Teachers' Perspectives on AI Integration in the ESP Classroom: An Analysis of Competences and Attitudes

Yuliia Baklazhenko – Zoia Kornieva

DOI: 10.18355/XL.2026.19.04.22

Abstract
The rapid development of generative artificial intelligence (AI) technologies has significantly transformed the landscape of higher education and language instruction. This study investigates ESP teachers' perspectives on the integration of AI in language education and examines how the emergence of AI-mediated learning environments influences professional attitudes and competence requirements, with particular attention to academic integrity concerns and the redefinition of the instructor's professional role.
The research is grounded in international and European frameworks for teachers' digital and AI competences, including the European Digital Competence Framework for Educators and the UNESCO AI Competency Framework for Teachers (2024). The Ukrainian professional standard for higher education teachers is also analyzed to determine its compatibility with AI-integrated educational practices.
Empirical data were collected through a questionnaire survey administered to 52 ESP teachers. The findings indicate that instructors generally recognize the pedagogical value of AI tools, particularly for supporting autonomous learning and language practice. At the same time, teachers demonstrate strong concern regarding the misuse of AI in assessed tasks and emphasize the need to revise assessment criteria, update curricula, and develop clear institutional policies regulating AI use. The results suggest that higher education is currently undergoing a transitional phase in AI integration, highlighting the growing importance of ethical competence, AI literacy, and pedagogical adaptation among ESP instructors.
Key words: artificial intelligence in education, English for Specific Purposes (ESP), AI competence, higher education, language teaching

1. Introduction

Rapid advances in generative artificial intelligence (AI), in particular the proliferation of large language models and conversational agents, are reshaping the landscape of higher education and language instruction. Generative AI tools – the type of AI used for new content generation (in form of a text, code, etc.) are rapidly infiltrating every step of educational activities. This has given rise to AIED (artificial intelligence in education) and has posed new methodological challenges of formulating the theoretical background for AI use in education.

AI offers English for Specific Purposes (ESP) teachers a list of benefits. As a generative tool, it can assist in performing routine teachers' tasks: generate a wide range of learning materials, such as tests, exercises, and even detailed explanations of complex topics; create interactive presentations based on existing materials by adding animations, sound effects, and other elements that make presentations more engaging. As an analytical engine, AI can automate many routine operations, such as checking assignments, grading tests, and providing feedback to students. Moreover, AI tools can facilitate student-teacher interaction, analyse students` interests and learning achievements in order to recommend additional materials for further study; respond to frequently asked questions from students, provide technical support, and perform other routine tasks. Such assistance allows teachers to save time and select more interactive

and engaging resources, helps them focus on more creative and strategic aspects of their work.

At the same time, AI technologies pose significant challenges for assessment validity, academic integrity, and the teacher's role as evaluator and pedagogue. Recent research on AI in education emphasizes both AI's pedagogical potential and the urgent need to develop teacher competence to ensure its human-centered, ethical adoption.

Policy frameworks increasingly call for updated educator competencies that go beyond general digital literacy to include AI-specific knowledge, ethical judgment, and adaptive pedagogy. However, because AIED is a relatively new field in education, research in this area is still emerging, especially in regional contexts and in field-specific instruction. The lack of specific data on ESP teachers' perspectives towards AI integration in the learning process necessitates this research.

The study aims to answer the following questions:

RQ1: What are the attitudes of ESP teachers towards AI integration in language instruction?

RQ2: How do ESP teachers perceive their role in maintaining academic integrity in AI-mediated learning environments?

RQ3: How do teachers perceive the evolving role of the ESP instructor in the context of AI integration?

Addressing these questions requires, first, establishing what AI-related competences teachers are expected to develop according to current professional frameworks. Examining these frameworks is a necessary starting point, as they provide the normative backdrop against which teachers' actual attitudes and competences can be meaningfully interpreted. The following section maps the most relevant global, European, and Ukrainian frameworks with specific attention to the AI-related competences of teachers in higher education.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. Overview of Teachers' AI Competences Frameworks

The proliferation of AI tools and technologies has necessitated selecting the competences and skills teachers of ESP must develop to embrace the opportunities and face the challenges of AI-augmented language teaching and learning. There already exist global and nationwide frameworks that describe digital skills and competences necessary for teachers in the modern educational paradigm. One example is 21st Century skills – a framework that includes a set of skills and attributes broadly organized into four categories, namely, ways of thinking, ways of working, tools for working and living in the world. Despite the rather comprehensive nature of 21st-century skills, they are generally applicable to using AI in the educational sphere: creativity and innovation skills are relevant to using AI tools for generating new products; critical thinking, problem solving and decision making constitute the basis for critically assessing AI-generated output and approving it for further use; ICT literacy implies AI-specific skills of prompt compilation, AI-tools interface navigation, etc.; personal and social responsibility may include, among others, using AI tools responsibly, following academic integrity rules and taking responsibility over product generated or modified using AI tools.

Another document relevant to the selection of AI competences is *European Framework for the Digital Competence of Educators (2017).* The framework consists of 6 competence areas and 22 competences, focusing on pedagogical, professional, and ethical dimensions of digital technology use (Redecker, 2017). Within the pedagogical competences described, there are ones that can be directly applied as AI competences:

- to select or develop digital resources, manage digital content responsibly;
- to design, plan and implement the use of digital technologies in the different stages of the learning process;
- use digital technologies within assessment;

- to use digital technologies to support learners' self-regulated learning;
- to use digital technologies to address learners' diverse learning needs.

DigComp 3.0: European Digital Competence Framework (Cosgrove & Cachia, 2025) is the European Commission's updated framework for citizens' digital competence, structured around five areas – information search, evaluation and management; communication and collaboration; digital content creation; safety; and problem identification and solving – comprising 21 competences in total. Its main development compared to earlier editions is the systematic integration of AI-related knowledge, skills, and attitudes across all competences, rather than treating AI as a separate or optional skill area.

One of the latest and most elaborated frameworks of teachers' AI competencies is the *UNESCO AI competency framework for teachers (2024).* This framework provides a global reference tool defining the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes that teachers need to engage effectively and responsibly with AI in education. Introducing "a teacher-AI-student dynamic", the framework aims to define the key competences needed to train teachers in AI. Thus, the framework lists 15 competences across five dimensions at three progression levels ("acquire", "deepen", "create"). Grouped into five dimensions ("Human-centered mindset", "Ethics of AI", "AI foundations and applications", "AI pedagogy", "AI for professional learning"), these competences resonate with the European Framework for the Digital Competence of Educators and comprehensively address spheres of AI-integrated education.

The first dimension – "Human-centered mindset" – includes the understanding of the human-led nature of AI, that the individual decisions of AI creators have a profound impact on human autonomy and rights, and an understanding of human accountability in the proper deployment and use of AI. At the highest progression level, teachers are supposed to be able to contribute to the building of inclusive AI societies guided by a critical understanding of the implications of AI for societal norms, and to promoting the design and use of AI for the enhancement of human welfare, inclusion and social justice

The second dimension - Ethics of AI – concentrates on the ethical issues related to AI and human-AI interactions. Teachers with competences in this sphere are expected to understand, internalize and champion the ethics of AI and to discuss ethical, sociocultural and environmental concerns from the design to the use of AI.

The third dimension relates to understanding the technological side of AI use. Thus, competences in "AI foundations and applications" domain include knowledge about what AI technology is and how AI models are trained, associated knowledge on data and algorithms, the main categories of AI technologies and examples of each, abilities to operate AI tools adopted in educational settings, and, at the final progression level, to customize or modify AI tools, create AI-assisted inclusive learning environments and address broader challenges in educational contexts.

The fourth dimension – "AI pedagogy" – deals with the abilities to identify, leverage the benefits of AI tools, integrate AI into the design and facilitation of student-centered teaching practices, assess AI's impact on teaching, learning and assessment; plan and facilitate AI-immersed learning scenarios, as well as explore student-centered pedagogical innovation.

The last dimension explores the implications of AI for professional learning. Thus, teachers are expected to use AI tools to enhance professional development and reflective practices, for tailored participation in collaborative professional learning communities, and to test and validate strategies on the effective use of AI to meet their own and their communities' transformative professional development needs.

The mentioned frameworks can be regarded as a well-established documentary background for teachers' AI competence development. However, while international frameworks provide elaborated, AI-specific guidance, their uptake at the national level varies considerably. In the Ukrainian context, the regulatory foundation for higher

education teachers' professional competences is established by the Professional Standard for Higher Education Teachers in Ukraine (2024). Examining this document is essential for the present study, as it defines the formal competence expectations within which the surveyed ESP instructors operate.

The Standard defines a system of integral, general, and professional competences that regulate teaching, research, organizational, and developmental activities of academic staff. The Standard provides a list of competences in the following areas: (1) Teaching, Consultancy, and Supervision of Practical Training; (2) Assessment of Learning Outcomes; (3) Creation of Educational and Methodological Materials; (4) Development, Evaluation and Enhancement of Educational Programs; (5) Planning and Execution of Scientific, Research, Creative, and Project Activities; (6) Organization of Participation in Educational, Scientific and Professional Events; (7) Professional Development; (8) Expert and Institutional Participation.

The analysis shows that the Standard is structurally compatible with AI integration, even in the *absence* of explicit references to artificial intelligence. Its focus on pedagogical responsibility, academic integrity and continuous professional development provides a strong foundation for embedding AI-related competences within established teacher competences in Ukrainian higher education.

We may conclude that the existing competence frameworks at the international and state levels establish expected AI knowledge and skills for a teacher. The real picture of the practical AI integration in the ESP teaching and learning process is, however, more complex and demonstrates the gap between prescribed competences and actual teacher readiness to use AI in their work. The following section reviews recent empirical studies examining how English language teachers in higher education contexts perceive AI, engage with it in practice, and develop the competence frameworks call for.

2.2. Literature Review on Teacher`s Attitudes towards AI Implementation and Related Competences

To review the existing literature on the topic, we searched the Web of Science platform using the query "AI competences & English teachers & higher education". The resulting 181 documents were sorted by relevance and thematically grouped for analysis. The reviewed studies range from large-scale quantitative surveys to qualitative interview-based designs and reflect different aspects of the problem.

The reviewed literature shows that teachers generally hold positive attitudes toward AI, though these are often accompanied by notable concerns. Yesilel (2025) found that English language teachers demonstrated positive attitudes toward AI-based tools while also expressing pedagogical and ethical concerns about data privacy, algorithmic bias, accountability, transparency, inclusivity, and a lack of human touch. Alshammari and Singh (2025), investigating 150 EFL teachers via mixed methods, report that educators who were trained in AI recognized its potential for personalizing learning, delivering immediate feedback, and gamifying instruction. Nonetheless, ethical concerns about data privacy and algorithmic bias persisted, along with financial and infrastructural barriers. The study also identified a significant gap in teachers' knowledge of AI research and techniques, emphasizing the need for targeted professional development. Cao's (2025) examination of university English teachers in Macao similarly reveals that while educators broadly supported the future use of AI in teaching, they remained currently unprepared to manage the opportunities and challenges it presents.

A number of studies examine how teachers see the opportunities and challenges of AI integration in teaching practice. Ngo and Fians (2026) found that educators were primarily motivated by efficiency gains and personalization opportunities when using AI tools for materials development. Omidvar and Meihami (2025), drawing on interviews with 35 EFL teachers, identify a range of AI-related opportunities, including professional, psychological, and economic benefits, as well as AI's potential to promote

personalized learning and reduce workload. The authors also point to challenges such as the need for comprehensive pedagogical and digital literacy training, concerns about over-reliance on AI, and the risk of reduced human interaction. Gaugl's (2026) study at the University of Vienna found cautiously positive perceptions of AI-supported EAP classes, with participants noting benefits for teaching but also expressing concerns about information verification and the dangers of over-reliance.

Several studies address the motivational aspect of teachers' intentions to adopt or teach AI. Choi, Jeon, and Jang (2025), drawing on Self-Determination Theory (SDT) and the Motivation-Opportunity-Ability (MOA) framework with a sample of 230 South Korean teachers, found that autonomous motivation, grounded in teachers' sense of autonomy, competence, and professional relatedness, was the strongest predictor of AI teaching intention. Kilat's (Kilat, 2026) large-scale survey of 488 higher education EFL teachers in the Philippines modeled behavioral intention toward generative AI and concluded that behavioral intention to adopt generative AI is primarily driven by performance-related beliefs, value-based appraisals, and self-assessed AI competence. These findings highlight the importance of inner motivational resources in shaping AI engagement.

Beyond general attitudes, research has begun to focus on the specific emotional factors that shape AI integration behaviors. Qadir and Omar (2025), studying 92 EFL university teachers, examined the interplay between digital literacy, technophobia, and technophilia in determining AI integration levels. Their findings revealed that digital literacy and technophilia were positively associated with AI integration, while technophobia was negatively related. Notably, older teachers showed slightly higher technophobia and lower technophilia and digital literacy, though no gender differences were observed. Emotional dimensions of AI engagement were also explored by Xie et al. (2025), who applied Appraisal Theory to examine the relationship between four dimensions of AI literacy (namely, Knowing and Understanding AI, Applying AI, Evaluating AI Applications, and AI Ethics) and three types of emotions: enjoyment, anger, and anxiety. The study of 148 Chinese EFL university teachers found that the ability to apply AI and evaluate AI applications positively predicted teachers' enjoyment, suggesting that competence in AI use is emotionally rewarding. Interestingly, the ability to evaluate AI applications also predicted teachers' anger. However, no dimension of AI literacy was found to predict anxiety; moreover, understanding of AI and ethics of AI dimensions did not predict any emotional outcomes. These results suggest that effective AI integration is strongly conditioned by teachers' digital skills and their affective orientations towards technology, calling for professional development that addresses both competence and attitudes simultaneously.

Another direction of research directly addresses teachers' AI competence. Vorotnykova, Dziabenko, and Morze's (2025) survey of 97 higher education teachers across disciplines found that while most possessed significant teaching experience, only 40.2% described any substantive use of AI in their professional practice, with key barriers including the absence of institutional policy, inadequate funding and infrastructure, and teacher anxiety. Bannister (2024), examining English Medium Instruction educators' language assessment literacy in relation to GenAI, identified generally low self-reported literacy levels and considerable anxiety regarding GenAI-assisted academic misconduct. The study underscores the need for ongoing professional development that addresses not only technical AI skills but also ethical frameworks for upholding academic integrity.

Pan and Wang (2025), working with 782 Chinese EFL teachers, developed AI literacy scale encompassing AI Knowledge, AI Use, AI Assessment, AI Design, and AI Ethics. The analysis identified four distinct AI literacy competence profiles: poor (12.1%), moderate (45.5%), good (28.4%), and excellent (14.1%), with most teachers clustered at moderate levels. Alshaie et al. (2025), applying UNESCO's (2023) AI

competence framework to 71 EFL instructors at a Saudi university, found overall high competency levels (M = 3.90) alongside a moderate positive relationship between AI competence and the quality of English education.

The Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework, and its AI-adapted counterpart (AI-TPACK), is widely used as a key theoretical approach for conceptualizing the intersection of technological, content-based, and pedagogical knowledge required for AI integration. Kulekci and Kiziltas (2026) assessed AI-TPACK levels among 244 pre-service English teachers and found relatively positive self-perceptions across dimensions (item means ranging from 3.61 to 3.88), with generally favorable attitudes towards AI. However, the authors suggest that positive orientations towards AI do not automatically translate into pedagogical integration capability and call for education programs to provide more structured and practice-oriented opportunities for AI integration in ELT contexts. Fekete (2026) argues, drawing on the same TPACK framework, that this gap can only be bridged through a pedagogy-first approach in which AI use is deliberately aligned with learning objectives and supports rather than drives language learning.

The systematic review by Ceallaigh and Murphy (2026) maps the GenAI-specific Technological Pedagogical Knowledge (TPK). TPK for GenAI, they argue, extends well beyond digital competence to encompass pedagogical reasoning and ethical awareness, and higher education institutions bear a central responsibility for enabling sustained professional development. Kohnke and Zou (2025), writing specifically about TESOL teacher education, similarly call for using TPACK and the SAMR model (Substitution, Augmentation, Modification, Redefinition) to address AI's critical sociopolitical, ethical, and cultural dimensions.

Finally, Chan and Tsi (2024) addressed the important question of whether AI might replace teachers by surveying 399 students and 184 teachers across eight Hong Kong higher education institutions. The authors found that while some participants acknowledged the theoretical possibility of AI displacing teachers, most affirmed that human teachers possess irreplaceable qualities, such as critical thinking, emotional intelligence, and the capacity for social-emotional development through interpersonal interaction. The preference for a human-centered, AI-assisted model of instruction is also evident from the research by Babanoglu, Karatas, and Dundar (2025) in Turkey.

We may conclude that teacher readiness for AI integration is shaped by the interplay of knowledge, affect, motivation, institutional context, and competences. Teachers generally have positive attitudes towards AI but also demonstrate concerns about ethics, data privacy, and institutional support. Although most teachers across studies have moderate AI competence and predominantly favorable attitudes, this may be insufficient for successful AI adoption. Addressing this situation requires coherent institutional strategies, selection and fostering teachers' field-specific AI competences, and a pedagogy-first orientation that positions AI as a complementary tool in service of learning. Moreover, more research is needed to find out the attitudes towards AI integration of ESP instructors as a specific category of teachers operating at the intersection of field-specific content and EFL. To this end, we investigated the attitudes and self-perceived AI competences of ESP teachers at a leading Ukrainian technical university, situating their responses within both the international frameworks reviewed above and the specific regulatory context of Ukrainian higher education.

3. Method

To examine ESP teachers' attitudes toward using AI in language instruction and their competencies in using AI in their professional activities, a questionnaire was administered to teachers at Igor Sikorskyi Kyiv Polytechnic Institute (n=52), Kyiv, Ukraine. All participants consented to the processing of their answers for research purposes. The survey comprised questions combining five-point Likert-scale statements and open-ended questions, and was designed to address the three research

questions outlined above. All participants provided informed consent for the use of their responses for research purposes.

3.1. Participants

The sample is characterized by a high level of professional experience: 40.4% of respondents reported 11–20 years of teaching experience, and 46.8% reported over 20 years. In terms of academic rank, the sample included associate professors (51%), full professors (9.8%), and senior lecturers (11.8%).

3.2. Data Collection and Analysis

The survey instrument was administered via Google Forms, enabling anonymous, efficient data collection, supporting multiple question formats, and exporting responses directly to a spreadsheet for subsequent analysis. The questionnaire was distributed through the professional networks of the Faculty of Linguistics. To extend coverage across departments, a snowball sampling strategy was employed: initial respondents were invited to share the survey with colleagues within their professional networks, resulting in participation from seven departments. Quantitative data from Likert-scale items were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, and response frequency distributions. Open-ended responses were analyzed thematically, with recurring patterns identified inductively across participants' answers.

4. Results

Respondents' Perspectives on AI Integration. Analysis of questions Q1–Q6 (See Table 1) indicates that instructors demonstrate a cautious view of AI implementation in the ESP classroom. Overall, the respondents recognize the pedagogical value of AI tools, particularly when they support learner autonomy and are used transparently for academic purposes. At the same time, they acknowledge that the widespread adoption of such technologies necessitates substantial adjustments at the institutional level, especially in assessment frameworks, curriculum design, and competency-based outcomes.

Statement Focus (1=Disagree, 5=Agree)	Mean Score	Median	St. Dev.	% Strongly Agree (5)
Q1. Students should have the right to use AI transparently	4.00	4	1.13	56.7%
Q2. AI is useful for autonomous learning	4.17	5	1.00	70.0%
Q3. I encourage students to use AI	3.30	3	1.34	16.7%
Q4. AI requires assessment criteria review	4.77	5	0.44	93.3%
Q5. AI requires curriculum update	4.07	5	1.25	60.0%
Q6. AI requires rethinking skills/competencies	4.47	5	0.74	83.3%

Table 1. Respondents' Perspectives on AI Integration

Across the six items, mean scores range from 3.30 to 4.77**,** suggesting predominantly positive attitudes towards implementation of AI tools in the classroom. The strongest agreement is observed for statements emphasizing the need to reconsider assessment criteria (Q4, M = 4.77) and to rethink the skills and competencies that are to be developed in a language classroom (Q6, M = 4.47), with more than 83% of instructors selecting "Strongly Agree". Similarly, respondents express high support for allowing students to use AI tools transparently (Q1, M = 4.00) and for recognizing AI's value in fostering autonomous learning (Q2, M = 4.17). A comparable level of agreement is found regarding the necessity of updating existing curricula to reflect AI-driven shifts in language learning practices (Q5, M = 4.07).

The only item with a notably lower endorsement is Q3 (M = 3.30), which concerns whether instructors actively encourage students to use AI. Although attitudes remain generally positive, only 16.7% of respondents strongly agree with this statement, suggesting some degree of hesitation. This finding may reflect ongoing uncertainties about appropriate usage frameworks, institutional policies, and the ethical implications of AI-assisted performance.

Ethics of AI and Institutional Policy. The analysis of integrity- and policy-focused items reveals three interlinked tendencies: strong concern about the pedagogical consequences of AI misuse, high self-confidence in teachers' ability to detect dishonest behavior, and a marked institutional vulnerability arising from inconsistent or absent regulatory frameworks.

The two highest-rated statements underscore an overwhelming consensus that the institutional response to AI remains inadequate. Nearly all respondents (92.9%) strongly agree that a clear policy framework is urgently required (See Table 2). A similarly high proportion emphasizes the necessity of open, systematic dialogue with students. These results point to a general perception that ethical boundaries are currently negotiated on an ad hoc basis, leaving both staff and students without coherent guidance.

Despite acknowledging that AI-generated content is more difficult to detect than traditional plagiarism (Q12, Mean 4.57), respondents express strong confidence in their own ability to identify and substantiate unauthorized use (Q11 and13, both above 4.20). Teachers perceive the situation as technically challenging yet remain convinced that their experiential knowledge, familiarity with student performance, and stylistic intuition allow them to recognize suspicious work. Yet, frequent suspicion of unauthorized AI use (Q8, Mean 4.27) implies higher cognitive load placed on instructors as well as frustration from academic misconduct on the part of students.

Concerns about the erosion of trust (Q7, Mean 4.27) and the potential negative influence of AI on learning outcomes (Q19, Mean 4.29) contribute to anxiety about the long-term pedagogical impact of generative tools. Many respondents report that AI has already compelled them to adjust their assessment strategies (Q10, Mean 4.20), indicating that the integration of AI into student practices is not perceived as hypothetical but as

Statement Focus (1=Disagree, 5=Agree)	Mean Score	Median	St. Dev.	% Strongly Agree (5)
Q7. AI harms trust	4.27	5	1.16	66.7%
Q8. I often suspect students use AI	4.27	5	1.03	86.7%
Q9. Students misunderstand AI boundaries	4.13	5	1.06	66.7%
Q10. AI affects my assessment approaches	4.20	5	0.86	60.0%
Q11. I can recognise unauthorised use	4.20	5	1.15	80.0%
Q12. AI is harder to detect than plagiarism	4.57	5	0.76	71.4%
Q13. I can reasonably prove dishonest use	4.50	5	0.76	71.4%
Q14. Clear sanctions for unauthorised AI use exist	3.93	4.5	1.33	50.0%
Q15. AI should be integrated in the future	4.64	5	0.63	85.7%
Q16. Clear policy for AI use in ESP must be created	4.86	5	0.51	92.9%
Q17. Open discussion with students is vital	4.86	5	0.35	85.7%
Q18. AI is equivalent to web browsers	2.71	3	1.07	7.1%
Q19. I worry that AI harms learning process	4.29	4	0.59	28.6%

Table 2. Respondents' Opinion on Integrity, Detection, and Institutional Policy

a present operational challenge. The belief that students lack understanding of acceptable boundaries (Q9, Mean 4.13) further highlights a communication gap between institutional expectations and student behavior.

Only half of the respondents strongly agree that clear sanctions are in place (Q14, Mean 3.93), revealing a fragmented regulatory environment. Moreover, very few respondents (7.1%) endorse the view that AI tools are equivalent to traditional search engines (Q18). This sharp rejection indicates that teaching staff do not perceive AI as merely an extension of existing digital research practices but as a categorically different entity requiring dedicated rules, instruction, and oversight.

Practical Challenges and Pedagogical Shifts. The open-ended responses offer important context for understanding how teachers recognise unauthorised AI use and how they see their professional role changing.

When detecting unauthorized AI use, teachers mainly rely on comparing a student's typical language performance with the submitted work. Detection focuses on mismatch rather than automated tools. Four factors of detecting unauthorized AI use can be distinguished:

Teachers observe that the absence of expected mistakes now functions as a marker of AI authorship. The most common indicator is error-free text, unusually polished structure or language that exceeds the student's known level.

Another frequent strategy is identifying language that is not characteristic of the student: advanced vocabulary, complex constructions, or a style that changes compared to previous work or to the student's performance while speaking. This gap between written and oral abilities signals potential misuse.

The strongest confirmation of unauthorized AI use comes when a student cannot explain or defend the submitted task. Respondents report that students often fail to answer basic questions, define the vocabulary they used, or reference their sources.

Teachers also note stylistic markers of AI-generated text, including overly formal logic, lack of personal voice, emotional neutrality, or similar submissions from different students. These patterns show that instructors can already recognize a distinct "AI style".

Changing Role of the ELT Instructor. In the final part of the questionnaire, responses show a shared understanding that the teacher's role must adapt to the realities of AI-assisted learning.

Teachers increasingly see themselves as *guides* who help students use AI responsibly, introduce ethical norms, explain acceptable vs. unacceptable uses, and integrate AI literacy into the curriculum. They generally support controlled, transparent use of AI rather than its complete prohibition.

Many respondents emphasize that human presence as a *tutor* and *instructor* remains the most important. Students still need live communication, creativity, and critical reasoning; thus, teachers must prioritize tasks that develop metacognition and spontaneous language use.

Several responses highlight that teachers must now act both as *mentors* and as *guardians* of academic integrity, supporting learners while ensuring compliance with academic integrity rules. This expanded role requires institutional support, professional development, and adequate compensation.

The survey results indicate that Ukrainian higher education is currently undergoing a transitional phase in AI integration. While students actively use AI tools in their learning, teachers work without clear institutional regulations and structured guidelines.

In line with the *UNESCO AI competency framework for teachers*, the findings suggest that ethical competence presently occupies a dominant position. Respondents primarily focus on issues of academic integrity, transparency, and responsible use. At the same time, recognition of the changing role of the teacher in AI-mediated

classrooms underscores the growing importance of the ability to use AI for professional development and pedagogical adaptation.

The generally positive attitude toward AI in education provides a favorable foundation for the recognition of AI benefits for teaching and learning. However, the Ukrainian context still lacks formally articulated AI-related competences embedded in policy documents and systematically implemented through holistic, discipline-specific training. This gap highlights the need for structured competence development frameworks aligned with national educational priorities.

5. Discussion

The predominantly positive yet cautious attitudes that the ESP instructors' answers demonstrated align with the broader pattern identified across international studies. Like the teachers in Yesilel's (2025) and Alshammari and Singh's (2025) samples, respondents recognize AI's pedagogical potential while simultaneously expressing concern about ethical boundaries and institutional unpreparedness. The notably lower endorsement of actively encouraging student AI use (Q3, M = 3.30), despite general openness, partly reflects Cao's (2025) finding that educators support AI in principle while feeling unprepared to manage it in practice. The sample's predominantly senior academics (46% with over two decades of teaching experience) may explain some caution toward AI integration, aligning with Qadir and Omar's (2025) observation, though the present study cannot confirm this given its anonymous design.

The near-universal demand for institutional policy (92.9% strong agreement) and the fragmentary sanctions environment (Q14, M = 3.93) confirm the pattern documented by Vorotnykova, Dziabenko, and Morze, whose Ukrainian sample similarly identified absent institutional policy as a primary barrier to responsible AI engagement. Bannister's (2024) finding of high anxiety around GenAI-assisted academic misconduct among EMI educators is evidently echoed in our study, though Igor Sikorskyi KPI instructors appear confident in their detection capacity.

The role redefinition articulated by respondents converges with findings of Chan & Tsi, (2024), Babanoglu, Karatas & Dundar (2025). Respondents' affirmation of irreplaceable human qualities like creativity, metacognitive development and live communication also aligns with the human-centered orientation of UNESCO framework's first dimension, "Human-centered mindset". However, the expanded role described by teachers carries workload and institutional support implications that the current Ukrainian regulatory context does not yet address.

Taken together, the findings reveal that Ukrainian teachers demonstrate positive attitudes and readiness to embrace AI technologies in ESP teaching and learning. Ethical awareness and caution signal a strong academic integrity culture and a belief that AI-assisted misconduct in the ESP context remains detectable through experiential means. The fact that the Ukrainian Professional Standard, while structurally compatible with AI integration, contains no explicit AI-related competences, together with the lack of well-established ESP policies for ethical use of AI, results in the call for documented guidelines. As Kulekci and Kiziltas (2026) and Fekete (2026) argue, positive attitudes and even moderate competence are insufficient without structured, pedagogy-first frameworks that guide purposeful integration.

6. Limitations

Despite the valuable insights provided, this study has several limitations that should be noted. First, the sample size is relatively small (n=52) and restricted to a single institution in Kyiv, which limits the generalizability of the findings to the broader population of Ukrainian ESP teachers. Second, the anonymous nature of the survey prevented the analysis of potential correlations between teachers' attitudes and demographic factors such as age or gender. Finally, the data reflect teachers' self-

reported perceptions of AI competence and detection capabilities rather than an objective assessment of their actual skills or performance in classroom scenarios.

7. Conclusions

This study investigated ESP teachers' attitudes towards AI integration, their approaches to academic integrity, and their perception of the evolving instructor role at Igor Sikorskyi Kyiv Polytechnic Institute.

First, in response to RQ1, ESP instructors show predominantly positive attitudes towards AI in education, with particularly strong consensus on the need to revise assessment criteria and rethink target competences.

Second, addressing RQ2, teachers express strong confidence in experiential and dialogic AI misuse detection strategies while also noting the absence of institutional policy. The demand for clear regulatory frameworks is well recognized.

Finally, respondents articulate a role redefinition towards AI literacy guide and academic integrity guardian, which is consistent with international findings and with the human-centered orientation of global AI competence frameworks.

The obtained results demonstrate that AI reshapes the ESP teaching and learning process and that, within these changes, teachers have established their own views, strategies and critical areas that should be dealt with at a broader level. First, this involves defining specific AI competences within teachers' competence frameworks and providing relevant professional development opportunities. Second, it requires rethinking institutional policies with clear ethical rules and sanctions for ethical misconduct, particularly in the ESP context. Thirdly, methodological issues appear, which should be addressed by offering new ways of assessing students' work and fostering academic trust through open dialogue.

Thus, future research should examine practical strategies for AI integration in ESP lessons, including human-driven methodologies, assessment guidelines and competence redefinition.

Bibliographic references

Alshaie, F. S., Bin-Hady, W. R. A., & Madani, O. (2025). The impact of EFL instructors' AI competence on developing the quality of English education in Ha'il: Teachers' perspective. Cogent Education, 12(1), Article 2585559. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2585559

Alshammari, S. R., & Singh, A. K. (2025). AI-ready: Evaluating EFL teachers' preparedness for the future of language instruction. Taiwan Journal of TESOL, 22(2), 101–132. https://doi.org/10.30397/TJTESOL.202510_22(2).0004

Babanoğlu, M. P., Karataş, T. Ö., & Dündar, E. (2025). Envisioning the future of AI-assisted EFL teaching and learning: Conceptual representations of prospective teachers. SAGE Open, 15(2), Article e13415. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251341590

Bannister, P. (2024). English medium instruction educator language assessment literacy and the test of generative AI in online higher education. Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics, 15(2), 55–72. https://doi.org/10.22055/rals.2024.45862.3214

Binkley, M., Erstad, O., Herman, J., Raizen, S., Ripley, M., Miller-Ricci, M., & Rumble, M. (2012). Defining twenty-first century skills. In P. Griffin, B. McGaw, & E. Care (Eds.), Assessment and teaching of 21st century skills (17–66). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-2324-5_2

Cao, L. Y. (2025). A study on the readiness of English teachers in Macao universities in the era of AI. Asian Education and Development Studies, 14(4), 680–699. https://doi.org/10.1108/AEDS-12-2024-0314

Chan, C. K. Y., & Tsi, L. H. Y. (2024). Will generative AI replace teachers in higher education? A study of teacher and student perceptions. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 83, Article 101395. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.101395
Choi, S., Jeon, J., & Jang, Y. (2025). Exploring teacher intention to teach AI: Self-determination theory (SDT) and motivation-opportunity-ability (MOA) perspectives. Education and Information Technologies, 30(17), 24173–24200. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-025-13693-4
Cosgrove, J., & Cachia, R. (2025). DigComp 3.0: European Digital Competence Framework – Fifth edition. Publications Office of the European Union. https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2760/0001149
Fekete, I. (2026). Pedagogically grounded AI use in the EFL classroom: Principles and classroom examples. ELT Journal, 80(1), 138–147. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccaf055
Gaugl, S. (2026). Using AI-driven interventions in EAP classes: A mixed-method study on motivation and learning outcomes. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 81, Article 101656. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2026.101656
Global Partnership for Education. (2020). 21st-century skills: What potential role for the Global Partnership for Education? A landscape review. https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/21st-century-skills-landscape-review
Kilat, R. V. (2026). Modeling behavioral intention toward generative AI use in higher education English language teaching. Frontiers in Education, 11, Article 1743380. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1743380
Kohnke, L., & Zou, D. (2025). Artificial intelligence integration in TESOL teacher education: Promoting a critical lens guided by TPACK and SAMR. TESOL Quarterly, 59(S3), S267–S278. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3396
Kulekci, G., & Kiziltas, E. (2026). Preparing for the AI era: AI-TPACK levels of pre-service English teachers and their attitudes toward AI. Journal of Language and Education, 12(1), 135–145. https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2026.29944
Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine. (2022). Professional standard for higher education teachers in Ukraine. Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine.
Ngo, T. N., & Fians, G. (2026). Between prompting strategies and ethical concerns: How EAP teachers develop materials with generative AI. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 81, Article 101680. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2026.101680
Omidvar, S., & Meihami, H. (2025). Exploring the "what" and "how" of opportunities and challenges of AI in EFL teacher education. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 9, Article 100443. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100443
O'Nualláin, T. J., & Murphy, S. (2026). Teaching the teachers: A systematic review of genAI-specific technological pedagogical knowledge (TPK) in teacher education. Computers and Education Open, 10, Article 100367. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2026.100367
Pan, Z., & Wang, Y. (2025). From technology-challenged teachers to empowered digitalized citizens: Exploring the profiles and antecedents of teacher AI literacy in the Chinese EFL context. European Journal of Education, 60(1), Article e70020. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.70020
Redecker, C. (2017). European framework for the digital competence of educators: DigCompEdu (Y. Punie, Ed.). Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2760/159770
Qadir, S. M., & Omar, R. M. (2025). Digital literacy, technophobia, and technophilia: Exploring their roles in artificial intelligence integration into English language education. E-Learning and Digital Media. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/20427530251395634
Redecker, C. (2017). European framework for the digital competence of educators: DigCompEdu. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2760/159770

Suto, I., & Eccles, H. (2014). The Cambridge approach to 21st century skills: Definitions, development and dilemmas for assessment. Cambridge Assessment. https://www.cambridgeassessment.org.uk/Images/461811-the-cambridge-approach-to-21st-century-skills-definitions-development-and-dilemmas-for-assessment-.pdf
UNESCO. (2024). AI competency framework for teachers. UNESCO Publishing. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000391104
Vorotnykova, I., Dziabenko, O., & Morze, N. (2025). Perspectives of implementation of personalized learning using artificial intelligence in higher education. Information Technologies and Learning Tools, 105(1), 144–157. https://doi.org/10.33407/itlt.v105i1.5893
Xie, X., Teng, M. F., & Alamer, A. (2025). Exploring AI literacy and AI-induced emotions among Chinese university English language teachers: The Partial Least Square Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) approach. International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 35(4), 1897–1911. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12798
Yesilel, D. B. A. (2025). English language teachers' perspectives on digital trust in AI-supported education. British Educational Research Journal, 51(2), 420–435. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.4209

Words: 6191
Characters: 46 069 (26 standard pages)

Prof. Zoia Kornieva, Doctor of Science
Department of Theory, Practice and Translation of the English Language,
National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute"
Kyiv
Ukraine
ORCID: 0000-0002-8848-4323
kornieva.zoia@edu.kpi.ua

assoc. Prof. Yuliia Baklazhenko, PhD
Department of Theory, Practice and Translation of the English Language,
National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute"
Kyiv
Ukraine
ORCID: 0000-0002-9035-7737
yuliia.baklazhenko@gmail.com