoning and justifications that guide teachers' instructional choices.

Moreover, mixed-methods research in technology-enhanced EFL instruction demonstrates the value of integrating quantitative and qualitative perspectives to understand teachers' decision-making. Surveys capture patterns of reported use, perceived usefulness, and prioritization of tools, while interviews provide in-depth insights into the rationale, ethical considerations, and contextual factors influencing those patterns (Almufarreh, 2024). Such approaches are particularly relevant for speaking instruction, where AI tools' effectiveness depends on nuanced pedagogical deployment and reflective teacher judgment. By combining both data types, researchers can identify common trends and explore the reasoning that underpins teachers' decisions, providing a comprehensive understanding of AI integration in speaking classrooms.

The literature indicates that while AI tools offer promising support for EFL speaking instruction, there remains a critical gap in understanding how teachers exercise professional judgment in deciding when and how to use these tools. Existing studies emphasize adoption, perceptions, and learner outcomes, but few investigate the deliberative processes, pedagogical reasoning, and contextual negotiations that shape teachers' choices. This gap underscores the need for research that examines teachers' explanations and justifications for AI integration, providing insights into decision-making processes that are both reflective and context-sensitive.

Although existing studies document AI affordances, teacher perceptions, and learner outcomes, they offer limited insight into how teachers justify pedagogical decisions regarding AI use in speaking instruction. Prior research rarely examines the reasoning, ethical considerations, and contextual negotiations underlying teachers' choices. Addressing this gap, the present study foregrounds teachers' professional agency,

examining how educators explain and justify when and how AI is integrated into speaking classrooms through an integrated mixed-methods approach.

METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a convergent mixed-methods design to explore how EFL teachers decide when and how to use AI tools in speaking instruction. Convergent designs involve the simultaneous collection of quantitative and qualitative data, followed by separate analyses and eventual integration to provide a comprehensive understanding of the research problem (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). The quantitative component, consisting of a survey, aimed to identify general patterns in teachers' decisions and the factors influencing AI use in speaking instruction. The qualitative component, consisting of semi-structured interviews, sought to capture in-depth explanations and justifications for teachers' decision-making. By converging both data sources, the study sought to triangulate findings, strengthen validity, and uncover both common trends and nuanced rationales underlying teachers' professional judgments regarding AI-mediated speaking instruction.

The use of a mixed-methods approach is particularly suitable for this study due to the complexity of decision-making in AI-supported speaking instruction. While surveys can capture patterns across a broader sample, they may not fully reveal the reasoning, ethical considerations, or contextual factors that influence teachers' choices. Interviews complement survey data by providing rich, detailed narratives of teachers' reflective practices, pedagogical strategies, and professional judgments. This methodological integration aligns with the study's analytical lens, teacher agency, by allowing exploration of both the observable patterns and the deliberative processes underpinning AI use in speaking instruction.

Participants

The study involved 24 EFL teachers from public and private secondary schools and universities. Participants were selected using purposive sampling, based on their experience in teaching English speaking skills and familiarity with AI tools such as speech recognition software, chatbots, or pronunciation applications. Inclusion criteria required teachers to have at least two years of EFL teaching experience and experience in using AI tools in their speaking instruction. This criterion ensured that participants possessed sufficient pedagogical expertise and practical exposure to AI tools to provide informed insights into their decision-making processes.

Participants reported using a range of AI-powered tools for speaking instruction, including pronunciation and speech-recognition applications (e.g., ELSA Speak, Google Speech-to-Text), AI chatbots for controlled dialogue practice (e.g., ChatGPT and Bing Chat), and automated feedback features embedded within learning management systems. Teachers' decisions were guided by the pedagogical affordances of these tools, such as

immediate feedback, structured practice, and learner autonomy, rather than by platform-specific features.

The participants represented a diverse range of teaching contexts, including large and small classrooms, beginner to advanced proficiency levels, and varied access to technological resources. Their demographic profiles included a balance of male and female teachers, teachers with varying levels of formal education (bachelor's and master's degrees), and teachers with differing lengths of professional experience. This diversity allowed the study to capture a broad spectrum of decision-making strategies, contextual influences, and ethical considerations in AI-supported speaking instruction. Participants were recruited via email invitations and professional networks, and all provided informed consent prior to data collection, in accordance with ethical guidelines for human-subject research.

Data Collection

A structured survey questionnaire was developed to capture teachers' reported decision-making patterns regarding AI use in speaking instruction. The survey consisted of 25 Likert-scale items, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), organized into four domains: (1) frequency of AI use in speaking activities, (2) perceived effectiveness of AI tools, (3) pedagogical considerations and alignment with learning objectives, and (4) ethical and contextual factors influencing AI use. Sample items included: "I use AI tools only when they support communicative speaking activities," and "Ethical considerations affect my decision to use AI in speaking instruction."

The survey was distributed online, allowing participants to respond at their convenience. The quantitative data provided a descriptive overview of teachers' decision-making tendencies, highlighting general patterns in the selection, timing, and purpose of AI tool integration in speaking instruction.

To complement the survey, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 12 of the survey participants, selected based on their responses to capture a range of AI use patterns. The interviews focused on eliciting participants' reflections on how they decide when and how to integrate AI tools into speaking instruction, the rationale behind their choices, and the contextual or ethical considerations that guide their decisions. Sample interview questions included:

- "Can you describe a situation in which you decided to use an AI tool for a speaking activity?"
- "What factors influenced your choice to use or not use AI in that instance?"
- "How do you ensure that AI use complements rather than replaces human interaction in speaking instruction?"

Interviews were conducted via video conferencing platforms, audio-recorded with participants' consent, and transcribed verbatim for analysis. Each interview lasted approximately 40–60 minutes, allowing for in-depth exploration of participants' experiences and decision-making processes.

Data Analysis

Survey data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including mean, median, standard deviation, and frequency distribution, to summarize participants' responses and identify general patterns in AI use for speaking instruction. The descriptive statistics allowed the researchers to determine which factors teachers prioritize when deciding to integrate AI tools, the relative frequency of AI use across different types of speaking activities, and teachers' perceived effectiveness of AI in supporting oral language development. This statistical analysis provided a broad overview of trends in teachers' decision-making and served as a foundation for interpreting qualitative findings.

Interview transcripts were analyzed using thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2021) six-phase framework: familiarization, coding, generating initial themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and reporting. The analysis focused on identifying patterns and categories related to teachers' justifications, contextual considerations, pedagogical strategies, and ethical reflections in AI-supported speaking instruction. Coding was conducted inductively, allowing themes to emerge from the data while also considering the analytical lens of teacher agency.

Following separate analyses, quantitative and qualitative findings were integrated to provide a comprehensive understanding of how teachers decide when and how to use AI in speaking instruction. Integration occurred at the interpretation stage through systematic comparison of survey patterns with interview themes. Quantitative results informed the selection of qualitative excerpts, while qualitative explanations were used to interpret and contextualize statistical trends, enabling the identification of convergent, complementary, and contrasting insights across data strands. This integrated approach ensured that the study captured both the breadth of teachers' reported behaviours and the depth of their reflective judgment, consistent with the study's theoretical framework of teacher agency and the convergent mixed-methods design.

Trustworthiness and Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to ethical standards in educational research. Participants provided informed consent and were assured of confidentiality and anonymity. To enhance trustworthiness, survey instruments were pilot-tested, and interview protocols were reviewed for clarity and relevance. Triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data, along with rich, illustrative excerpts from interviews, contributed to the credibility and rigor of the findings. Reflexive memos and peer debriefing were employed during the analysis to reduce researcher bias and ensure accurate interpretation of participants' experiences.

FINDINGS

This study examined how EFL teachers explain and justify their decisions about when and how to use AI tools in speaking instruction. Data were collected through surveys and semi-structured interviews, analyzed using descriptive statistics and thematic analysis, and then integrated to provide a comprehensive understanding of teachers' decision-making processes. The findings are presented in two main sections: patterns of AI use in speaking instruction from the survey and teachers' rationales and justifications from the interviews.

Patterns of AI Use in Speaking Instruction

Survey data revealed that teachers adopt a selective approach in integrating AI tools into speaking instruction. Overall, the mean frequency of AI use was 3.41 (SD = 0.67) on a 5-point Likert scale, indicating moderate adoption. Teachers reported using AI tools primarily for pronunciation practice (79%) and fluency exercises (70%), while fewer reported using AI for interactive dialogue simulations (45%) or peer communication scaffolding (38%). These findings suggest that teachers prioritize AI tools for activities where immediate feedback and structured practice are feasible, rather than for open-ended communicative tasks requiring dynamic interaction.

Table 1.
Frequency of AI Use in Speaking Activities

Speaking Activity	Regular Use (Often + Always)	Less Frequent Use (Never + Rarely + Sometimes)	Mean	SD
Pronunciation practice	79%	21%	4.12	0.65
Fluency exercises	70%	30%	3.98	0.72
Dialogue simulation	45%	55%	3.21	0.78
Peer communication scaffolding	38%	62%	3.05	0.84

To demonstrate integration between quantitative and qualitative findings, a joint display is presented below, aligning survey patterns of AI use with representative interview excerpts and their integrated interpretations.

Table 2.
Joint Display of AI Use Patterns and Teachers' Justifications

Speaking Task	Survey Result	Interview Evidence	Integrated Interpretation

Pronunciation practice	79% frequent use	"Students can repeat without embarrassment and get instant feedback" (T3)	Teachers prioritize AI where low-risk, individualized feedback supports pronunciation accuracy and learner confidence
Fluency exercises	70% frequent use	"AI helps them speak more without waiting for turns" (T7)	AI is used to increase speaking volume and practice opportunities under classroom time constraints
Dialogue simulation	45% moderate use	"Chatbots help, but they cannot replace real interaction" (U1)	Teachers limit AI use where authenticity, spontaneity, and negotiation of meaning are pedagogically essential
Peer communication scaffolding	38% limited use	"Students need real humans for meaningful discussion" (T5)	Human-mediated interaction is prioritized for developing communicative competence and pragmatic skills

This joint display illustrates how quantitative patterns of AI use are directly explained by teachers' pedagogical reasoning, demonstrating integrated mixed-methods findings rather than parallel data strands. Survey results also indicated several factors influencing teachers' decisions regarding AI integration. Learner proficiency emerged as the most influential factor, with 67% of participants indicating that they tailor AI use to students' skill levels. Beginners were more likely to receive AI-supported pronunciation and structured oral practice, while advanced learners engaged primarily in teacher-facilitated discussions. Classroom size (58%), availability of technological resources (50%), and alignment with curriculum objectives (49%) also influenced AI integration. Ethical considerations, such as avoiding over-reliance on AI and ensuring authentic interaction, were moderately influential, with a mean of 3.42 across relevant survey items.

Table 3.
Factors Influencing Teachers' Decisions to Use AI

Factor	**Mean**	**SD**	**% Agree/Strongly Agree**
Student proficiency	4.01	0.63	67%
Class size	3.78	0.71	58%
Availability of technology	3.65	0.69	50%
Ethical considerations	3.42	0.62	46%
Curriculum alignment	3.35	0.67	49%

Teachers' perceptions of AI effectiveness varied by task type. Pronunciation improvement received the highest mean rating (4.12), followed by fluency practice (3.98), and self-paced speaking exercises (3.87). Conversational simulations received lower effectiveness ratings (mean = 3.21), suggesting that teachers perceive AI as less suitable for tasks requiring nuanced oral interaction. Standard deviations ranged from 0.62 to 0.84, reflecting variability in experience, confidence with AI tools, and classroom contexts. Overall, survey findings indicate that teachers use AI strategically and selectively, prioritizing tasks with measurable outcomes, immediate feedback, and structured practice, while exercising caution in activities demanding authentic human interaction.

Teachers' Rationales and Justifications

Semi-structured interviews provided rich insights into teachers' reasoning, highlighting three key themes: pedagogical alignment, contextual constraints, and ethical considerations.

Pedagogical Alignment

Teachers emphasized that AI tools are most effective when aligned with specific instructional objectives, particularly improving pronunciation and fluency. Teacher T3 (Secondary School) noted:

> *"I use the speech recognition tool mainly for pronunciation practice. Students can hear their mistakes and try again without embarrassment in front of peers" (T3, Secondary School).*

This illustrates how teachers frame AI as a low-risk, confidence-building tool that supports accuracy development without increasing learners' affective anxiety. Teachers highlighted that AI serves as a supplementary tool rather than a replacement for teacher-led instruction. During conversational activities, teachers preferred to facilitate interactions themselves, ensuring meaningful feedback and negotiation of meaning. Teacher U1 (University) explained:

> *"I avoid using chatbots for open-ended dialogues. They are helpful for practice, but real interaction requires my guidance" (U1, University).*

This reflects teachers' deliberate prioritization of human mediation for tasks requiring authenticity, spontaneity, and interactive meaning-making. Teachers also valued AI for individualized and self-paced learning, allowing students to rehearse independently while teachers manage classroom time effectively. Teacher T7 (Secondary School) shared:

> *"AI allows each student to practice speaking at their own pace while I can focus on those who need direct attention" (T7, Secondary School).*

This indicates how teachers leverage AI strategically to manage classroom constraints while maintaining instructional responsiveness to individual learner needs.

Contextual Constraints

Contextual factors strongly influenced AI integration. Teachers reported adjusting AI use based on class size, technology access, and students' digital literacy. Large classes benefited from AI tools for individual pronunciation and fluency practice, while limited access to devices or unstable internet connections sometimes prevented AI use. Teacher T2 commented:

> *"In a class of 40 students, it's impossible to give everyone personalized feedback. AI helps fill that gap, especially for pronunciation drills. But sometimes the internet is slow, or not everyone has a laptop, so I adjust the activity" (T2, Secondary School).*

This highlights how teachers exercise situational judgment, adapting AI use pragmatically rather than applying it uniformly across contexts. Institutional support and classroom resources also played a role. Teacher U3 remarked:

> *"We need to be flexible because sometimes the lab isn't available, or not all students have devices, so AI use must fit the context" (U3, University).*

This demonstrates teachers' contextual responsiveness in aligning pedagogical intentions with infrastructural realities.

Ethical and Reflective Considerations

Ethical considerations were central to teachers' decision-making. Many expressed concern about over-reliance on AI, which could undermine students' communicative competence and creativity. Teacher T5 noted:

> *"I make sure students do not become dependent on AI. Real interaction is crucial for developing natural fluency" (T5, Secondary School).*

This reflects teachers' ethical stance in safeguarding the communicative purpose of speaking instruction against technological overuse. Equity and fairness were also highlighted. Teacher U2 added:

> *"AI exercises are optional and always followed by peer or teacher feedback to ensure fairness and authentic learning" (U2, University).*

This illustrates how ethical reflection informs teachers' decisions to integrate AI in ways that maintain inclusivity and pedagogical balance. Teachers' reflections indicate that their decisions involve deliberative judgment, weighing pedagogical benefits, contextual feasibility, and ethical considerations. AI use is not automatic; it is guided by professional expertise and reflective practice.

Integration of Survey and Interview Findings

Combining survey and interview data reveals a coherent pattern: teachers adopt strategically selective and context-sensitive approaches to AI integration in speaking instruction. Survey results showed that AI is most frequently used for pronunciation and fluency exercises, while interviews explained why these tasks are prioritized: immediate feedback, structured practice, and reduced student anxiety. Similarly, lower survey frequency for conversational simulation aligns with teachers' concerns about AI's limitations in supporting authentic interaction.

The integrated findings underscore the interplay between teacher agency and contextual factors. Teachers exercise reflective, ethical, and pedagogically informed decision-making when integrating AI, balancing the affordances of technology with learner needs, classroom realities, and curricular goals. This deliberative process highlights teachers' active mediation of AI, ensuring that it enhances rather than replaces meaningful oral communication.

Teachers' decisions demonstrate a multidimensional approach. Pedagogical alignment, contextual feasibility, and ethical reflection collectively shape AI integration, reflecting iterative reflective practice, professional autonomy, and contextual responsiveness—key components of teacher agency. Teachers navigate the affordances and limitations of AI tools, deciding not only what tasks AI can support but also how and when to implement these tools responsibly.

In summary, the findings indicate that AI integration in EFL speaking instruction is deliberative, selective, and contextually grounded. Teachers primarily use AI for pronunciation, fluency, and self-paced practice, while human-mediated instruction is prioritized for open-ended dialogues. Their decisions are informed by pedagogical objectives, learner proficiency, classroom constraints, and ethical considerations, reflecting the dynamic exercise of teacher agency. The convergence of survey and interview data provides a comprehensive picture of both observable patterns of AI use and the reflective reasoning behind these decisions, demonstrating the nuanced and context-sensitive nature of professional judgment in AI-supported speaking instruction.

DISCUSSION

This study explored how EFL teachers explain and justify their decisions about when and how to use AI tools in speaking instruction, using a convergent mixed-methods approach. The findings reveal a nuanced, context-sensitive exercise of teacher agency, highlighting the interplay between pedagogical objectives, technological affordances, contextual constraints, and ethical considerations. Rather than merely documenting patterns of AI use, this discussion interprets the implications of these patterns, situating them within the broader literature on teacher agency, technology-enhanced language learning, and AI integration in EFL contexts (Crompton et al., 2024; Ling & Jan, 2025).

The survey and interview findings collectively indicate that teachers adopt a strategically selective approach in integrating AI tools. Pronunciation practice and fluency exercises were identified as the primary domains of AI use, reflecting teachers' perception that these activities benefit most from immediate feedback, structured repetition, and individualized practice. This strategic prioritization aligns with prior research emphasizing the suitability of AI for discrete, measurable speaking tasks that require rapid and automated feedback (Du & Daniel, 2024; Zou et al., 2023). Teachers appear to view AI as a tool for scaffolded practice, supporting students' oral skills without replacing teacher-mediated interaction, a stance also reported in studies on AI-supported speaking practice in EFL contexts (Kemelbekova et al., 2024; Nguyen Huu, 2025).

From a theoretical perspective, this selective approach demonstrates the exercise of teacher agency, as conceptualized by Emans et al. (2025) and further elaborated in recent studies on agency in technology-enhanced instruction (Yli-Pietilä et al., 2024; Nezhad & Stolz, 2024). Teachers in this study were not passive adopters of AI tools; instead, they actively evaluated AI's pedagogical affordances and determined where and when it could meaningfully enhance speaking instruction. This reflects autonomy and reflective judgment, key dimensions of teacher agency, where professional expertise informs decisions about task appropriateness, student readiness, and the balance between technological and human facilitation (Koh et al., 2023; Ling & Jan, 2025).

The findings also highlight the deliberative balancing act teachers perform when integrating AI into speaking instruction. While AI provides immediate and individualized feedback, it cannot replicate the spontaneity, negotiation of meaning, or nuanced interaction central to communicative speaking competence (Wei, 2023; Samuel et al., 2023). Teachers' limited use of AI for conversational simulations and peer communication scaffolding underscores this awareness. This careful calibration of AI use illustrates that teachers prioritize pedagogical alignment over novelty or technological availability, echoing concerns raised in previous studies about the limitations of AI in supporting authentic oral interaction (Xiao & Zhi, 2023; Celik et al., 2024).

This emphasis on pedagogical alignment resonates with decision-making models in educational technology, which argue that technology integration should be guided by instructional objectives, learner needs, and contextual feasibility rather than by technological enthusiasm alone (Walter, 2024). By grounding AI use in pedagogical goals, teachers demonstrate an understanding of AI as a complementary tool in speaking instruction. AI functions as an enabler for skill development, while teachers remain central mediators of authentic communicative competence, consistent with findings in AI-supported language learning research (Qiao & Zhao, 2023; Ling & Jan, 2025).

Contextual factors emerged as a critical influence on teachers' decision-making. Class size, availability of technological resources, students' digital literacy, and institutional support were cited as determinants of AI feasibility and scope. Teachers in large classes relied on AI to provide individualized speaking practice when one-on-one feedback was impractical, whereas limitations in devices or internet connectivity required flexible adaptation. These findings align with prior research highlighting how contextual

constraints shape technology integration in EFL classrooms (Huang & Yip, 2021; McCarthy & Yan, 2024).

These findings further align with the notion of contextual responsiveness within teacher agency, which emphasizes teachers' capacity to negotiate instructional decisions in response to situational demands rather than applying universal or prescriptive approaches (Yusra et al., 2022; Herrera-Seda & Pantić, 2025). Teachers' adaptive use of AI reflects an iterative reflective process, where pedagogical objectives, technological affordances, and learner characteristics are continuously evaluated. This reinforces the view that AI integration is not a one-size-fits-all solution but a dynamic and situated practice shaped by equity and accessibility considerations (Memarian & Doleck, 2023).

The study's findings also highlight the ethical dimensions of AI integration in speaking instruction. Teachers expressed concern about over-reliance on AI and the potential erosion of learner autonomy and authentic interaction. By consciously limiting AI use in open-ended dialogues and emphasizing teacher-facilitated feedback, teachers demonstrated an ethical commitment to maintaining instructional integrity. Such concerns echo broader discussions on ethical responsibility in educational AI use (Memarian & Doleck, 2023; Jose & Jayaron Jose, 2024).

This ethical stance resonates with the concept of moral teacher agency, which foregrounds ethical, professional, and pedagogical responsibility in instructional decision-making (Morman et al., 2025). Teachers exercised judgment not solely based on perceived effectiveness but also on broader implications for learning quality, student development, and fairness. Ensuring equitable access, balancing AI-mediated and human interaction, and preserving authenticity in speaking tasks reflect deliberate, context-sensitive professional decision-making, illustrating the close interplay between ethical reasoning and pedagogical action in AI-mediated classrooms (Williyan et al., 2025).

To extend these interpretive findings toward a more portable and cumulative contribution, the integrated survey and interview results can be distilled into an AI Use Framework for EFL Speaking Instruction, which explicates the conditions under which AI is pedagogically appropriate. The framework conceptualizes AI integration as a process of teacher-mediated decision-making rather than tool-driven adoption and proposes that AI use is appropriate when three interrelated conditions are met: (1) the speaking task is practice-oriented and form-focused (for example, pronunciation or fluency rehearsal), where immediate feedback, repetition, and self-paced practice enhance learning; (2) learner and contextual conditions support autonomous, supplementary practice, such as in large classes or contexts with limited opportunities for individualized feedback, provided that learners have sufficient digital access and literacy; and (3) teacher mediation actively safeguards communicative and ethical integrity by regulating the scope of AI use and ensuring that human interaction, peer communication, and teacher feedback remain central for open-ended, meaning-focused speaking activities. Together, these conditions position AI not as an autonomous instructional agent but as a contingent pedagogical tool whose value emerges through reflective, context-sensitive teacher

judgment, foregrounding teacher agency as the mechanism through which AI affordances are aligned with communicative learning goals.

Overall, the findings contribute to a deeper understanding of teacher agency in AI-mediated speaking instruction by illustrating how professional judgment manifests in classroom practice. Teachers' decisions regarding when and how to use AI were multidimensional, encompassing pedagogical reasoning, contextual responsiveness, and ethical reflection. This multidimensionality supports the view that teacher agency is dynamic and emergent, shaped by the interaction of professional expertise, classroom realities, and technological affordances (Emans et al., 2025; Yli-Pietilä et al., 2024).

Moreover, the study extends prior research by highlighting the specificity of speaking instruction as a domain where teacher agency is particularly salient. Unlike reading or writing, speaking requires real-time interaction, negotiation of meaning, and oral fluency development, which current AI tools cannot fully replicate (Wei, 2023; Du & Daniel, 2024). Teachers' selective AI use reflects an awareness of these skill-specific constraints, demonstrating that agency involves not only general instructional autonomy but also skill-sensitive pedagogical judgment.

Finally, the findings offer practical implications for professional development and curriculum design. Teacher training initiatives should move beyond technical proficiency with AI tools to emphasize strategic decision-making and ethical reflection, thereby strengthening teachers' capacity to exercise reflective agency (Ng et al., 2022; Walter, 2024). At the policy level, institutions should ensure equitable access to technological resources, provide sustained support for AI integration, and encourage reflective pedagogical practices. Consistent with prior research, AI should be positioned not as a replacement for teachers but as a pedagogical tool whose value depends on thoughtful, context-aware integration aligned with instructional goals and ethical considerations (Crompton et al., 2024; Ling & Jan, 2025).

By moving beyond adoption rates and learner outcomes to examine teachers' rationales and justifications, this study addresses a critical gap in AI-in-EFL research. The integration of quantitative patterns and qualitative explanations demonstrates how teachers actively exercise agency in navigating trade-offs between AI affordances, pedagogical goals, and contextual realities. In doing so, the study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of technology-enhanced language teaching and strengthens the empirical link between theoretical models of teacher agency and practical classroom implementation.

CONCLUSION

This study examined how EFL teachers explain and justify their decisions about when and how to use AI tools in speaking instruction. Findings indicate that teachers exercise deliberate, context-sensitive, and ethically informed professional judgment when integrating AI. They strategically prioritize AI for tasks such as pronunciation practice and fluency exercises, where immediate feedback and structured practice are most effective, while relying on teacher-mediated interaction for open-ended dialogue and

communicative activities. Teachers' decisions are shaped by a combination of pedagogical objectives, student proficiency, classroom resources, and ethical considerations, reflecting a dynamic exercise of teacher agency in navigating the affordances and limitations of AI in speaking classrooms.

The study contributes to the literature on technology-enhanced language teaching by highlighting the multidimensional and reflective nature of teacher decision-making in AI-supported speaking instruction. Short-term research could examine classroom-level decision-making across specific AI tools and learner proficiency levels to capture fine-grained variations in pedagogical judgment. Longitudinal and cross-context studies are needed to investigate how sustained, agency-driven AI integration influences speaking development, learner autonomy, and teachers' professional practice over time. Future research could also explore AI integration in other language skills, such as listening, reading, or writing, to examine whether similar patterns of teacher agency emerge. Comparative studies across different educational contexts, proficiency levels, or AI tools would provide further insight into the scalability and adaptability of AI-supported instruction, thereby informing more nuanced pedagogical frameworks and professional development programs.

REFERENCES

Alharbi, W. (2023). AI in the foreign language classroom: A pedagogical overview of automated writing assistance tools. *Education Research International*, *2023*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/4253331

Almufarreh, A. (2024). Determinants of students' satisfaction with AI tools in education: A PLS-SEM-ANN approach. *Sustainability*, *16*(13), 5354. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16135354

Banegas, D. L., Budzenski, M., & Yang, F. (2024). Enhancing pre-service teachers' projective agency for diverse and multilingual classrooms through a course on curriculum development. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *00*(00), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2024.2318967

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. In *Sage Publications* (p. 320). https://books.google.se/books?id=Hr11DwAAQBAJ&hl=sv

Celik, I., Gedrimiene, E., Siklander, S., & Muukkonen, H. (2024). The affordances of artificial intelligence-based tools for supporting 21st-century skills: A systematic review of empirical research in higher education. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *40*(3), 1–20.

Chen, Y. chen. (2022). Effects of technology-enhanced language learning on reducing EFL learners' public speaking anxiety. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *37*(4), 789–813. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2055083

Choi, S., Jang, Y., & Kim, H. (2023). Influence of pedagogical beliefs and perceived trust on teachers' acceptance of educational artificial intelligence tools. *International*

Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, *39*(4), 910–922. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2022.2049145

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches. In *SAGE Publications,Inc.: Vol. Sixth Edit* (Issue 1). SAGE Publications. https://medium.com/@arifwicaksanaa/pengertian-use-case-a7e576e1b6bf

Crompton, H., Edmett, A., Ichaporia, N., & Burke, D. (2024). AI and English language teaching: Affordances and challenges. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *55*(6), 2503–2529. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13460

Du, J., & Daniel, B. K. (2024). Transforming language education: A systematic review of AI-powered chatbots for English as a foreign language speaking practice. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *6*(January), 100230. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100230

Emans, A., Oolbekkink-Marchand, H., Bakker, C., & De Bruijn, E. (2025). Teacher agency in the dynamics of educational practices: A theory synthesis. *Frontiers in Education*, *9*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1515123

Fitriati, S. W., & Williyan, A. (2025). AI-enhanced self-regulated learning: EFL learners ' prioritization and utilization in presentation skills development. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, *9*(2), 22–37. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.202530647

He, X. (2024). Enhancing reading comprehension with AI-generated adaptive texts. *International Journal of New Developments in Education*, *6*(7), 46–52. https://doi.org/10.25236/IJNDE.2024.060708

Herrera-Seda, C., & Pantić, N. (2025). Exercising teacher agency for inclusion in challenging times: A multiple case study in Chilean schools. *Education Sciences*, *15*(3), 316. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15030316

Huang, J., & Yip, J. W. C. (2021). Understanding ESL teachers' Agency in their early years of professional development: A three-layered triadic reciprocity framework. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*(September). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.739271

Jose, J., & Jayaron Jose, B. (2024). Educators' academic insights on artificial intelligence: Challenges and opportunities. *Electronic Journal of E-Learning*, *22*(2), 00–00. https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.21.5.3272

Kemelbekova, Z., Degtyareva, X., Yessenaman, S., Ismailova, D., & Seidaliyeva, G. (2024). AI in teaching English as a foreign language: Effectiveness and prospects in Kazakh higher education. *XLinguae*, *17*(1), 69–83. https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2024.17.01.05

Koh, J., Dominic, H., Elmendorf, H., & Cowgill, S. (2023). Student voice and teacher

agency: Storytelling in letters of recommendation for college admissions. *Language and Education*, *37*(6), 717–730. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2023.2217147

Kolho, P. (2024). A vocational education and training subject teacher for fostering students' entrepreneurial skills—The development of a conceptual model. *International Journal of Training and Development*, *28*(4), 430–453. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12335

Ling, Y., & Jan, J. M. (2025). Voices from the Flip: Teacher perspectives on integrating AI chatbots in flipped English classrooms. *Education Sciences*, *15*(9), 1219. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15091219

McCarthy, K. S., & Yan, E. F. (2024). Reading comprehension and constructive learning: Policy considerations in the age of artificial intelligence. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *11*(1), 19–26. https://doi.org/10.1177/23727322231218891

Memarian, B., & Doleck, T. (2023). Fairness, Accountability, Transparency, and Ethics (FATE) in Artificial Intelligence (AI) and higher education: A systematic review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *5*(May), 100152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100152

Morman, K. M., Wang, C., Brady, L. M., & Fryberg, S. A. (2025). Individual and contextual morality: How educators in oppositional and permissive communities use culturally responsive practices. *Behavioral Sciences*, *15*(4), 446. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15040446

Moxon, S. (2024). All-Talk: Enhancing EFL pronunciation with Microsoft Azure Speech Services. *ABAC Journal*, *44*(4). https://doi.org/10.59865/abacj.2024.58

Nezhad, P. M., & Stolz, S. A. (2024). Unveiling teachers' professional agency and decision-making in professional learning: The illusion of choice. *Professional Development in Education*, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2024.2349058

Ng, D. T. K., Luo, W., Chan, H. M. Y., & Chu, S. K. W. (2022). Using digital story writing as a pedagogy to develop AI literacy among primary students. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *3*, 100054. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100054

Nguyen Huu, H. (2025). AI for English speaking practice: A study of effectiveness and engagement among Vietnamese university learners. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.10050

Novoa-Echaurren, Á., Pavez, I., & Anabalón, M. E. (2025). Reflective practice and digital technology use in a university context: A qualitative approach to transformative teaching. *Education Sciences*, *15*(6), 643. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15060643

Qiao, H., & Zhao, A. (2023). Artificial intelligence-based language learning: illuminating the impact on speaking skills and self-regulation in Chinese EFL context. *Frontiers*

in Psychology, *14*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1255594

Samuel, Y., Brennan-Tonetta, M., Samuel, J., Kashyap, R., Kumar, V., Krishna Kaashyap, S., Chidipothu, N., Anand, I., & Jain, P. (2023). Cultivation of human centered artificial intelligence: Culturally adaptive thinking in education (CATE) for AI. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, *6*. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.1198180

Srinivasan, V., & Murthy, H. (2021). Improving reading and comprehension in K-12: Evidence from a large-scale AI technology intervention in India. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *2*, 100019. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100019

Tapalova, O., & Zhiyenbayeva, N. (2022). Artificial intelligence in education: AIEd for personalised learning pathways. *Electronic Journal of E-Learning*, *20*(5), 639–653. https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.20.5.2597

Walter, Y. (2024). Embracing the future of Artificial Intelligence in the classroom: The relevance of AI literacy, prompt engineering, and critical thinking in modern education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *21*(1), 15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00448-3

Wei, L. (2023). Artificial intelligence in language instruction: Impact on English learning achievement, L2 motivation, and self-regulated learning. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*(November), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1261955

Williyan, A., Puspitasari, D., Putri, A. R., Rahmawati, Y., Budiyanto, & Muthmainnah. (2025). EFL teachers' inquisitive agency in AI-enhanced writing instruction. *Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems*, *1270 LNNS*, 277–289. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-2015-9_19

Williyan, A., Supriyono, Y., Sari, N., & Dewi, N. (2025). *Deliberative teacher agency: A phenomenological study on ICT integration in writing instruction by Indonesian EFL educators*. *159*(3), 5–29.

Xiao, Y., & Zhi, Y. (2023). An exploratory study of EFL learners' use of ChatGPT for language learning tasks: Experience and perceptions. *Languages*, *8*(3), 212. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8030212

Yli-Pietilä, R., Soini, T., Pietarinen, J., & Pyhältö, K. (2024). Profiles of teacher's professional agency in the classroom across time. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *68*(5), 954–968. https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2023.2196536

Yusra, K., Lestari, Y. B., & Hamid, M. O. (2022). Teacher agency and the implementation of CEFR-like policies for English for tourism and hospitality: Insights from local vocational high schools in Indonesia. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *23*(3), 233–253. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2021.1965739

Zhou, C., & Hou, F. (2024). Can AI empower L2 education? Exploring its influence on

the behavioural, cognitive and emotional engagement of EFL teachers and language learners. *European Journal of Education*, *59*(4). https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12750

Zou, B., Lyu, Q., Han, Y., Li, Z., & Zhang, W. (2023). Exploring students' acceptance of an artificial intelligence speech evaluation program for EFL speaking practice: An application of the Integrated Model of Technology Acceptance. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *0*(0), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2023.2278608