Journal of Languages & Translation
P-ISSN: 2716-9359 E-ISSN: 2773-3505
Special Issue December 2025 pp.01-14

Digital Doppelgängers: Navigating Identity, Ethics, and Voice in the Age of AI Personas

Ines Zahra GAFOUR[1]
University of Oran 2 – Mohamed Ben Ahmed-Algeria
gafour.inesszahra@univ-oran2.dz
0009-0009-8994-4043

Youcef CHEHRI[2]
University of Mustapha Stambouli of Mascara – Algeria
youcef.chehri@univ-mascara.dz
0009-0002-9051-9262

Received: *02/06/2025*	***Accepted:*** *08/11/2025*	***Published:*** *01/12/2025*

Abstract

In an era increasingly shaped by algorithmic agency and synthetic expression, the emergence of AI-generated personas presents a significant challenge to established understandings of authorship, identity, and pedagogical ethics. This paper explores the implications of artificial voice simulation within English Language Teaching (ELT) and English Language Learning (ELL) contexts. where questions of voice, agency, and authenticity are central to both instruction and learner development. Grounded in interdisciplinary perspectives from critical pedagogy, digital ethics, and posthumanist thought, the study interrogates how AI personas complicate traditional relationships between learners, teachers, and text, particularly, learner agency, authenticity, and voice construction. By situating these concerns within contemporary classroom practices, ranging from communicative language classrooms to digitally mediated and safe learning environments, the paper argues that educational technologies cannot be regarded as neutral or merely supportive tools. Instead, they function as active agents that shape how knowledge is produced, how identity is negotiated, and how authorship is constructed and distributed among human and non-human participants. Therefore, the analysis highlights emerging tensions surrounding learner autonomy, the authenticity of linguistic expression, and the ethical boundaries of using simulated voices in instructional settings. Ultimately, the study advocates for a pedagogical paradigm that is both critically responsive and active to these technological shifts and ethically attuned to their broader cultural implications. It calls for an approach that goes hand in hand with ELT and ELL which recognises AI's transformative potential while foregrounding the protection of learning agency, the integrity of human voice, and the need for transparent, reflective engagement with rapidly evolving digital realities.

Keywords: AI Personas; Digital Pedagogy; Authorship; Posthumanism; Learner Identity.

[1] Corresponding author: Ines Zahra GAFOUR/ z.gafour98@univ-chlef.dz

Introduction

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence in the twenty-first century has significantly transformed the processes through which knowledge is generated, disseminated, and internalized. Intelligent technologies, such as adaptive learning systems and AI-driven writing applications, have evolved beyond their role as passive tools to become active agents in shaping educational methodologies, linguistic practices, and the construction of epistemic authority. Within the fields of English Language Teaching (ELT) and Learning (ELL), the introduction of AI-generated personas (synthetic agents capable of simulating dialogue, responding to queries, and producing coherent, human-like text) presents both unprecedented opportunities and profound challenges. These digital entities, which function as conversational partners, tutors, or even co-authors, destabilize foundational concepts such as authorship, voice, and learner identity, particularly within contexts where linguistic performance is central to academic and social self-construction

As these AI personas infiltrate classroom spaces, the boundaries between the human and the machinic begin to blur, provoking philosophical and pedagogical inquiry into the nature of authorship, originality, and ethical engagement. What does it mean to learn, or to express oneself, when machines can convincingly simulate cognition, empathy, and creativity? How does the presence of AI interlocutors shape the learner's sense of authorship, autonomy, and intellectual responsibility? These are not merely abstract questions; they are materially situated in the daily practices of writing, speaking, and interacting in increasingly digitized learning environments. The concept of "authentic voice," once grounded in the singularity of human experience, now demands reconsideration in light of the algorithmic duplication of tone, register, and rhetorical sophistication.

These developments intersect with broader posthumanist discourses, which critique humanist assumptions of bounded, rational subjects and instead theorize identity as distributed across networks of technology, culture, and code (Bayne, 2015). Within this framework, AI personas are not simply tools; they are discursive agents that mediate and co-construct meaning. Their presence in educational settings, therefore, raises critical questions not only about academic integrity and plagiarism but about the ethics of knowledge production in an age of synthetic cognition.

This research addresses the urgent pedagogical and philosophical challenges by examining the impact of AI-generated personas on student identity and ethical engagement in university-level English Language Teaching (ELT) classrooms. Specifically, it investigates how learners and educators negotiate the shifting contours of authenticity, authorship, and agency in a post-digital era. Drawing on a mixed-methods approach (qualitative + interpretative content analysis) and data gathered from students and teachers at the University of Abdelhamid Ibn Badis of Mostaganem, this study seeks to illuminate the effective, ethical, and cognitive dimensions of engaging with AI in language learning. Rather than offering deterministic evaluations, it situates these technologies within a critical pedagogical framework, one that calls for the cultivation of both technological fluency and humanistic discernment. In doing so, it contributes to a growing body of scholarship concerned with the implications of AI for subject formation, educational ethics, and the evolving ecology of the classroom.

1. Literature Review

1.1. Artificial Intelligence and the Shifting Landscape of Educational Technology

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into education has profoundly recalibrated pedagogical paradigms, particularly within the domains of English Language Teaching (ELT) and Learning (ELL). AI-driven applications, such as intelligent tutoring systems, voice simulators, and conversational agents, now permeate language instruction, facilitating differentiated learning, fostering learner autonomy, and, most notably, enabling instantaneous feedback. An important dimension of AI's educational utility is its effectiveness in bridging the feedback gap that has long challenged language classrooms, where tailored, immediate responses address both cognitive needs and individual learning

trajectories. This development reflects a paradigmatic shift in how instructional support is conceptualized, moving from static, teacher-led correction to dynamic, learner-responsive mediation.

Moreover, Feedback, a long-established cornerstone of effective language acquisition, remains indispensable in the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction. EFL learners often exhibit a persistent need for evaluative feedback as they navigate the complexities of linguistic competence and strive for higher standards of performance (Bransford et al., 2000). Empirical studies affirm that both written and oral feedback serve not only corrective and instructional purposes but also exert motivational force, sustaining engagement and advancing proficiency, particularly in writing (Yu & Xu, 2021).

Ni and Xu (2025) further underscore the pedagogical interplay between cognition and emotion, arguing that written corrective feedback (WCF) catalyzes positive affective responses and measurable gains in proficiency. Although an overemphasis on accuracy may sometimes result in counterproductive perfectionism, such tendencies often reflect learners' internalized high standards and commitment to mastery. Within this framework, AI-facilitated feedback assumes a dual role: as a cognitive scaffold and an affective regulator, potentially redefining the feedback culture in EFL learning environments.

While early discourses lauded AI innovations for their efficiency and adaptability, recent scholarship has adopted a more critical perspective, emphasizing the ethical, pedagogical, and epistemological challenges posed by AI in educational settings (Selwyn, 2019; Holmes et al., 2019; Williamson & Eynon, 2020). In the realm of AI-driven voice simulation, these concerns are especially pertinent. Traditionally, the concept of "voice" in language learning extends beyond mere phonetics to encompass aspects of identity, self-expression, and ownership (Canagarajah, 2002). However, when learners interact with algorithmically generated voices, these foundational dimensions become destabilized, raising pressing questions about authenticity, authorship, and the role of human subjectivity in communicative acts.

1.2. The Crisis of Authorship and Intellectual Authenticity in the Age of AI Personas

An "AI persona" refers to a simulated identity or role assigned to an artificial intelligence system, designed to emulate specific human traits, expertise, or perspectives, allowing users to interact with the AI as though it were a real person performing a defined role (Benharrak et al., 2024). These personas come in varied forms, such as *Expert Personas* (e.g., "History Professor" or "PhD Advisor"), *Real Individual Personas* modeled after familiar figures, *Publication Role Personas* like "Reviewer" or "Editor," and *Critical or Strict Personas*, such as the "mean reviewer" used to challenge writers' critical thinking and style.

To better illustrate how an AI persona can shape style and tone, consider the following comparison between a neutral AI and a literary persona:

Table 1: AI (ChatGpt) Without Persona vs. AI With Literary Persona ("Elena")

Aspect	AI Without Persona	AI With Literary Persona: Elena, Literary Author & Critic
Response Style	Neutral, technical	Evocative, reflective, personal
Tone	Direct, academic	Warm, introspective, elegant
Response	*"To enhance emotional depth in your story, focus on character development and consistent tone. Use internal monologue and descriptive language to convey emotion. Readers should be able to relate to the characters' motivations and conflicts."*	*"Ah, emotional depth – that elusive thread that binds reader to character. To truly reach into the reader's chest, you must first dwell in your character's soul. Ask not only what your protagonist feels, but why they can't say it aloud. Let silence speak. Let a glance carry weight. And above all, don't rush – sorrow lingers, joy flutters. Let your language breathe."*

This contrast reveals how AI personas not only simulate expertise but also convey distinct rhetorical identities, making them powerful tools for stylistic experimentation and audience adaptation in writing.

The use of AI personas provides English language learners with a suite of powerful tools, ranging from natural language processing and real-time feedback to dialogue simulation and customized content generation. These tools can replicate stylistic nuances, simulate personality traits, and align with specific discursive identities, thereby enabling learners to compose texts tailored to particular audiences or rhetorical purposes. Whether functioning as conversational partners, instructional tutors, critical reviewers, or even co-authors, these personas offer an unprecedented level of accessibility and adaptability. For many learners, especially in EFL contexts, the ability to manipulate AI outputs opens vast possibilities for experimentation and learning.

However, this ease of use comes with critical implications. As AI personas become embedded in educational routines, a form of cognitive and linguistic co-dependency may emerge. Learners who rely on AI to simulate voice, argumentation, and structure may find themselves distanced from their own developing authorial identities. This growing reliance raises significant concerns about voice erosion, authenticity, and the ownership of language, fundamental pillars of language learning (Cotton et al., 2024). The promise of democratized access to academic discourse must be weighed against the potential risk of homogenized expression and diminished critical autonomy.

These shifts do not affect learners alone; they reverberate through the teaching profession. In the context of ELT, teachers may view the proliferation of AI personas and generative technologies as a threat to their roles, fearing that machines could assume instructional tasks, provide feedback, and undermine the need for human mediation. However, such a perspective risks overlooking the pedagogical opportunities AI might offer. Zhai (2024) challenges this techno-pessimistic view by asserting:

> GenAI is unlikely to replace teachers; instead, it plays a crucial role as an instructional companion to assist teachers in all aspects of instruction. Teachers' perceptions of GenAI thus directly impact their acceptance, which, together with their knowledge of GenAI, further influences how effectively GenAI is integrated into the classroom and shapes the broader impact it has on teaching and learning (p. 5).

This insight suggests that educators who embrace AI personas as pedagogical collaborators, rather than competitors, are better positioned to co-construct meaningful learning environments. Similarly, this logic can be extended to how teachers approach learners' use of AI personas in the writing and language acquisition process. Rather than prohibiting their use outright, teachers might shift the focus toward deconstructing these personas, fostering critical engagement, and leveraging them as tools for skill development.

Collie and Martin (2024) argue that the successful integration of AI tools depends not only on institutional support but also on teachers' professional agency. Their study emphasizes that autonomy-supportive leadership and attention to teachers' stress and professional growth are essential for navigating change in the age of AI. In this sense, educators who actively engage with AI technologies, especially those involving personas, can guide learners to reflect on their linguistic choices, develop rhetorical awareness, and reclaim intellectual ownership of their work.

1.3. Reconfiguring Identity and Agency: A Posthumanist View of AI in ELT

The advent of AI in English Language Teaching (ELT) marks a paradigm shift that extends beyond pedagogical innovation; it invites a reconsideration of the very nature of subjectivity, authorship, and educational agency. Posthumanist theory, which challenges Enlightenment-era notions of the autonomous, rational human subject, offers a critical lens through which to examine these shifts. Rather than viewing technology as an external tool used by human agents, posthumanism emphasizes the entangled relationships between human and nonhuman actors, including algorithms, interfaces, and AI systems (Braidotti, 2013; Hayles, 1999).

In this framework, identity is not a fixed essence, but a process continuously negotiated across hybrid human-machine networks. Learners interacting with AI-generated content are no longer merely recipients of knowledge; they co-construct meaning with intelligent systems that respond, reshape, and even anticipate their discursive choices. This co-authorship challenges conventional educational binaries (such as teacher-learner, active-passive, or human-machine) and demands a reassessment of what it means to possess a voice in the digital classroom (Bayne, 2016).

The integration of AI personas, particularly in writing, reading, and dialogic tasks, is emblematic of this posthuman condition. These systems do not simply support language acquisition; they participate in the formation of linguistic identity itself. For example, a student composing an argumentative essay with the guidance of an AI "critical reviewer" is engaging with a nonhuman interlocutor whose suggestions shape the rhetoric, structure, and tone of the final product. This form of co-production reframes authorship as a distributed act and complicates traditional metrics of originality, creativity, and ownership.

From a posthumanist perspective, such interactions are not threats to human agency but reconfigurations of it. Agency, in this context, is not lost but reassembled across socio-technical assemblages (Barad, 2007). Learners who understand how to navigate these assemblages (by strategically using AI, questioning its assumptions, and critically integrating its feedback) can emerge with a heightened sense of rhetorical awareness and autonomy. The key challenge, then, is not technological dependency but critical integration.

For educators, this view calls for a shift from knowledge transmission to facilitation of ethical engagement with intelligent systems. Teachers must help students develop what Bayne (2018) calls *post-digital literacies* skills that go beyond digital competence to include critical awareness of how technologies mediate meaning, agency, and identity. In this view, teaching with AI becomes an act of choreography: guiding learners to move fluently between human expression and algorithmic suggestion without collapsing into either.

Furthermore, the posthumanist approach does not seek to displace the human from the educational equation but to decentralize it and to acknowledge that meaning, learning, and identity are increasingly the products of dynamic human-machine entanglements. In ELT contexts, this reframing opens the possibility for new pedagogical models, where voice is not merely defended against machines but reimagined through them.

1.4. Ethical Concerns and the Need for Critical Digital Pedagogy

The integration of AI-generated content and synthetic personas into English Language Teaching (ELT) brings forth a range of ethical considerations that extend beyond concerns of privacy and data security. As these technologies increasingly shape learners' writing practices, communicative habits, and perceived voices, it becomes essential to scrutinize how algorithmic systems mediate authorship, agency, and representation (Selwyn, 2019; Noble, 2018). The question is no longer just about how learners use technology, but how technology uses learners, shaping the limits of their expression through systems designed with embedded norms and potentially opaque biases.

Critical digital pedagogy, as advocated by Morris and Stommel (2018), argues for a reorientation of educational technology use: one that prioritizes learner agency, transparency, and ethical reflexivity over seamless automation and productivity. In this light, the classroom must become not a site of passive technological adoption, but one of interrogation and resistance, where students are empowered to question the assumptions behind the tools they use. This includes examining who constructs the AI personas, whose knowledge is prioritized, and what types of linguistic or cultural expression are encouraged or suppressed by algorithmic mediation.

Biesta (2006) emphasizes the ethical dimensions of education, framing pedagogy as a deeply political act that must resist instrumentalist models of learning. Applied to AI in ELT, this perspective demands that educators move beyond efficiency-based metrics to foreground the purpose and consequences of digital mediation. Learners must be guided not only to use AI responsibly but to

engage in critical reflection on how their voices are shaped, mimicked, or overwritten by generative systems.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

This study adopts a mixed-methods research design, primarily grounded in qualitative inquiry and supplemented by interpretative content analysis. The approach is suited to exploring how participants interpret, internalize, and negotiate the presence of AI-generated personas within English Language Teaching (ELT) contexts. Given the complexity of themes such as authenticity, academic voice, and identity, a qualitative lens allows for rich, contextualized understanding, while the integration of thematic percentages adds interpretative depth to the findings.

2.2. Context and Participants

The research was conducted at the University of Abdelhamid Ibn Badis of Mostaganem, specifically within the Department of English, which provides a representative microcosm of the broader Algerian ELT academic landscape. Participants were purposefully selected based on their active engagement with English teaching and learning practices.

A total of 35 individuals participated in the study:

- 25 university students enrolled in undergraduate English programs
- 10 university teachers with experience in teaching methodology, Literature, Phonetics, Didactics, Oral Expression, and academic writing.

This diverse cohort offered a multifaceted view of AI's impact across different roles and stages within the educational ecosystem.

2.3. Data Collection

Data was collected through semi-structured, open-ended interviews designed to elicit reflective and in-depth responses from both students and teachers. The interview protocol was structured around four thematic pillars: the role of AI in education and language teaching, the emergence and legitimacy of AI-generated personas, the impact of AI on notions of authorship and academic voice, and shifts in identity and authority in the classroom due to AI integration. (see Appendix A for the full list of

interview questions). Interviews were conducted in English and audio-recorded with consent. On average, each session lasted between 45 minutes and one hour. All recordings were transcribed verbatim for subsequent analysis.

2.4. Data Analysis

Thematic analysis was employed to interpret qualitative data, guided by Braun and Clarke's (2006) framework for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns within data. Transcripts were imported into *NVivo*, a qualitative analysis software that facilitated systematic *thematic coding* and the visualization of recurring patterns.

Four overarching categories were inductively developed:

1. ***Concern*** – highlighting ethical, pedagogical, and epistemological anxieties
2. ***Support*** – expressing enthusiasm or optimism about AI's role
3. ***Resistance*** – demonstrating hesitation or outright opposition to AI integration
4. ***Solution-Oriented Reflections*** – offering constructive or adaptive responses to AI's presence

Each of these categories encompasses multiple emergent themes based on recurrent language and conceptual clustering. "Relative frequency (percentage)" was assigned to each category to reflect the "dominant stances" among participants and to enable a theme-centered interpretation of the data.

3. Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval for the study was obtained through the university's research committee. Participants were informed about the purpose of the study, and consent was obtained prior to data collection. Anonymity and confidentiality were maintained throughout, and all data were securely stored and used solely for academic purposes.

4. Results and Discussion

Preliminary findings indicate that while both students and educators acknowledge the potential of AI tools to enhance learning efficiency, they simultaneously express significant concerns regarding dependency, the erosion of academic voice, and the impersonation of scholarly expression. Some participants also reported a sense of identity distortion or "misidentification" when interacting with AI-generated personas. Notably, discomfort emerged around the notion of machine-generated content being submitted for academic evaluation, raising questions about authorship and academic integrity.

Teachers expressed a need for institutional guidelines to help navigate the ethical complexities introduced by AI personas. Students, meanwhile, called for more critical engagement with these tools, including explicit discussions about authorship, representation, and the limits of algorithmic neutrality. These responses reflect an urgent demand for pedagogical frameworks that neither demonize nor romanticize AI but rather equip learners and educators with the critical tools to engage responsibly with synthetic cognition.

Table 2: Students' Perceptions of AI Personas and Academic Voice

Category	Percentage	Themes
Concerns	40%	- Limited awareness of how AI personas can blur academic identity and voice - Ethical concerns overshadowed by fear of failure and performance anxiety - Feelings of guilt due to unclear institutional guidelines on AI and academic integrity - Anxiety about losing originality in academic expression.
Resistance	10%	- Preference for human feedback and handwritten work - Greater fear of plagiarism detection tools than actual ethical breaches - Skepticism about AI's depth and reasoning in complex academic topics.
Support	30%	- AI used to brainstorm or clarify challenging concepts, especially under exam stress - Viewed as a personalized academic assistant - Acceptance driven by widespread peer usage, normalizing AI's presence.
Solution-Oriented	20%	- Suggest integrating AI into academic skills training, including ethics and boundaries - Recommend workshops to explore the benefits and limits of AI - Emphasize that while AI is useful for idea generation, final work should reflect individual voice.

Table 2 presents a detailed overview of students' perspectives on the use of AI in academic contexts. The data reveals that a majority of students are primarily concerned with the ethical dilemmas and potential impacts on personal and academic identity posed by AI technologies. These concerns include issues such as authorship, academic integrity, and the dehumanization of learning. At the same time, a smaller yet steadily increasing segment of students demonstrates a more proactive and constructive stance. This group emphasizes the potential benefits of AI when implemented with clear guidelines and ethical safeguards, suggesting an emerging openness to its critical and structured integration into academic practices.

Table 3: Teachers' Perspectives on AI Integration and Pedagogical Challenges

Category	Percentage	Theme
Concerns	45%	Fear of losing students' authentic voice and individuality - Ethical concerns about plagiarism, academic dishonesty, and misuse - Worry over students' over-dependence on AI in critical thinking and expression - Lack of awareness among students about identity confusion or voice erosion.
Support	25%	Recognition of AI as a valuable brainstorming or scaffolding tool - Persona-based interaction seen as an opportunity to train students to develop a stylistic voice - AI can aid in differentiation and personalized learning.
Solution-Oriented	20%	Request for structured AI training programs in teacher education - Proposal to include AI-use guidelines and ethics in syllabi - Encourage co-use of AI with human instruction to sharpen rather than replace student voice - Suggestion to open dialogue with students about limits and possibilities of AI
Resistance	10%	Opposition to integrating AI in writing/language teaching due to unpredictability - Belief that AI will dilute literary analysis and creative skills - Concerns about the role of the teacher being replaced or undermined

Table 3 outlines teachers' perspectives, which largely echo the ethical and pedagogical concerns expressed by students. However, educators placed greater emphasis on the necessity of institutional support, comprehensive training, and clear policy frameworks to ensure the responsible and effective use of AI in academic settings. While their stance reflects a degree of caution, it also reveals a measured optimism; AI is not outright rejected but rather approached as a potentially valuable tool that must be thoughtfully integrated into teaching practices. For many educators, the successful implementation of AI depends on well-defined boundaries, ethical safeguards, and its alignment with pedagogical objectives.

The findings of this study suggest a complex landscape of perceptions surrounding the use of AI-generated personas in English Language Teaching (ELT) and English Language Learning (ELL). Both students and educators acknowledged the potential of AI tools to enhance learning efficiency and support personalized engagement. However, the data also reveals a deep undercurrent of concern regarding dependency, academic integrity, and the erosion of individual voice. These tensions resonate with posthumanist critiques that interrogate the displacement of human agency in meaning-making processes, as AI technologies begin to blur traditional boundaries between the organic and the artificial in pedagogical spaces (Hayles, 1999).

The phenomenon of "misidentification" reported by several student participants suggests a nuanced affective dimension to AI use, one in which learners experience a disruption of self-representation. This emotional response underscores the importance of understanding identity not only as a cognitive construct but also as an affectively mediated experience within learning environments. Such findings add a critical dimension to existing literature on digital voice erosion and learner identity, suggesting that the affective impacts of synthetic agents merit further exploration.

Educators in the study articulated an urgent need for institutional guidance to navigate the ethical and pedagogical complexities introduced by AI personas. This aligns with calls in recent scholarship for clear frameworks to manage the integration of AI in educational settings. Teachers emphasized the necessity of training that encompasses both the technical and ethical dimensions of AI use, while

students advocated for more open, critical engagement with these technologies in the classroom. These responses highlight a collective recognition that AI literacy must move beyond operational competence toward ethical reflexivity and critical understanding.

While concerns dominated the discourse, a notable portion of participants adopted a more constructive stance, suggesting structured ways to integrate AI into academic practices. Supporters viewed AI as a personalized assistant, especially useful in high-stress contexts such as exam preparation. This perspective challenges the dominant narrative of AI as a threat to originality, suggesting instead that when used transparently and responsibly, AI can support rather than replace critical thinking. Nonetheless, it is essential to consider counterarguments, such as the possibility that the moral panic surrounding AI may overshadow its democratizing potential, particularly for students facing linguistic or cognitive challenges.

The combined perspectives of students and teachers in this study reveal a critical pedagogical juncture, one in which AI technologies have moved from the periphery to the core of educational practice. While participants expressed both optimism and concern, what stands out is a collective call for structured guidance (ethical, institutional, and pedagogical) on how to engage with AI in ways that enhance, rather than compromise, human expression. These findings underscore the imperative to approach digital literacy not merely as a technical competence but as a critical practice that actively engages with evolving notions of identity, authorship, and agency within a rapidly shifting academic landscape.

5. Limitations of the Study

Despite its insights, this study is subject to several limitations that may affect the generalizability and scope of its findings.

5.1. Sample Size Constraints

The study was limited to a relatively small sample size, consisting of only 25 students and 10 teachers from a single university. This limited sample size restricts the ability to generalize the findings to broader educational contexts. While the sample provides valuable insights into the perspectives of students and teachers at this specific institution, it may not accurately represent the diverse views and experiences present in other educational settings, particularly in institutions with different resources, cultural contexts, or academic traditions. As a result, the findings may not be fully applicable to all English Language Teaching (ELT) environments, especially those in non-university or non-Western contexts.

5.2. Context-Specific Focus

Another limitation arises from the context-specific nature of the study. By focusing exclusively on university-level English Language Teaching (ELT), the research primarily reflects the experiences and challenges faced within a higher education setting. This context may differ significantly from other educational environments, such as primary or secondary schools, or even private-sector language education. The unique demands, expectations, and pedagogical approaches within university-level ELT may not be directly applicable to other educational contexts, where the use of AI tools and the concerns about academic integrity, identity, and authorship may be quite different.

5.3. Lack of Longitudinal Data

Furthermore, the study is inherently cross-sectional, capturing a snapshot of participants' experiences at a single point in time. As a result, it does not provide insight into the long-term effects of AI integration on student identity, academic voice, or academic integrity. The transient nature of the data collection means that the study cannot assess whether the trends observed (such as shifts in voice, identity, and authority) persist or evolve over time. Longitudinal studies would be necessary to explore

how sustained AI usage might influence these factors over months or years, providing a deeper understanding of the long-term implications for both students and educators.

6. Recommendations

In light of the findings regarding students' and educators' interactions with AI tools in English Language Teaching (ELT), the following recommendations are proposed to ensure ethical, effective, and pedagogically sound integration of artificial intelligence into academic practices:

6.1. Integrate AI Literacy into ELT Curricula

AI literacy should be treated as an essential component of 21st-century education. ELT curricula must include explicit instruction on how to use AI tools ethically and effectively. This involves teaching students not only how to interact with AI systems but also how to critically evaluate their outputs. Emphasis should be placed on developing students' awareness of core academic values, particularly in relation to voice, authorship, and identity. Students must learn how to maintain their original academic voice while navigating AI-assisted environments.

6.2. Develop Institutional Guidelines

Educational institutions must take proactive steps to establish comprehensive and transparent policies governing the use of AI in academic contexts. These guidelines should clearly articulate acceptable and unacceptable uses of AI tools for academic writing, classroom participation, and assessments. Institutions should also define boundaries to help students avoid academic misconduct, including plagiarism and over-dependence on automated tools. Clear institutional messaging will not only alleviate confusion but also foster a culture of responsibility and academic integrity.

6.3. Provide Teacher Training on AI Integration

To effectively mediate students' use of AI, teachers themselves need structured training on the affordances and limitations of these technologies. Professional development programs should equip educators with the necessary knowledge to incorporate AI tools into their pedagogy while preserving academic standards. This training should include practical examples of how AI can enhance instruction, support differentiation, and assist students in developing their writing and analytical skills without undermining their original contributions.

6.4. Encourage Reflective Practice

Reflection should be an integral part of both student and teacher engagement with AI. Educators are encouraged to design reflective exercises that help students distinguish between authentic and AI-assisted voices. For example, persona-awareness activities can promote self-evaluation and critical thinking about authorship. Moreover, institutions should foster a culture of transparency by encouraging peer-reviewed or declared use of AI tools, particularly in formative work, where the goal is to support learning rather than produce final outputs.

Conclusion

In the age of artificial intelligence, the ELT classroom is undergoing a profound transformation, one that requires educators and learners to reconsider the very nature of knowledge production, authorship, and identity. As this study has shown, the use of AI in academic settings is not merely a matter of technological adoption; it is a shift in how learners position themselves intellectually, ethically, and pedagogically.

A central finding of this inquiry is that AI systems are increasingly shaping learners' behaviors through the construction of AI personas, not as sentient entities, but as interactive interfaces that subtly influence tone, reasoning, and engagement. These personas often project confidence, fluency, and

expertise, which can affect how students perceive their own academic voices. As a result, students may begin to rely more heavily on these systems, not just for linguistic support, but as sources of intellectual framing. This shift raises critical questions about academic identity, especially regarding authorship, ownership of ideas, and the development of independent thinking.

At the same time, educators are navigating the tensions between innovation and integrity. The findings suggest a growing need to foster technological fluency alongside ethical literacy, encouraging learners to engage critically with AI, rather than consume its output unreflectively. This involves rethinking classroom practices, assessment methods, and teacher training to meet the demands of a hybrid educational future. To fulfill this vision, pedagogy must center on cultivating curiosity, reflection, and critical dialogue, elements that no AI, however advanced, can authentically replicate. The classroom must become a space where learners are not replaced or overshadowed by AI but rather empowered to use it as a tool for self-development and academic growth.

Furthermore, the future of ELT does not rest on resisting technological change, but on integrating it responsibly. It is only by addressing how AI shapes learning behaviors, identity formation, and academic voice that we can ensure technology serves education, not the other way around.

References

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Duke University Press.

Bayne, S. (2016). Posthumanism and research in digital education. In C. Haythornthwaite, R. Andrews, J. Fransman, & E. M. Meyers (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of e-learning research* (2nd ed., pp. 83–101). SAGE Publications.

Bayne, S. (2015). Teacherbot: Interventions in automated teaching. *Teaching in Higher Education, 20*(4), 455–467. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2015.1020783

Bayne, S. (2018). Posthumanism: A navigation aid for educators. On Education: Journal for Research and Debate, 1(2). https://doi.org/10.17899/on_ed.2018.2.4

Biesta, G. (2006). *Beyond learning: Democratic education for a human future*. Paradigm Publishers.

Braidotti, R. (2013). *The posthuman*. Polity Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Canagarajah, S. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th anniversary ed.). Continuum. (Original work published in 1970)

Cambridge University Press & Assessment. (2023). *English language education in the era of generative AI: Our perspective*. https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/Images/685411-english-language-education-in-the-era-of-generative-ai-our-perspective.pdf

Collie, R. J., & Martin, A. J. (2024). Teachers' motivation and engagement to harness generative AI for teaching and learning: The role of contextual, occupational, and background factors. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 6*, 100224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100224

Cotton, D. R., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 61*(2), 228–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2232323

Hayles, N. K. (1999). *How we became posthuman: Virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature, and informatics*. University of Chicago Press.

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning*. Center for Curriculum Redesign.

Knox, J. (2020). Artificial intelligence and education in China. *Learning, Media and Technology, 45*(3), 298–311. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1754236

Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*. Pearson Education.

Morris, S. M., & Stommel, J. (2018). *An urgency of teachers: The work of critical digital pedagogy*. Hybrid Pedagogy Publishing.

Ni, F., & Xu, W. (2025). How do English proficiency and learning motivation shape EFL students' emotions toward written corrective feedback? *System, 131*, 103681. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2025.103681

Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press.

Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education*. Polity Press.

Selwyn, N., & Facer, K. (Eds.). (2013). *The Politics of Education and Technology: Conflicts, Controversies, and Connections*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

van Dijck, J. (2013). *The culture of connectivity: A critical history of social media*. Oxford University Press.

Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *45*(3), 223–235. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1798995

Yu, S., & Hu, G. (2017). Understanding university students' peer feedback practices in EFL writing: Insights from a case study. *Assessing Writing*, *33*, 25–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2017.03.004

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education – Where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *16*(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0

Zhai, X. (2024). *Understanding the transformative impact of generative artificial intelligence on teachers: A framework of perception, knowledge, acceptance, and practice*. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.03018

Appendices

A. Students' Interview Questions :

- How do you feel about using AI tools like ChatGPT in your academic work? In what ways do you think these tools support or challenge your own thinking and expression?
- Have you ever asked an AI to answer using a persona (as if it were someone else, such as a professor, a PhD student, or a writer)?
- When you use an AI persona, do you feel like your own academic voice is being amplified or replaced?
- When using an AI persona, do you think that it trains you to think critically, or does it create a kind of shortcut that might affect your long-term academic identity?
- To what extent do you think using AI personas can shape (or distort) your own academic identity? Do you ever feel like your writing no longer sounds like "you"?
- Have you ever struggled to distinguish between what "you" believe and what the AI (in a given persona) is suggesting?
- Should there be ethical boundaries around the use of AI personas in student writing and research? What kind of limits (or freedoms) do you think are appropriate in an academic setting?
- Where do you personally draw the line between useful support and over-dependence on AI personas in academic writing? How do you ensure your voice remains present?

B. Teachers' Interview Questions:

- How do you personally feel about the growing use of AI tools (like ChatGPT) in higher education? Do you view them more as instructional support or as a potential threat to academic development?
- Have you ever encountered a student submission that seemed "too good to be true"? For example, a response that sounded more like it was written by a scholar, an author, or even a PhD student than by the student?
- Do you think students using AI personas (e.g., "answer as a professor" or "respond as a journal reviewer") in their writing might lose their own academic voice?
- In your experience, does the use of AI personas encourage mimicry or genuine learning?
- Have you ever had to address concerns of identity confusion or voice inconsistency in student work, possibly influenced by AI?
- As a teacher, do you believe AI tools should be regulated in terms of how students use personas in academic assignments?
- From your perspective, what institutional policies or classroom practices could help preserve students' authentic academic voice while allowing space for responsible AI use?