Scientific Research Publishing

Open Journal of Social Sciences, 2026, 14(11), 581-592
https://www.scirp.org/journal/jss
ISSN Online: 2327-5960
ISSN Print: 2327-5952

English Teachers' Perceptions of Generative Artificial Intelligence: Pedagogical Utility, Adoption, and Training Needs at a Mexican Technological University

Lilia Zulema Gaytán Martínez[1*], Juan Carlos Vázquez Brindis[1], Alex Corral Verdugo[1], Eusebio Jiménez López[2], Laura Olivia Amavizca Valdez[1], Adrián Sepúlveda Romo[1], Yadira Beltrán Márquez[1]

[1]Research Department, Universidad Tecnológica del Sur de Sonora, Ciudad Obregón, Sonora, México
[2]Research and Graduate Studies, Tecnológico Nacional de México/ITS Cajeme-Universidad La Salle Noroeste, Cuidad Obregón, Sonora, México
Email: *zgaytan@uts.edu.mx

How to cite this paper: Gaytán Martínez, L. Z., Vázquez Brindis, J. C., Corral Verdugo, A., Jiménez López, E., Amavizca Valdez, L. O., Sepúlveda Romo, A., & Beltrán Márquez, Y. (2026). English Teachers' Perceptions of Generative Artificial Intelligence: Pedagogical Utility, Adoption, and Training Needs at a Mexican Technological University. *Open Journal of Social Sciences, 14,* 581-592.
https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2026.1411031

Received: October 24, 2026
Accepted: November 22, 2026
Published: November 25, 2026

Copyright © 2026 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc.
This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Open Access

Abstract

This study examined English teachers' perceptions at the Technological University of Southern Sonora regarding the use of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) as a pedagogical support tool. A quantitative, descriptive, and correlational study was conducted using a non-experimental, cross-sectional design, involving all nine teachers in the study population. Data were collected using a 21-item questionnaire structured around four dimensions: current adoption and use, perceived pedagogical utility, teacher training and readiness, and ethical and regulatory concerns. The analysis included descriptive statistics, Spearman's rank correlation, and Wilcoxon signed-rank tests. The results showed a mean score of 4.17 for perceived pedagogical utility and 3.96 for current adoption and use, with a statistically significant difference between the two dimensions ($p = 0.027$). Teacher training and readiness yielded a mean score of 4.00, with five participants (55.6%) agreeing or strongly agreeing that they were prepared to integrate these tools into their teaching. Additionally, eight teachers (88.9%) expressed interest in receiving training. No statistically significant association was found between ethical concerns and current adoption and use. Given the small population size and the cross-sectional design, the findings should be interpreted as an exploratory assessment at the institutional level. The study concludes that continuing professional development, institutional guidelines, and follow-up evaluations of teaching practices are priorities for fostering the critical and responsible integration of GenAI into education.

Keywords

Generative Artificial Intelligence, English Language Instruction, Teachers' Perceptions, Teacher Education, Higher Education

1. Introduction

The transformations driven by Industry 4.0 and Industry 5.0 are rapidly reshaping the conceptualization and implementation of educational processes in higher education worldwide. Industry 4.0, also known as the Fourth Industrial Revolution, promotes the integration of highly automated systems, intelligent data analytics, and adaptive learning mechanisms. In contrast, Industry 5.0, which emerged in 2020 (Jiménez et al., 2026), emphasizes a human-centered approach in which intelligent technologies complement human capabilities to support more personalized learning experiences (Hashim et al., 2024). Within this context, generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) offers new opportunities to develop educational resources, tailor content to individual needs, and expand pedagogical support (Kasneci et al., 2023). However, despite its potential to enhance teaching and learning, the implementation of GenAI poses significant challenges related to academic integrity, learning assessment, and the risk of overreliance on digital tools (Xia et al., 2024; Bittle & El-Gayar, 2025).

Furthermore, in language teaching, particularly English language instruction, GenAI offers new opportunities to enrich learning experiences through dynamic and adaptive interactions. For example, natural language processing models can simulate conversations, support communication skills practice, and provide immediate feedback to facilitate the development of speaking skills (Wan & Moorhouse, 2024). Similarly, GenAI tools support the design of instructional tasks, exercises, and other learning materials (Lee et al., 2025). However, realizing these benefits requires teachers to develop the competencies needed to critically evaluate AI-generated outputs, identify potential biases, and address ethical implications (Moorhouse, 2024). Regardless of how GenAI is integrated into educational settings, teacher guidance remains an essential component of the teaching and learning process (Haroud & Saqri, 2025).

Integrating GenAI into education requires differentiated instructional design that takes into account students' educational levels, degrees of autonomy, and cognitive needs. The literature documents a wide range of educational applications of GenAI. For example, a systematic review of 407 publications by Yusuf et al. (2024) highlights its versatility across diverse educational contexts. Nevertheless, integrating GenAI into classroom practice also requires adapting teaching tasks and strengthening teachers' professional competencies. In this regard, a systematic review of teacher training emphasizes the importance of ongoing professional development and pedagogical adaptation to help teachers guide students toward the responsible use of GenAI. These efforts are essential to ensure effective teacher mediation that

responds to the specific demands of each learning environment.

The adoption of GenAI in Latin American higher education institutions has progressed unevenly. Faculty members often experiment with these tools individually, while institutional governance policies remain limited (Valentini, 2026). This situation raises concerns about academic integrity, ethical issues, insufficient faculty training, and the possibility that inappropriate use of GenAI may undermine students' intellectual autonomy and critical thinking skills.

Ongoing professional development and the adaptation of pedagogical strategies are therefore essential to help teachers promote the responsible use of GenAI and provide guidance that responds to the needs of their learning environments. Against this backdrop, understanding faculty members' perceptions of GenAI's usefulness, the factors that facilitate its adoption, and the main challenges they encounter when incorporating these tools into their academic practice is essential. Although scholarly interest in GenAI in higher education has grown considerably (Bobula, 2024), further research is needed to deepen our understanding of faculty perceptions, particularly regarding the perceived usefulness of these tools, the conditions that shape their adoption, and the challenges associated with their pedagogical integration.

In Mexico, the technological university system represents a distinctive higher education context in which the integration of GenAI into teaching and learning warrants further investigation. This system is characterized by a competency-based educational model that emphasizes hands-on learning and close alignment with the needs of the productive sector (Secretaría de Educación Pública. [SEP], n.d.; Aguilar-Barceló & Mungaray-Moctezuma, 2019). Research on the integration of GenAI into Mexican higher education has primarily focused on conventional universities, leaving technological universities comparatively underexplored. This research gap is particularly relevant because their vocational orientation and competency-based approach may give rise to specific pedagogical needs and distinctive conditions for technology adoption.

The state of Sonora, Mexico, is home to six technological universities. This context highlights the need for empirical research on the integration of GenAI into technological higher education, focusing on faculty perceptions, the perceived educational value of these tools, training needs, and the ethical and regulatory implications of their use. Against this backdrop, the present study examines English instructors' perceptions of the use of GenAI in their teaching practice at the Technological University of Southern Sonora, located in Ciudad Obregón, Sonora, Mexico. These instructors teach students enrolled in both Técnico Superior Universitario (TSU; Higher University Technician) and bachelor's degree programs. The study was guided by the following research question: How do English instructors at the Technological University of Southern Sonora perceive the use of GenAI as a pedagogical support tool?

Accordingly, this study aimed to analyze instructors' perceptions across four dimensions: current adoption and use, perceived pedagogical utility, instructor training and readiness, and ethical and regulatory concerns.

2. Method

Methodological Design and Participants. The study adopted a quantitative approach with a descriptive and correlational scope and employed a non-experimental, cross-sectional design. The study population comprised nine faculty members who teach English courses at the Technological University of Southern Sonora (N = 9). A census sampling approach was used, whereby all members of the target population were invited to participate in the study.

Research Instrument and Operationalization of Variables. Data were collected using a structured, 21-item questionnaire developed specifically for this study and organized around four theoretical dimensions: D1, Adoption and Current Use; D2, Perceived Pedagogical Utility; D3, Teacher Training and Attitudes; and D4, Ethical and Regulatory Concerns. Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). To ensure consistent score interpretation, the negatively worded item P15 ("Avoid using GenAI in class") was reverse-coded using the following formula: P15R = 6 - P15, where P15R represents the recoded score and P15 the original response. Content validity was assessed through a review of the specialized literature and a qualitative pilot study focused on the clarity, readability, and comprehensibility of the items.

Reliability Assessment. The internal consistency of the questionnaire administered to English teachers at the Technological University of Southern Sonora (N = 9) was assessed using Cronbach's alpha (α). The overall coefficient was 0.954, indicating excellent internal consistency in the sample studied. The coefficients for the individual dimensions ranged from 0.841 to 0.938. These results provide preliminary evidence of the instrument's internal consistency for the diagnostic purposes of this study. However, given the small sample size, the reliability estimates should be interpreted cautiously and do not, in themselves, establish the instrument's factorial validity or its generalizability to other teaching populations.

Data Processing and Statistical Analysis. The Shapiro-Wilk test was used to assess the normality of the data distributions. Given the small sample size and the evidence of non-normality for some variables ($p < 0.05$), nonparametric statistical procedures were prioritized. Responses were summarized using the median (Md) and interquartile range (IQR), while the mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) were calculated as supplementary descriptive measures. The internal consistency of the instrument was assessed using Cronbach's alpha (α) for both the overall questionnaire and its individual dimensions. Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (ρ) was used to examine associations between dimensions, while the Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used to assess differences between paired scores. A significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ was established for all inferential analyses.

It is worth noting that, given the sample size (N = 9) and the presence of ties resulting from the Likert scale, nonparametric inferential analyses were performed using specific procedures to account for tied ranks and zero differences. In the Wilcoxon signed-rank test, tied ranks were assigned average ranks, whereas zero differences ($d_i = 0$) were handled by excluding zero-difference pairs (the classical Wil-

coxon method). *p*-values were calculated using the asymptotic approximation with continuity correction. For Spearman's rank correlation coefficient, tied observations were assigned average ranks, and statistical significance was assessed using the asymptotic approximation based on the Student's t-distribution. To analyze the overall questionnaire, the total score was calculated as the unweighted arithmetic mean of all 21 items, after reverse-coding item P15. This calculation is mathematically equivalent to a weighted average of the four dimension scores, with weights proportional to the number of items in each dimension (D1 = 5, D2 = 6, D3 = 4, and D4 = 6).

Ethical Considerations. This study adhered to the principles of voluntary participation, anonymity, and confidentiality. All participating teachers provided informed consent before completing the questionnaire and were informed that the data collected would be used exclusively for academic and research purposes. Measures were taken to protect participants' identities and ensure the responsible handling of their responses.

3. Results

This section presents the results obtained from a 21-item questionnaire administered to nine English instructors at the Technological University of Southern Sonora. The internal consistency of the instrument was assessed by calculating Cronbach's alpha (α) for the overall questionnaire and each of its four dimensions.

Table 1 summarizes the descriptive statistics and internal consistency coefficients for the overall questionnaire and its individual dimensions. The overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient was α = 0.954, indicating excellent internal consistency in the sample studied. The coefficients for the individual dimensions ranged from 0.841 to 0.938, suggesting high internal consistency among the items within each dimension.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and internal consistency by dimension.

Dimension evaluated	Dimension evaluated	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)	Median (Md)	Interquartile Range (IQR)	Cronbach's alpha (α)
D1 (Adoption and Current Use)	P1, P13, P15	3.96	0.86	3.11	0.95	0.911
D2 (Perceived educational value)	P2, P3, P4, P7	4.17	0.86	4.12	0.70	0.841
D3 (Training and Teaching Skills)	P5, P6, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P14	4.00	0.81	4.30	0.75	0.938
D4 (Ethical and Regulatory Concerns)	P16, P17, P18, P19, P20, P21	3.83	0.53	4.00	0.50	0.844
Global Scale: Complete Questionnaire	P1-P21	3.98	0.62	4.12	0.60	0.954

Note: N = 9, M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; Md = Median; IQR = Interquartile Range; a = Cronbach's alpha. The dimensions group the corresponding questionnaire items into an ordinal scale ranging from 1 to 5. The overall mean for the scale (M = 3.98) corresponds to the weighted mean calculated from all 21 items on the instrument (N = 9), taking into account the recoding of the reverse-scored item P15.

Table 2 presents the items with representative faculty ratings, including the percentage of agreement (the sum of responses in categories 4 and 5 on the Likert scale) and the results of the Shapiro-Wilk normality test ($p < 0.05$). Table A1 lists the 21 items on the questionnaire.

Table 2. Key items.

Featured Item	Dimension	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)	% Agreement (4 and 5)	Shapiro-Wilk (p-value)
P20. Teaching the Ethical and Responsible Use of GenAI	D4	4.78	0.67	88.9%	$p < 0.001$
P6. I'm interested in receiving training on how to incorporate AI into my classes.	D3	4.67	0.71	88.9%	$p < 0.001$
P3. I think AI could help design more engaging educational materials.	D2	4.33	1.32	88.9%	$p < 0.001$
P4. I think AI could reduce the time needed to plan lessons.	D2	4.11	0.78	77.78%	$p = 0.012$
P10. I feel ready to incorporate AI tools into my classes.	D3	3.78	0.83	55.6%	$p = 0.025$
P15. I prefer to avoid using artificial intelligence tools in my classes, even if they are available.	D1	4.33	0.71	0.0%	$p = 0.023$

Note: The agreement percentage combines the "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" responses. For the reverse-scored item P15, the mean shown corresponds to its original value before recoding. Of the total population (N = 9), 88.9% equals 8 teachers and 55.6% equals 5 teachers. The probability values correspond to the Shapiro-Wilk normality test.

Finally, using an exploratory approach, Spearman's correlation analysis (r) and rank comparisons using the Wilcoxon test (W) were conducted among the different dimensions of the questionnaire. The results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Spearman's correlation matrix and Wilcoxon hypothesis test.

Comparison/ Relationship between dimensions	Spearman's correlation coefficient (ρ)	p-value (ρ)	Wilcoxon Statistic (W)	p-value (W)	Statistical Conclusion (α = 0.05)
D2 (Utility) ↔ D1 (Adoption)	0.803	0.009	39.0	0.027	A strong positive correlation and a significant D2 > D1.
D3 (Training) ↔ D2 (Utility)	0.856	0.003	31.5	0.041	Very strong positive correlation.
D3 (Training) ↔ D1 (Adoption)	0.513	0.158	35.0	0.009	D3 > D1: A statistically significant difference between the overall dimensions, reflecting the high priority assigned to training in contrast to the current level of adoption.
D4 (Ethics) ↔ D1 (Adoption)	0.042	0.915	29.0	0.248	An ethical concern regardless of the level of adoption.

Note: N = 9; r = Spearman's correlation coefficient; W = Wilcoxon signed-rank test statistic. Comparisons were evaluated at a significance level of α = 0.05.

4. Discussion

The results of this study provide insights into the implementation of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) among faculty members teaching English courses at the Technological University of Southern Sonora. An overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient of $\alpha = 0.954$ was obtained, indicating excellent internal consistency of the instrument and supporting its reliability for diagnostic purposes. However, given the small sample size (N = 9), these findings should be interpreted as exploratory.

One notable finding was the discrepancy between the perceived pedagogical utility of GenAI (M = 4.17) and its adoption in teaching activities (M = 3.96). This difference was statistically significant (W = 39.0, $p = 0.027$), suggesting that recognizing the potential of GenAI in education does not necessarily translate into its incorporation into teaching practice. This finding is consistent with Bobula's (2024) assertion that opportunities for personalization and instructional support may be constrained by the lack of conceptual frameworks or by operational barriers. A strong positive correlation was also observed between the two dimensions (r = 0.803, $p = 0.009$). This association is consistent with the possibility that a favorable assessment of specific applications, such as the development of engaging instructional materials, may facilitate their gradual adoption in the classroom. This application was assessed using item P3 (M = 4.33), for which 8 of the 9 teachers reported agreeing or strongly agreeing.

The "Training and Teaching Readiness" dimension (D3) obtained the highest mean score (M = 4.00). This finding reflects English teachers' interest in acquiring and strengthening their digital competencies (item P6: M = 4.67, with 88.9% of respondents, eight teachers, agreeing or strongly agreeing). In addition, the Wilcoxon signed-rank test revealed statistically significant differences between the training and adoption dimensions (W = 35.0, $p = 0.009$). At the item level, the results showed that, although interest in receiving training was very high (item P6: M = 4.67; 88.9% agreement), respondents' perceptions of their current preparedness were more moderate (item P10: M = 3.78; only 55.6% considered themselves prepared). Rather than simply comparing two multidimensional constructs, these findings highlight a substantial gap between faculty members' strong interest in receiving training and their self-perceived competencies. This discrepancy suggests that the Technological University of Southern Sonora should develop targeted faculty training strategies, in line with the recommendations of Haroud and Saqri (2025).

The Ethical and Regulatory Concerns dimension (D4) received a relatively high mean score (M = 3.83). Within this dimension, item P20 stood out, with 88.9% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement concerning the ethical and responsible use of GenAI by faculty members.

No statistically significant correlation was found between ethical concerns and current GenAI adoption and use (r = 0.042, $p = 0.915$). This result indicates that no statistically significant monotonic association was detected between the two

variables in this sample. Thus, greater awareness of the ethical risks associated with GenAI does not necessarily correspond to a lower willingness to use it. This finding is consistent with the arguments presented by Bittle and El-Gayar (2025) and Xia et al. (2024), who emphasize that challenges such as plagiarism call for changes in assessment strategies and the establishment of clear institutional guidelines rather than outright bans on the technology. This trend is also reflected in item P15 (Avoiding the use of generative AI in the classroom), for which no participant expressed support for completely prohibiting or avoiding the use of these tools in teaching (0.0%). Rather than favoring restrictions on technological use, these findings are consistent with those reported by Bittle and El-Gayar (2025) and Xia et al. (2024), who argue that challenges related to academic integrity call for a transformation of teaching and assessment strategies, together with the establishment of clear institutional guidelines, rather than outright restrictions on the use of generative AI in the classroom.

Given the competency-based orientation of the educational model adopted by Mexico's Technological Universities, which emphasizes competency development and links with the productive sector (Secretaría de Educación Pública, n.d.; Aguilar-Barceló & Mungaray-Moctezuma, 2019), the use of GenAI should extend beyond routine, instrumental applications. In English language teaching, GenAI should be used to foster critical thinking, support meaningful human interaction, and promote student autonomy, while remaining a complementary resource guided by clearly defined pedagogical objectives. This perspective is consistent with the findings reported by Hashim et al. (2024) and Wan and Moorhouse (2024) regarding the pedagogical integration of GenAI.

5. Conclusion

An analysis of the perceptions of English language teachers at the Technological University of Southern Sonora (N = 9) indicates an overall favorable attitude toward the pedagogical integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI). Teachers perceive these tools as potentially valuable resources for enhancing various educational activities, particularly the development of interactive materials (P3: M = 4.33) and lesson planning (P4: M = 4.11). These findings position GenAI as a potentially strategic resource for promoting educational practices aligned with the principles of Education 4.0 and 5.0. However, the results also reveal a statistically significant difference between the perceived pedagogical utility of GenAI (M = 4.17) and its level of classroom adoption (M = 3.96; $p = 0.027$). This gap is further evidenced by the statistically significant difference between the overall training and adoption dimensions ($p = 0.009$), as well as by the contrast between the high perceived need for training (M = 4.00) and the proportion of teachers who consider themselves adequately prepared to integrate these technologies into their teaching practices (55.6%). Consequently, the strong perceived need for training, together with the interest expressed by 88.9% of teachers in receiving professional development (item P6), suggests favorable conditions for implement-

ing an institutional strategy for continuing professional development.

Regarding ethical considerations, concerns about academic dishonesty, privacy, and technological dependence received a relatively high mean score (M = 3.83). However, no statistically significant correlation was detected between ethical concerns and current GenAI adoption and use (r = 0.042, p = 0.915). This finding suggests that ethical concerns do not necessarily preclude the adoption of GenAI, although the small sample size limits the generalizability of this result. Notably, 88.9% of participants recognized the importance of guiding students toward the ethical and responsible use of GenAI.

Consequently, the Technological University of Southern Sonora faces the challenge of transforming the individual and exploratory use of these tools into a structured institutional strategy. To this end, three actions are recommended. First, establish clear institutional guidelines for the use of GenAI, learning assessment, academic integrity, and data protection, prioritizing responsible governance over outright prohibition. Second, implement ongoing faculty development programs focused on digital literacy, the design of AI-assisted learning activities, authentic assessment, and the development of competencies for the critical use of these technologies. Third, promote longitudinal studies and intervention-based research to determine whether the systematic integration of AI-assisted learning produces sustained improvements in students' language proficiency, autonomy, and learning outcomes.

In summary, the main institutional opportunity lies not only in expanding access to GenAI tools but also in strengthening faculty competencies and establishing the pedagogical and ethical frameworks needed to use these technologies in relevant, critical, and responsible ways.

An analysis of teachers' perceptions of the use of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in the classroom provides a basis for proposing the following recommendations for the Technological University of Southern Sonora:

Establish institutional policies for the responsible use of GenAI: Develop clear guidelines addressing digital literacy, the design of AI-assisted learning activities, and the development of competencies for the critical and responsible use of these technologies.

Promote follow-up research and evaluation: Conduct longitudinal studies and intervention-based research to determine whether the systematic integration of GenAI leads to sustained improvements in students' language proficiency and to identify the pedagogical conditions that support such outcomes.

Strengthen ongoing faculty professional development: Implement continuing professional development programs that enhance digital literacy, the design and planning of GenAI-supported instructional activities, and teachers' ability to critically assess the potential and limitations of these technologies.

Limitations. This study is limited to nine English language teachers at a single institution and employs a census-based, cross-sectional design. These characteristics limit the generalizability of the findings and the precision and stability of the

statistical estimates. Furthermore, reliance on self-reported data may introduce response bias, and the reported perceptions do not necessarily reflect actual classroom practices or measurable learning outcomes. Finally, the instrument requires further psychometric validation using larger and more diverse samples.

Acknowledgements

The authors of this paper would like to thank the administration of the Technological University of Southern Sonora, the National Technological Institute of Mexico/Cajeme Higher Technological Institute, and La Salle Noroeste University for their assistance in conducting this research.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, Zulema Gaytán and Juan C. Brindis; methodology, Zulema Gaytán. and Alex Corral; software, Adrián Sepúlveda and Eusebio Jiménez; validation, Laura O. Valdez and Yadira Beltrán; formal analysis, Zulema Gaytán and Eusebio Jiménez; investigation, Laura O. Amavica and Juan C. Brindis; resources, Adrián Sepúlveda and Yadira Beltrán; writing, Zulema Gaytán and Eusebio Jiménez; writing, Zulema Gaytán and Alex Corral; project administration, Zulema Gaytán; funding acquisition, Eusebio Jiménez and Juan C. Brindis. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

Aguilar-Barceló, J.-G., & Mungaray-Moctezuma, A. -B. (2019). La empleabilidad de los egresados de las universidades tecnológicas en México: Un análisis de eficiencia. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación Superior, 10,* 3-24. https://doi.org/10.22201/iisue.20072872e.2019.29.520

Bittle, K., & El-Gayar, O. (2025). Generative AI and Academic Integrity in Higher Education: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda. *Information, 16,* Article 296. https://doi.org/10.3390/info16040296

Bobula, M. (2024). Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Higher Education: A Comprehensive Review of Challenges, Opportunities, and Implications. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education, No. 30,* 1-18. https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.vi30.1137

Haroud, S., & Saqri, N. (2025). Generative AI in Higher Education: Teachers' and Students' Perspectives on Support, Replacement, and Digital Literacy. *Education Sciences, 15,* Article 396. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15040396

Hashim, M. A. M., Mason-Jones, R., Ndrecaj, V., Tlemsani, I., & Matthews, R. (2024). Higher Education via the Lens of Industry 5.0: Strategy and Perspective. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open, 9,* Article 100828. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.100828

Jiménez, E., Palomares, J.E., López, O., Muñoz, F., García, L.A., Castro, J.G. (2026). The Evolution of Mechatronics Engineering and Its Relationship with Industry 3.0, 4.0, and 5.0. *Technologies, 14,* Article 81. https://doi.org/10.3390/technologies14020081

Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F. et al. (2023). ChatGPT for Good? On Opportunities and Challenges of Large Language Models for Education. *Learning and Individual Differences, 103,* Article 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Lee, S., Jeon, J., McKinley, J., & Rose, H. (2025). Generative AI and English Language Teaching: A Global Englishes Perspective. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 45,* 85-108. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190525100184

Moorhouse, B. L. (2024). Generative AI Tools and the English Language Classroom: Affordances, Risks, and Pedagogical Implications. *RELC Journal, 55,* 376-387.

Secretaría de Educación Pública (s. f.). *Dirección General de Universidades Tecnológicas y Politécnicas*. https://dgutyp.sep.gob.mx/

Valentini, A. (2026). *La implementación de la IA en la educación superior en América Latina y el Caribe* (Documento de trabajo n.º 16). Instituto Internacional de la UNESCO para la Educación Superior en América Latina y el Caribe (UNESCO IESALC).

Wan, Y., & Moorhouse, B. L. (2024). Using Call Annie as a Generative Artificial Intelligence Speaking Partner for Language Learners. *RELC Journal, 56,* 489-498. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231224813

Xia, Q., Weng, X., Ouyang, F., Lin, T. J., & Chiu, T. K. F. (2024). A Scoping Review on How Generative Artificial Intelligence Transforms Assessment in Higher Education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21,* Article 40. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00468-z

Yusuf, A., Pervin, N., Román-González, M., & Noor, N. M. (2024). Generative AI in Education and Research: A Systematic Mapping Review. *Review of Education, 12,* e3489. https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3489

Appendix

Table A1. All of the reagents.

Featured Item	Dimension	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)	% Agreement (4 and 5)	Shapiro-Wilk (p-value)
P1. How often do you use artificial intelligence tools (such as ChatGPT, Gemini, Copilot, Perplexity, and Claude) to support your teaching practice?	D1	3.67	0.71	77.78%	$p < 0.0001$
P2. I believe that AI could improve the quality of English language instruction.	D2	4.11	0.93	88.89%	$p = 0.0071$
P3. I think AI could help design more engaging educational materials.	D2	4.33	1.32	88.9%	$p < 0.001$
P4. I think AI could reduce the time needed to plan lessons.	D2	4.11	0.78	77.8%	$p = 0.012$
P5. I believe that learning to use artificial intelligence tools would be beneficial for my teaching practice.	D3	4.33	0.71	88.89%	$p = 0.0235$
P6. I'm interested in receiving training on how to incorporate AI into my classes.	D3	4.67	0.71	88.9%	$p < 0.001$
P7. I believe that AI could help improve my students' learning.	D2	4.11	0.78	77.78%	$p = 0.0548$
P8. Even if I received training, I believe that AI would be of very little use in my teaching practice.	D3	1.89	1.05	11.11%	$p = 0.0391$
P9. I am interested in learning new AI tools for my teaching practice.	D3	4.44	0.73	88.89%	$p = 0.0077$
P10. I feel ready to incorporate AI tools into my classes.	D3	3.78	0.83	55.56%	$p = 0.0254$
P.11 I believe that training in AI would improve my teaching performance.	D3	4.44	0.73	88.89%	$p = 0.0077$
P.12. I am willing to modify my teaching strategies to incorporate AI.	D3	4.33	1.00	88.89%	$p = 0.0019$
P13. I use AI tools to support my teaching activities.	D1	3.89	1.17	88.89%	$p = 0.0005$
P14. I would recommend that other teachers use AI tools.	D3	4.11	1.27	88.89%	$p = 0.0010$
P15. I prefer to avoid using artificial intelligence tools in my classes, even if they are available.	D1	1.67	0.71	0.0%	$p = 0.023$
P16. I'm concerned that students are relying too heavily on AI.	D4	4.22	0.83	77.78%	$p = 0.0254$
P17. Institutional policies must be established to regulate the use of AI.	D4	3.89	1.05	66.67%	$p = 0.1942$
P18. AI can encourage academic dishonesty if it is not properly monitored.	D4	3.56	1.13	55.56%	$p = 0.2485$
P19. The protection of personal data must be taken into account when using AI tools.	D4	4.22	0.97	88.89%	$p = 0.0057$
P20. Teaching the Ethical and Responsible Use of GenAI.	D4	4.78	0.67	88.9%	$p < 0.001$
P21. I do not believe it is necessary to establish standards or criteria for the use of AI in English language instruction.	D4	2.33	1.32	22.22%	$p = 0.0161$