

Factors Shaping Lecturers' Adoption of AI Tools in Business English Classes

Andi Musdariah¹, Akhmad², Muslimin³, Naura Syahirah Renata Langga⁴,

Andara Kayla Tri Alviani⁵

^{1,2,3,4,5}State Polytechnic of Ujung Pandang

Email: andimusdariah.am@poliupg.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study explores the factors influencing lecturers' adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Business English teaching at higher education institutions. As AI technologies offer the potential to enhance teaching quality and provide personalized learning experiences, understanding the barriers and enablers of AI adoption is crucial for successful integration. The research examines six key dimensions: Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Social Influence, Facilitating Conditions, Behavioral Intention to Use, and Actual Use, based on the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT). A survey was conducted with 10 lecturers to assess their perceptions, attitudes, and experiences with AI tools. The findings reveal that lecturers perceive AI as beneficial for improving teaching quality and providing faster feedback, with high levels of Performance Expectancy and Effort Expectancy (mean = 4.2, SD = 0.79). However, significant challenges were identified in Facilitating Conditions, such as inadequate training, resources, and technical support, which hinder AI's effective use (mean = 2.3–2.7, SD = 1.06–1.58). Additionally, Social Influence showed strong peer support (mean = 4.2, SD = 0.79) but weak institutional leadership (mean = 2.8, SD = 1.14). The study highlights the importance of institutional commitment, training, and resource availability in fostering AI adoption. The findings contribute to the existing literature by addressing the gap in research on AI adoption specifically within the context of Business English teaching.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, Business English Teaching, Technology Adoption, Vocational Higher Education, Lecturers' Perceptions.*

1) INTRODUCTION

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into higher education holds transformative potential, especially in fields like Business English, where the need for innovative, efficient, and personalized teaching practices is growing. AI tools can significantly enhance teaching quality by offering faster feedback, personalized learning experiences, and automation of repetitive tasks (Novawan et al., 2024). This promises not only to improve the effectiveness of instruction but also to foster more engaging and adaptable learning environments for students. However, despite the acknowledged potential, the

widespread adoption of AI in educational settings, particularly in language and communication courses such as Business English, remains limited (Basri et al., 2020).

The adoption of AI in teaching is influenced by a variety of factors, including lecturers' perceptions, institutional support, and technical infrastructure (Guri-Rosenblit, 2005). Understanding these factors is critical for institutions seeking to incorporate AI technologies successfully into their teaching methodologies (Ng et al., 2021). While much research has focused on AI's potential to improve student learning outcomes, there is limited empirical research that specifically examines the factors that influence lecturers' willingness to use AI in Business English teaching. Previous studies have largely addressed technology acceptance in broader educational contexts, with few exploring how domain-specific factors, such as teaching Business English, impact AI adoption (Alhumaid et al., 2023).

This study aims to fill this gap by investigating the factors that influence lecturers' use of AI in Business English teaching. Specifically, the research focuses on six key dimensions: Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Social Influence, Facilitating Conditions, Behavioral Intention to Use, and Actual Use. These dimensions are grounded in established technology acceptance frameworks, including the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (García de Blanes Sebastián et al., 2022). By exploring these factors, this study seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of the barriers and enablers of AI adoption, particularly in the context of Business English, a domain often overlooked in AI adoption studies.

The novelty of this research lies in its domain-specific focus examining how AI adoption in Business English teaching differs from other academic disciplines and its emphasis on lecturers' perceptions rather than just technological capabilities or student outcomes. While previous studies have primarily focused on institutional or technological readiness, this research highlights the role of lecturers as critical agents in AI integration. It also examines the specific challenges and opportunities lecturers face when incorporating AI into their teaching practices, providing a localized perspective that can inform policy and decision-making at educational institutions.

This study will offer valuable insights for higher education institutions seeking to promote AI adoption in their curricula. It will also provide practical recommendations to enhance lecturers' confidence and competence in using AI, ensuring that AI tools are utilized effectively to improve Business English teaching. The findings will contribute to the broader conversation on AI's role in

education, addressing the current research gap while adding to the body of knowledge on AI adoption in specialized teaching contexts.

2) METHODS

This study employs a quantitative descriptive research design, which is suitable for analyzing lecturers' readiness to adopt Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Business English teaching. The study focuses on identifying the factors that influence the acceptance and adoption of AI among lecturers in vocational higher education, based on the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT). The research is cross-sectional, as data is collected at one point in time, providing a snapshot of the factors influencing lecturers' perceptions and willingness to adopt AI in their teaching (Ofosu-Ampong, 2024).

Participants

The sample consisted of 10 lecturers who were purposively selected based on their involvement in teaching Business English and their familiarity with AI in education. These lecturers were from various academic backgrounds, ensuring a range of perspectives on the adoption of AI in teaching. Although the sample size is relatively small, it was sufficient for providing preliminary insights into the factors influencing AI use in this specific context.

Survey Instrument

A structured questionnaire was used to collect data. The questionnaire was designed to measure six key dimensions identified in the literature on technology adoption: Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Social Influence; the influence of colleagues and leadership in adopting AI, Facilitating Conditions, Behavioral Intention to Use, and Actual Use. Each of these dimensions was measured using a set of Likert-scale items (ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). The questionnaire was administered online, allowing respondents to complete it at their convenience.

Data Collection Procedure

The online survey was distributed via email to the 10 selected lecturers, and responses were collected over a period of one week. Participation was voluntary, and all respondents were assured of the confidentiality of their responses. To encourage honest and reflective responses, the survey was anonymous.

Statistical Analysis

The data collected from the survey were analyzed using descriptive statistics, primarily focusing on the mean and standard deviation. The mean was used to determine the average response for each item within the six dimensions, providing an overview of lecturers' overall perceptions towards AI adoption in teaching. The standard deviation was used to measure the variability or spread of responses for each item, indicating the level of agreement or disagreement among respondents. Higher standard deviations suggest greater disagreement or diversity in responses, while lower standard deviations indicate more consensus among respondents.

For each dimension, the mean values were calculated to assess the general tendency of responses, and the standard deviation was calculated to determine how consistent the responses were within that dimension. This allowed for a deeper understanding of both the general trends in lecturers' perceptions and the degree of variability in their attitudes and intentions towards AI usage.

3) RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Result

Demographic Data of Respondents

The following table presents the demographic data of the respondents, providing an overview of key variables such as sex, age, teaching experience, and qualification. This data helps to contextualize the sample by highlighting the distribution of respondents across these demographic categories, offering insights into the composition of the participant group. The frequencies and percentages are provided for each category within these variables to better understand the characteristics of the respondents.

Table 1: *Demographic Data of Respondents*

Variable	Category	Percentage (%)
Sex	Male	40
	Female	60
Ages	25-34 year	10
	35-44 year	30
	45-50 year	10
	>50 year	50
Teaching Experiences	5-10 year	20
	11-15 year	20

Paper presented at The 2nd ICONETT, 2025
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar
South Sulawesi-Indonesia

	16- 20 year	10
	> 20 year	50
Qualifications	S2	60
	S3	40

The data presents a demographic breakdown of a sample based on variables such as sex, age, teaching experience, and academic qualification. In terms of sex, the distribution reveals that there are 4 male respondents (40%) and 6 female respondents (60%), indicating a slight predominance of females in this sample.

Regarding age, the largest group falls within the >50 year category, comprising 5 individuals (50%), followed by those aged 35-44 years (30%, or 3 individuals), while 1 individual each falls within the 25-34 year and 45-50 year categories, representing 10% each. This suggests that the sample is predominantly composed of individuals in the older age bracket, with a strong concentration in the >50 year group.

When examining teaching experience, a noteworthy trend is observed in the >20 years category, where 5 individuals (50%) have the most experience. This is followed by two respondents (20%) in both the 5-10 year and 11-15 year categories, and 1 respondent (10%) with 16-20 years of experience. These figures highlight a sample with a significant proportion of highly experienced educators, with a substantial portion also having mid-level experience.

In terms of academic qualification, the data shows that 6 respondents (60%) hold a Master's degree (S2), while 4 respondents (40%) possess a Doctorate degree (S3). This distribution indicates that the majority of the sample has attained a Master's degree, with a considerable number also holding a Doctorate. In summary, the sample predominantly consists of older, highly experienced educators, with a higher proportion of females, and most participants possess at least a Master's degree. Based on the collected demographic data, the following key insights were observed.

Factors Influencing Faculty in Using AI in Business English Teaching

The table of findings below explores the key factors influencing faculty adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Business English instruction. These factors are derived from established models such as the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT). Specifically, it examines how Teaching Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Social Influence, and Facilitating Conditions impact faculty perceptions and usage of AI

tools in their teaching practices. The findings offer valuable insights into the factors that shape the acceptance and integration of AI in the educational context of Business English

Table 2: Factors Influencing Faculty in Using AI in Business English Teaching

No	Items	M	STD
I	Performance Expectancy		
1	I believe that the use of AI in Business English teaching will improve my teaching quality.	4.2	0.79
2	I feel that the use of AI in Business English teaching will help me provide faster feedback to students.	4.2	0.79
3	I am confident that the use of AI in Business English teaching will increase my effectiveness in delivering material.	3.9	0.74
4	The use of AI helps me achieve the goals of Business English teaching more efficiently.	3.9	0.74
II	Effort Expectancy		
5	I feel that AI in teaching is easy to use in Business English classes	4.2	0.79
6	I feel that using AI in Business English teaching requires minimal effort	3.9	0.74
7	I feel that learning how to use AI in Business English teaching is easy to understand.	3.9	0.74
8	I feel comfortable using AI in Business English teaching after learning how it works.	3.9	0.74
III	Social Influence		
9	My colleagues encourage me to use AI in Business English teaching.	4.2	0.79
10	I feel that the use of AI in Business English teaching is considered important by my colleagues.	3.9	0.74
11	The use of AI in Business English teaching has become common among my colleagues.	3.9	0.74
12	I feel that my superiors or leaders at my institution support the use of AI in Business English teaching.	2.8	1.14
IV	Facilitating Conditions		
13	My institution provides adequate training for using AI in Business English teaching	2.7	1.06
14	I have sufficient access to the technological resources needed to use AI in Business English teaching	2.3	1.42
15	I feel that the infrastructure at my institution supports the use of AI in Business English teaching.	2.5	1.58
16	There is sufficient technical support available for me to use AI in Business English teaching.	2.5	1.58
V	Behavioral Intention to Use		
17	I plan to continue using AI in my Business English teaching.	4.2	0.79
18	I intend to integrate more AI-based tools into my Business English teaching in the future.	3.9	0.74
19	I will use AI in my Business English teaching if given the opportunity.	3.9	0.74
VI	Actual Use		
20	I have already started using AI in my Business English teaching.	3.9	0.74
21	I routinely use AI in the process of teaching Business English.	3.9	0.74
22	The use of AI has become an important part of how I teach Business English	3.9	0.74

Performance Expectancy

Paper presented at The 2nd ICONETT, 2025
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar
South Sulawesi-Indonesia

The findings show that lecturers generally have a positive perception of AI's contribution to improving Business English teaching. Items such as improving teaching quality and providing faster feedback scored relatively high ($M = 4.2$, $SD = 0.79$), indicating strong agreement that AI enhances efficiency and instructional outcomes. Confidence in delivering materials and achieving teaching goals also scored fairly high ($M = 3.9$, $SD = 0.74$), though slightly lower than perceptions of feedback and quality improvement. This suggests that while lecturers strongly believe in AI's capacity to support teaching quality and responsiveness, some are more cautious regarding its effectiveness in deeper pedagogical aspects.

Effort Expectancy

In terms of ease of use, lecturers reported relatively high agreement that AI is easy to use and understand ($M = 3.9$ – 4.2 , $SD = 0.74$ – 0.79). They also felt comfortable using AI after learning how it works, reflecting a positive user experience. The overall pattern shows that lecturers do not perceive AI as requiring high effort, with the highest score being on the perception that it is easy to use in classes ($M = 4.2$). This highlights that effort expectancy is not a significant barrier to adoption, as most faculty members consider AI to be user-friendly and manageable.

Social Influence

Social factors appear to play a moderately strong role in encouraging AI adoption. Lecturers acknowledged encouragement from colleagues ($M = 4.2$, $SD = 0.79$), suggesting peer influence is meaningful. They also noted that AI use is becoming common among peers ($M = 3.9$) and seen as important by colleagues ($M = 3.9$). However, the lowest score in this dimension relates to institutional leadership support ($M = 2.8$, $SD = 1.14$), indicating a gap between peer influence and top-down encouragement. This shows that while peer networks motivate lecturers, limited institutional endorsement may hinder broader adoption.

Facilitating Conditions

This dimension shows the weakest support, with consistently low mean values ($M = 2.3$ – 2.7) and relatively high variability ($SD = 1.06$ – 1.58). Lecturers expressed concerns over lack of training, insufficient infrastructure, limited technical support, and inadequate access to resources. The lowest score was on access to technological resources ($M = 2.3$), highlighting serious structural barriers to implementation. These findings indicate that even if lecturers are motivated and perceive AI positively, institutional and infrastructural gaps remain critical obstacles to effective integration.

Discussions

Among the six dimensions, Performance Expectancy emerged as the most positively perceived factor. Lecturers overwhelmingly agreed that AI would enhance their teaching quality ($M = 4.2$) and provide faster feedback to students ($M = 4.2$). This aligns strongly with the perceived usefulness component of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), which suggests that individuals are more likely to adopt technology if they perceive it as beneficial to their work or goals (Davis, 1989). Lecturers' confidence in AI's potential to improve their pedagogical practices aligns with other studies that suggest perceived benefits are crucial for technology adoption in educational contexts (Boelens et al., 2017). For instance, when lecturers see AI as a tool that enhances teaching quality, they are more likely to integrate it into their classrooms.

Similarly, Effort Expectancy, which reflects the ease with which lecturers believe they can use AI tools, scored positively ($M = 3.9\text{--}4.2$). The TAM and the Theory of Planned Behaviour emphasize that ease of use is a significant predictor of technology adoption. In this case, lecturers reported feeling comfortable using AI after some training, indicating that the technology is perceived as accessible and manageable. This is consistent with the idea that when users perceive a technology as easy to use, they are more likely to adopt it (García de Blanes Sebastián et al., 2022; Kavitha & Joshith, 2025). The low perceived effort associated with AI adoption in this study suggests that user-friendly tools are essential for encouraging widespread adoption, especially in academic environments where time and resources may be limited.

While Performance Expectancy and Effort Expectancy reveal positive attitudes toward AI adoption, Facilitating Conditions (such as training, resources, and technical support) highlight significant challenges. Lecturers reported insufficient training ($M = 2.7$), limited access to technological resources ($M = 2.3$), and lack of technical support ($M = 2.5$). These issues align with the facilitating conditions construct in the UTAUT model, which emphasizes that external factors like infrastructure and support are critical to the successful adoption of technology (Celik, 2023). Despite strong perceptions of AI's potential, the lack of institutional support creates a barrier to its effective use. This finding reflects broader challenges in educational technology integration, where resource limitations can undermine the potential benefits of innovative tools (Ofosu-Ampong, 2024).

To address these concerns, universities and institutions need to invest in both technological infrastructure and professional development for lecturers. This might involve providing

comprehensive training on AI tools, ensuring access to modern devices and software, and offering technical support services that can assist lecturers as they experiment with AI in the classroom. By doing so, the institution can eliminate the infrastructural barriers that currently hinder AI adoption and enhance the ability of lecturers to leverage AI effectively.

In terms of Social Influence, the data revealed a strong positive perception of peer support, with lecturers noting that their colleagues encouraged the use of AI in teaching ($M = 4.2$). However, institutional leadership support was rated much lower ($M = 2.8$), indicating that while peer networks are influential, institutional leadership's role is crucial for fostering a broader adoption of AI. According to Venkatesh, social influence both from peers and superiors shapes individual behaviours and decisions regarding technology use (Kohnke et al., 2023). This finding is consistent with the Social Cognitive Theory, which highlights how individuals are influenced by the behaviours and opinions of others within their social environment (Wang et al., 2014). For AI to become more widely adopted, institutional leaders must explicitly endorse and support its use, ensuring that AI integration is viewed as a strategic priority for the institution.

The Behavioural Intention to Use AI in the future was strong ($M = 3.9$), indicating that lecturers are motivated to continue integrating AI into their teaching practices. This intention aligns with the Theory of Planned Behaviour, which suggests that intentions are the most direct predictors of actual behaviour (Ajzen, 2005). The fact that lecturers intend to use more AI tools in the future highlights the potential for growth in AI adoption, assuming the necessary facilitating conditions (training, resources, and leadership) are provided (García de Blanes Sebastián et al., 2022).

However, Actual Use ($M = 3.9$) revealed that while lecturers have started using AI and even integrated it into their routines, the extent of use is still moderate. This suggests that while behavioural intentions are strong, there is a gap between intention and consistent use. Such a gap is often observed in technology adoption studies, where external factors (e.g., lack of support, infrastructure) prevent users from fully engaging with the technology, despite positive intentions (Venkatesh et al., 2003).

To address the weaknesses identified in Facilitating Conditions and Social Influence, several actionable steps can be implemented. First, institutions should enhance training programs for lecturers to ensure they have the necessary skills to use AI effectively (Ndaba & Naidoo, 2024). Offering hands-on workshops, online tutorials, and mentorship from more experienced colleagues would increase lecturers' confidence and competence in integrating AI into their teaching (Maulina et al., 2019). In

addition to training, improving access to technological resources is essential. Institutions must ensure that lecturers have the right tools, such as high-speed internet, AI software, and appropriate hardware, to facilitate smooth AI adoption. Providing adequate technical support is another key factor, as lecturers need reliable assistance when facing technological issues (Chan & Tang, 2024). Establishing dedicated AI support teams, complemented by self-service resources like FAQs and online help desks, would ensure that technical challenges do not become roadblocks for lecturers.

In parallel, addressing the gap in Social Influence requires a strong endorsement from institutional leadership (Hoang, 2015). Senior leaders should champion AI adoption by publicly supporting AI initiatives and integrating AI into the institution's strategic goals. Creating positions such as an AI coordinator would further emphasize the importance of AI in education. Peer networks also play a significant role in encouraging AI adoption. Institutions can foster a culture of collaboration by facilitating platforms where lecturers can share experiences, insights, and challenges related to using AI. Regular peer learning sessions and creating opportunities for lecturers to collaborate on AI-driven projects will make the integration of AI a collective effort (Learning et al., 2025). Moreover, integrating AI into the institutional culture is vital. AI should be seen as a strategic tool for enhancing education, and lecturers who successfully incorporate AI into their teaching should be recognized and rewarded. This will not only motivate others but also help establish AI as an integral part of the academic environment (Fanani et al., 2024).

To evaluate the effectiveness of these strategies, institutions can conduct regular surveys or focus group discussions to gauge lecturers' perceptions of AI adoption. Monitoring AI usage data and tracking its impact on teaching and student outcomes would provide valuable insights into the progress of AI integration (Samoili et al., 2020). Additionally, continuous evaluation of training programs and infrastructure will ensure that any emerging challenges are addressed in a timely manner.

By focusing on improving Facilitating Conditions and enhancing Social Influence, institutions can create a more supportive and encouraging environment for AI adoption. This will ensure that lecturers are not only willing to use AI but also have the resources and backing needed for its successful integration into their teaching practices.

4) CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the findings underscore the need for a holistic approach to AI adoption in Business English teaching. While lecturers demonstrate positive attitudes and strong intentions to use AI, the lack of institutional support, particularly in terms of training, resources, and leadership endorsement, represents a significant barrier to effective implementation. Drawing from TAM and UTAUT, it is clear that perceived usefulness and ease of use are critical drivers of AI adoption, but these factors alone are insufficient without the necessary facilitating conditions and strong social influence. Higher education institutions must prioritize investments in infrastructure, professional development, and leadership support to ensure that AI adoption can reach its full potential. By addressing these barriers, institutions can create an environment where AI tools are not only embraced but become an integral part of the teaching and learning process.

Acknowledgment

We express our gratitude to Politeknik Negeri Ujung Pandang for providing the BLU Funds under the Politeknik Negeri Ujung Pandang Annual Work Plan (DIPA) 2025 Number 1029/P/2025.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (2005). *Attitudes, Personality and Behavior* (T. Manstead (ed.); Second). Open University Press.
- Alhumaid, K., Al Naqbi, S., Elsoori, D., & Al Mansoori, M. (2023). The adoption of artificial intelligence applications in education. *International Journal of Data and Network Science*, 7(1), 457–466. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.ijdns.2022.8.013>
- Basri, M., Patak, A. A., Musdariah, A., & Abduh, A. (2020). Innovative Learning Technology (ILT) in Indonesian Vocational Higher Education. *International Journal on Advanced Science, Engineering and Information Technology*, 10(6), 2599–2605. <https://doi.org/10.18517/ijaseit.10.6.11348>
- Boelens, R., De Wever, B., & Voet, M. (2017). Four key challenges to the design of blended learning: A systematic literature review. *Educational Research Review*, 22, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2017.06.001>
- Celik, I. (2023). Towards Intelligent-TPACK: An empirical study on teachers' professional knowledge to ethically integrate artificial intelligence (AI)-based tools into education. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 138(May 2022), 107468. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107468>
- Chan, K. K.-W., & Tang, W. K.-W. (2024). Evaluating English Teachers' Artificial Intelligence Readiness and Training Needs with a TPACK-Based Model. *World Journal of English Language*, 15(1), 129. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v15n1p129>

- Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly: Management Information Systems*, 13(3), 319–339. <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>
- Fanani, A., Nurcahyani, D., Najih, A., & Zaki, M. (2024). Teachers' Perspectives on Using AI in Teaching English at High Schools in Jombang. 2(11), 829–840.
- García de Blanes Sebastián, M., Sarmiento Guede, J. R., & Antonovica, A. (2022). Application and extension of the UTAUT2 model for determining behavioral intention factors in use of the artificial intelligence virtual assistants. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.993935>
- Guri-Rosenblit, S. (2005). Eight paradoxes in the implementation process of E-learning in higher education. *Higher Education Policy*, 18(1), 5–29. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.hep.8300069>
- Hoang, N. T. (2015). EFL Teachers' Perceptions and Experiences of Blended Learning in a Vietnamese University [Queensland University of Technology]. In Office of Education Research; Faculty of Education. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/83945/>
- Kavitha, K., & Joshith, V. P. (2025). Artificial Intelligence Powered Pedagogy: Unveiling Higher Educators' Acceptance with Extended TAM. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 21(8). <https://doi.org/10.53761/s1pkk784>
- Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023). Exploring generative artificial intelligence preparedness among university language instructors: A case study. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 5(June), 100156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100156>
- Learning, P., Management, E., & Equity, D. (2025). AI-Driven Educational Transformation in Indonesia: From Learning Personalization to Institutional Management. 17, 1819–1832. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v17i2.7448>
- Maulina, Noni, N., & Basri, M. (2019). WhatsApp Audio and Video Chat-Based in Stimulating Students' Self-Confidence and Motivation to Speak English. *Asian EFL Journal*, 23(6.3), 181–203.
- Ndaba, N. E., & Naidoo, G. M. (2024). Digital transformation challenges in higher education institutions post COVID-19. *Corporate Governance and Organizational Behavior Review*, 8(3), 54–63. <https://doi.org/10.22495/cgobrv8i3p5>
- Ng, D. T. K., Leung, J. K. L., Chu, K. W. S., & Qiao, M. S. (2021). AI Literacy: Definition, Teaching, Evaluation and Ethical Issues. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 58(7), 504–509. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pra2.487>
- Novawan, A., Ikeda, O., & Walker, S. A. (2024). The New Face of Technology-Enhanced Language Learning (TELL) with Artificial Intelligence (AI): Teacher perspectives, practices, and challenges. *Journal of English in Academic and Professional Communication JEAPCO*, 10(1), 1–18.
- Ofosu-Ampong, K. (2024). Beyond the hype: exploring faculty perceptions and acceptability of AI in teaching practices. *Discover Education*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-024-00128-4>

- Samoili, S., López, CoboLópez-Cobo, M., Gómez, E., De Prato, G., & Martínez-Plumed, Fernando Delipetrev, B. (2020). AI Watch - Defining Artificial Intelligence. In Joint Research Centre (European Commission). <https://doi.org/10.2760/382730>
- Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly: Management Information Systems*, 27(3), 425–478. <https://doi.org/10.2307/30036540>
- Wang, Z., Chen, L., & Anderson, T. (2014). A framework for interaction and cognitive engagement in connectivist learning contexts. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 15(2), 121–141. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v15i2.1709>