The International Review of Multidisciplinary Research
Volume 1, Issue 4, April 2026, pp. 604-615
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19890103

Teaching Literature in the Face of Artificial Intelligence in Education: Challenges and Coping Strategies of English Teachers

[1]Alprince King A. Biri, [2]Fatnadia Shellhata M. Asmawil, [3]Shirley P. Barrera, [4]Angelica N. Landero, [5]Abnir T. Arilin

[1]Stratworks Research Inc., [2]Western Mindanao State University, [3]Department of Education, [4]Ateneo de Zamboanga University, [5]Universidad de Zamboanga

[1]alprincekingabdulabiri@gmail.com, [2]fatnadia.asmawil@gmail.com, [3]shirleypenuliar002@gmail.com, [4]angelicalandero02@gmail.com, [5]abnirarilin5@gmail.com

Article Details:

Received: 6 April 2026
Revised: 17 April 2026
Accepted: 22 April 2026
Published: 29 April 2026
Corresponding Email:
alprincekingabdulabiri@gmail.com

Recommended Citation:

Biri, A. K. A., Asmawil, F. S. M., Barrera, S. P., Landero, A. N., Arilin, A. T. (2026). Teaching Literature in the Face of Artificial Intelligence in Education: Challenges and Coping Strategies of English Teachers. The International Review of Multidisciplinary Research. 1 (4), 604-615. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19890103

Index Terms:

artificial intelligence, literature teaching, pedagogical challenges, coping strategies, AI in education

Abstract. This study explored the experiences of English teachers in teaching literature in the context of artificial intelligence (AI) in education, with particular focus on the challenges they encountered, the coping strategies they employed, and how they navigated AI integration while preserving traditional pedagogical practices. Anchored in Reader-Response Theory, Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK), and Technostress Theory, the study utilized a descriptive qualitative research design. Fifteen higher education English instructors from selected institutions in Zamboanga City were purposively selected as participants. Data were collected through a validated semi-structured interview guide and analyzed using thematic analysis. The findings revealed several interconnected challenges, including diminished student engagement in deep literary interpretation, overreliance on AI-generated outputs, difficulties in ensuring academic integrity, limited teacher preparedness in AI use, and challenges in adapting instructional strategies within evolving technological environments. In response, teachers employed various coping strategies such as reinforcing critical thinking through guided discussion, modifying assessment practices to ensure authenticity, establishing clear guidelines on AI use, integrating AI as a supplementary tool, and engaging in self-directed learning to improve AI literacy. Teachers also navigated AI integration by balancing technological tools with discussion-based instruction, emphasizing human interpretation, and redesigning learning activities that promote critical engagement. The study concludes that AI significantly reshapes literature teaching, requiring teachers to continuously adapt while preserving the interpretive and humanistic nature of the subject. These findings provide valuable insights for improving instructional practices, strengthening teacher training, and informing institutional policies in AI-mediated learning environments.

Introduction

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in education has greatly changed teaching and learning across many subjects, including literature. As AI tools became easier to access, teachers gained new ways to improve instruction, assessment, and student engagement. Previous studies showed that AI can support personalized learning, automate routine academic tasks, and increase teaching efficiency (Holmes et al., 2019; Luckin et al., 2016; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). In the same way, policy reports highlighted AI's potential to solve long-standing educational challenges while reshaping teaching practices (UNESCO, 2021).

However, the growing use of AI in education has also raised several pedagogical and ethical concerns. Many studies pointed to issues such as academic dishonesty, data privacy, and students becoming too dependent on AI-generated work (Kasneci et al., 2023; Cotton et al., 2023). The rise of generative AI systems, such as large language models, made this issue more complex because these tools can produce essays, summaries, and interpretations that closely resemble human work (Dwivedi et al., 2023). Because of this, AI has become more than just a support tool; it has started to change how knowledge is accessed, created, and evaluated in schools.

In this changing environment, literature teaching holds a unique and challenging place. Traditionally, literature classes focus on discussion, critical thinking, and exploring human experiences through teacher-student interaction. Meaning-making in literature has long depended on reflection, dialogue, and shared interpretation. However, with the growing availability of AI tools, many students now use technology to generate summaries, explanations, and interpretations of literary texts, often skipping close reading and classroom discussions.

Recent studies on generative AI in education found that students often use AI tools to improve reading comprehension, create interpretations, and complete tasks faster (Kasneci et al., 2023; Dwivedi et al., 2023). While this can make learning more accessible and provide support, it also raises concerns about weaker cognitive engagement and fewer chances to develop higher-order thinking skills (Cotton et al., 2023). In particular, depending too much on AI-generated interpretations may shift meaning-making from human interaction to machine-produced responses, changing the true nature of literary learning.

In teaching practice, AI integration has brought both benefits and challenges. On one hand, AI tools can help with lesson planning, personalized learning paths, and feedback systems (Luckin et al., 2016). On the other hand, teachers need new skills such as AI literacy, ethical decision-making, and adaptability to technology. A lack of training and institutional support has been identified as a major barrier, leading to uneven implementation and different levels of teacher confidence (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019).

Moreover, recent research showed that teachers experience AI integration in complex and sometimes conflicting ways. While many teachers see AI's potential to support learning, they also feel uncertain about its effects on assessment, authorship, and academic honesty (Kasneci et al., 2023; Dwivedi et al., 2023). Recent qualitative research has also shown that students experience anxiety, self-doubt, and reduced academic confidence when dealing with AI-related issues, particularly in contexts where the authenticity of their work is questioned (Biri et al., 2025). These tensions are especially visible in literature classrooms, where the human and interpretive nature of the subject meets the generative power of AI. Teachers are therefore challenged to preserve authentic literary engagement while adjusting to changing student practices shaped by AI.

The integration of artificial intelligence in education had presented several challenges for teachers, particularly in adapting their instructional practices to a rapidly changing technological environment. Studies showed that many educators struggled with limited knowledge and training in using AI tools effectively in the classroom. For instance, Ifenthaler and Schumacher (2023) found that teachers often lacked the necessary competencies to integrate AI into their teaching, which affected their confidence and readiness. Similarly, Selwyn (2019) emphasized that the introduction of digital technologies, including AI, often created uncertainty among teachers, as they were required to adjust to new roles and expectations without sufficient institutional support. These findings suggested that the presence of AI not only changed classroom practices but also placed additional demands on teachers' professional skills.

In addition to technical challenges, teachers also faced concerns related to academic integrity, assessment, and student learning behaviors. Research by Lancaster (2020) highlighted that emerging technologies made it more difficult for teachers to ensure originality in student work. More recent discussions by Sharples (2023) pointed out that AI-generated outputs complicated traditional assessment methods, as it became harder to determine whether students genuinely understood the material. Furthermore, Luckin (2018) noted that while AI could support teaching, it also required educators to rethink how learning was evaluated and guided. These challenges were particularly significant in subjects like literature, where interpretation and critical thinking are central, making it more difficult for teachers to balance the use of AI with the need to maintain meaningful and authentic learning experiences.

As artificial intelligence became more present in educational settings, teachers developed various strategies to cope with its challenges and integrate it meaningfully into their teaching. One common approach involved improving their own technological and pedagogical competencies. Studies showed that teachers engaged in continuous professional learning to better understand how AI tools functioned and how they could be used responsibly in the classroom (Ifenthaler & Schumacher, 2023; Holmes et al., 2022). In addition, educators began to redesign their instructional practices by incorporating AI as a support tool rather than a replacement for learning. For example, teachers guided students on how to use AI for brainstorming or initial comprehension while still emphasizing critical thinking and personal interpretation

(Sharples, 2023). These strategies reflected an effort to adapt to technological change while maintaining the core goals of education.

Another important coping mechanism involved adjusting assessment practices and classroom policies to address AI-related concerns. Teachers adopted alternative forms of assessment, such as oral discussions, reflective writing, and in-class activities, to better evaluate students' understanding and reduce overreliance on AI-generated outputs (Cotton et al., 2023). Furthermore, educators emphasized the importance of academic integrity by setting clear guidelines on acceptable AI use and encouraging responsible engagement with technology (Eaton, 2023). Some studies also highlighted that teachers fostered open discussions with students about the role of AI in learning, helping them become more aware of its benefits and limitations (Selwyn, 2019). These coping strategies demonstrated that rather than resisting AI, teachers actively navigated its presence by modifying their practices to sustain meaningful and authentic learning experiences.

The integration of artificial intelligence in literature teaching had required teachers to balance technological tools with traditional approaches centered on interpretation, discussion, and human experience. Literature instruction had long emphasized close reading, critical thinking, and dialogic engagement between teachers and students (Rosenblatt, 1978). This reader-response perspective viewed meaning as something constructed through interaction with the text, rather than simply delivered as fixed information. However, the introduction of AI tools capable of generating interpretations and summaries had challenged this process, as students could access ready-made analyses without engaging deeply with the text. Studies on digital reading practices suggested that increased reliance on technology could shift students' attention toward efficiency and surface-level understanding rather than reflective interpretation (Baron, 2021).

In response to these changes, teachers had begun to navigate a balance between preserving traditional literary practices and integrating AI in meaningful ways. Research indicated that educators emphasized discussion-based learning, guided questioning, and interpretive activities to ensure that students remained actively engaged in meaning-making (Beach & O'Brien, 2015). At the same time, some teachers incorporated AI as a supplementary tool to support comprehension, particularly for difficult texts, while maintaining that final interpretations should emerge from students' own thinking (Selwyn, 2019). This approach reflected an effort to retain the humanistic core of literature teaching while adapting to new technological realities. As a result, teaching literature in the presence of AI became a process of negotiation, where teachers continuously adjusted their practices to sustain both relevance and depth in literary learning.

Given these conditions, there is a growing need to examine how English teachers experience and respond to AI in literature instruction. Although many studies explored the wider impact of AI in education, only limited attention has been given to subject-specific contexts and the lived experiences of teachers, especially in literature classes. There is still a gap in understanding how teachers manage the shift from traditional interpretation to AI-assisted learning, and how they create coping strategies to address these challenges.

This study aimed to explore the experiences of English teachers in teaching literature in the face of artificial intelligence in education. Specifically, it aimed to: (1) examine the challenges experienced by English teachers in teaching literature within the context of artificial intelligence in education; (2) describe the coping strategies employed by English teachers in addressing the challenges associated with artificial intelligence in literature instruction; and (3) explore how English teachers navigate the integration of artificial intelligence while maintaining traditional approaches to literature teaching. The study sought to provide a deeper and more context-sensitive understanding of AI integration—one that recognizes both its educational benefits and its impact on the teaching and learning of literature.

The study offered insights into how AI reshaped interpretive practices, classroom interaction, and assessment in literature instruction. The findings were anticipated to benefit educators by informing pedagogical adjustments that preserve critical and humanistic engagement with texts while adapting to technological change. Additionally, the study could guide school administrators and policymakers in designing responsive training programs and ethical guidelines for AI use in classrooms. Finally, the study contributed to the limited body of qualitative research on AI in literature education, particularly by foregrounding teachers' lived experiences and contextual realities, thereby enriching theoretical and practical discussions on technology-mediated teaching.

Statement of the Problem

This study sought to explore the experiences of English teachers in teaching literature in the face of artificial intelligence in education. Specifically, it aimed to examine the challenges they encountered, the coping strategies they employed, and the ways in which they navigated the evolving demands of AI-mediated learning environments.

1. What challenges do English teachers experience in teaching literature within the context of artificial intelligence in education?

2. How do English teachers cope with the challenges associated with the use of artificial intelligence in literature instruction?
3. How do teachers negotiate the balance between traditional literature teaching practices and AI-mediated learning environments?

This study was anchored on three related theories that explained how English teachers experienced and responded to the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in teaching literature: Reader-Response Theory, Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK), and Technostress Theory. These frameworks helped explain literary interpretation, the teacher's role in using technology, and the challenges caused by technological change.

Reader-Response Theory by Rosenblatt (1978) stated that meaning in literature is created through the interaction between the reader and the text. It highlighted the importance of students' personal experiences, emotions, and reflections in understanding literary works. In this study, the theory helped examine how AI-generated interpretations may affect authentic student engagement and deeper literary understanding. The TPACK framework by Mishra and Koehler (2006) explained that effective teaching requires the combination of content knowledge, teaching strategies, and technological skills. In this study, it helped show how English teachers balanced traditional literature teaching with the use of AI tools while maintaining learning goals. Technostress Theory by Tarafdar et al. (2011) focused on the stress people experience when adapting to new technologies. In education, this may include increased workload, lack of confidence, and uncertainty in using digital tools. In this study, the theory helped explain the challenges teachers faced with AI and the coping strategies they used. Together, these theories provided a strong foundation for the study by explaining the effects of AI on student interpretation, teacher practices, and the experiences of educators in literature classrooms.

Methodology

This study employed a descriptive qualitative research design to explore the experiences of English teachers in teaching literature in the face of artificial intelligence in education. Descriptive qualitative research is appropriate when the objective of the study is to obtain a comprehensive summary of participants' experiences, perceptions, and practices in their natural context, without imposing highly abstract theoretical interpretations (Sandelowski, 2000). In this study, the design allowed for an in-depth examination of how teachers experienced challenges, developed coping strategies, and navigated the integration of AI in literature instruction (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Since the integration of artificial intelligence in education is a relatively recent and evolving phenomenon, a qualitative approach enabled the researcher to capture the nuanced and context-specific experiences of teachers. Specifically, the descriptive qualitative design focused on presenting participants' accounts in a straightforward and meaningful way, staying close to their actual words while identifying patterns and themes across responses (Kim et al., 2017).

The population of this study consisted of 15 higher education English instructors teaching literature courses in selected schools in Zamboanga City. These participants were deemed appropriate for the study as they were directly engaged in literature instruction and were likely to encounter the integration of artificial intelligence in their teaching practices. Focusing on higher education instructors allowed the study to capture more complex and reflective pedagogical experiences, particularly in relation to interpretation, critical thinking, and academic writing, which are central to literature teaching.

This study employed purposive sampling, a non-probability sampling technique commonly used in qualitative research to select participants who possess specific characteristics relevant to the research problem (Palinkas et al., 2015). Purposive sampling enabled the researcher to intentionally select English instructors who had direct experience with teaching literature in contexts where artificial intelligence tools were present or used by students. To ensure the relevance and quality of the data, the following inclusion criteria were established for participant selection: *(1)* the participant must be a higher education instructor currently teaching literature or literature-related courses; *(2)* the participant must have at least one (1) year of teaching experience in higher education to ensure familiarity with instructional practices*; (3)* the participant must have encountered or observed the use of artificial intelligence tools such as AI writing or interpretation tools among students in their classes; and *(4)* the participant must be willing to participate and share their experiences related to the integration of artificial intelligence in literature teaching. These criteria ensured that the selected participants were capable of providing meaningful insights into the challenges and coping strategies associated with AI in literature instruction.

The primary instrument used in this study was a researcher-developed semi-structured interview guide designed to elicit in-depth responses regarding the participants' experiences, challenges, and coping strategies in teaching literature in the face of artificial intelligence. Semi-structured interviews are widely used in qualitative research as they allow flexibility in probing participants' responses while ensuring alignment with the research objectives (Creswell & Poth, 2018). To ensure the content validity of the instrument, the interview guide was subjected to expert validation by professionals with expertise in English education, qualitative research, and educational technology. These experts reviewed the questions for

clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study's objectives and research questions. Revisions were made based on their feedback to enhance the accuracy and appropriateness of the instrument. Establishing validity through expert review is a common practice in qualitative studies to ensure that the instrument effectively captures the intended constructs (Patton, 2015).

The data collected from the interviews were analyzed using thematic analysis, a widely used method for identifying, analyzing, and interpreting patterns or themes within qualitative data. Thematic analysis allows researchers to organize and describe data in rich detail while also interpreting various aspects of the research topic (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In this study, the analysis followed a systematic process that included familiarization with the data, initial coding, searching for themes, reviewing and refining themes, and defining and naming themes. This approach enabled the researcher to capture recurring patterns in teachers' experiences, particularly in relation to challenges, coping strategies, and navigation of AI integration. Thematic analysis was appropriate for this study as it provided flexibility while maintaining rigor, making it suitable for descriptive qualitative research (Nowell et al., 2017).

Prior to data collection, the researcher sought permission from the selected higher education institutions in Zamboanga City to conduct the study. Once approval was obtained, potential participants who met the inclusion criteria were identified and invited to participate. The researcher explained the purpose of the study and secured informed consent from each participant. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews conducted at a time and place convenient for the participants, either face-to-face or through an online platform. Each interview was recorded with permission and later transcribed for analysis. Throughout the process, the researcher ensured that participants were comfortable and able to freely express their experiences. After data collection, the responses were organized and prepared for thematic analysis.

This study adhered to established ethical principles to ensure the protection of participants' rights and well-being throughout the research process. Participants were informed about the purpose of the study, and informed consent was obtained prior to data collection. They were assured that their participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time without any consequences. To maintain confidentiality and anonymity, pseudonyms were used, and any identifying information was excluded from the report. Additionally, all data were securely stored and used solely for research purposes. These practices are consistent with ethical standards in qualitative research, which emphasize respect for persons, beneficence, and justice (Belmont Report, 1979; Creswell & Poth, 2018). Ensuring ethical rigor helped build trust with participants and enhanced the credibility of the study.

Results and Discussion

Research Question 1:
What challenges do English teachers experience in teaching literature within the context of artificial intelligence in education?

Theme 1: *Diminished Student Engagement in Deep Literary Interpretation*
A dominant theme that emerged from the data was the decline in students' engagement in deep literary interpretation, as many participants observed that students increasingly relied on artificial intelligence to generate explanations of texts. A total of 12 out of 15 participants expressed concern that students no longer engaged in close reading or critical reflection, as they tended to depend on AI-generated summaries and interpretations. Teachers noted that instead of participating in discussions or forming their own insights, students often presented responses that appeared "ready-made," limiting opportunities for meaningful interaction. This shift was perceived to weaken the dialogic nature of literature teaching, where interpretation is traditionally developed through guided questioning, discussion, and personal reflection. This was reflected in the responses of the participants:

"Most of my students no longer try to analyze the text on their own. They immediately go to AI and just accept whatever interpretation is given." (Participant 4)

"Before, we had meaningful discussions in class. Now, when I ask questions, their answers sound the same—like they all came from one source." (Participant 9)

The findings suggest that while AI tools may support comprehension, they may also reduce students' cognitive and interpretive effort. This has important implications for literature instruction, as it challenges the foundational goal of fostering critical thinking and personal engagement with texts. Teachers may need to redesign instructional strategies to encourage active participation and ensure that students remain involved in the interpretive process rather than passively consuming AI-generated meanings.

Theme 2: *Difficulty in Ensuring Academic Integrity in Student Outputs*

Another significant challenge identified was the difficulty in maintaining academic integrity, particularly in assessing whether students' outputs were genuinely their own. This concern was reported by 11 out of 15 participants, who indicated that AI tools made it increasingly challenging to detect original student work. Teachers shared that essays, reflections, and literary analyses submitted by students often appeared highly structured and polished, raising doubts about authorship. However, due to the sophistication of AI-generated texts, verifying the extent of AI assistance became problematic. This concern was evident in the following responses:

"It's hard to tell now if the work is really theirs. The essays are too perfect, but when I ask them to explain, they struggle." (Participant 2)

"Before, you could recognize a student's writing style. Now, everything sounds the same, and you start questioning if it's AI-generated." (Participant 7)

This issue has critical implications for assessment practices in literature teaching. Traditional written outputs, which have long been used to evaluate students' understanding and interpretation, may no longer serve as reliable indicators of learning. As a result, teachers may need to adopt alternative forms of assessment, such as oral discussions, in-class writing, or process-based evaluation, to ensure authenticity and uphold academic integrity in AI-mediated learning environments.

Theme 3: *Insufficient Preparation and AI Literacy Among Teachers*
A third theme that emerged was the lack of sufficient preparation and AI literacy among teachers, which affected their ability to effectively integrate AI into literature instruction. This challenge was reported by 9 out of 15 participants, who expressed uncertainty about how AI tools functioned and how they should be appropriately used in the classroom. Some teachers admitted that they felt "behind" their students in terms of technological knowledge, making it difficult to guide or regulate AI use effectively. This concern was reflected in the participants' responses:

"Honestly, my students know more about these AI tools than I do. Sometimes I don't know how to address it properly in class." (Participant 5)

"We were never trained for this. AI just came in suddenly, and we are expected to adjust without enough support." (Participant 11)

This result highlights the need for targeted professional development and institutional support for teachers. Without adequate training, educators may struggle to respond to the challenges posed by AI, potentially leading to ineffective or inconsistent practices. Enhancing teachers' AI literacy is therefore essential not only for managing classroom dynamics but also for ensuring that AI is used in ways that support, rather than undermine, the goals of literature education.

Theme 4: *Overreliance on AI Leading to Surface-Level Understanding*
Another recurring challenge identified was the overreliance of students on AI tools, which led to surface-level understanding of literary texts. This was expressed by 10 out of 15 participants, who observed that students tended to accept AI-generated interpretations without questioning or analyzing them further. Teachers noted that while students were able to produce correct or acceptable answers, these responses often lacked depth, originality, and personal insight. Instead of engaging in critical thinking, students appeared to prioritize efficiency and task completion. This concern was reflected in the participants' responses:

"They just copy what the AI says… and when you ask them to explain it further, parang hanggang doon lang—they can't really go deeper." (Participant 6)

"I noticed that they rely too much on AI… it's like they stop thinking for themselves. The answers are there, but the understanding is not really there." (Participant 13)

This suggests that AI use may unintentionally promote passive learning behaviors if not properly guided. For literature teaching, this is particularly concerning, as the subject requires nuanced interpretation and reflection. The implication is that teachers need to design learning activities that require students to justify, critique, or expand upon AI-generated responses, thereby encouraging deeper engagement rather than mere acceptance of information.

Theme 5: *Designing Effective Instructional Strategies in AI-Mediated Classrooms*
Participants also reported difficulty in adapting their instructional strategies to accommodate the presence of AI in the classroom. A total of 8 out of 15 participants shared that they were uncertain about how to integrate AI into their teaching without compromising learning objectives. Some teachers struggled to determine when and how AI should be used, while others found it challenging to modify lesson plans that were originally designed for traditional, discussion-based instruction. This challenge was reflected in the participants' responses:

"I'm not really sure how to adjust my lessons… kasi before, everything was discussion-based. Now I have to think, should I allow AI or not? How do I even include it properly?" (Participant 1)

"It's difficult to redesign activities… parang you have to rethink everything. What worked before doesn't always work now because students can just use AI." (Participant 10)

This challenge highlights the evolving nature of pedagogy in AI-integrated environments. Teachers are required not only to deliver content but also to strategically incorporate technology in ways that enhance, rather than replace, learning. The implication is that there is a need for pedagogical frameworks and guidelines that support teachers in redesigning their instruction, particularly in subjects like literature where interaction and interpretation are central.

Theme 6*: Tension Between Traditional Literary Pedagogy and AI-Mediated Learning*
The final theme identified was the tension between traditional approaches to literature teaching and AI-mediated learning practices, reported by 11 out of 15 participants. Teachers expressed concern that the increasing use of AI conflicted with long-established practices such as close reading, Socratic discussion, and interpretive dialogue. They described a sense of conflict between maintaining the integrity of literature teaching and adapting to the realities of students' AI use. This was evident in the participants' responses:

"I still believe in discussion… in letting students discover meaning on their own. But now, with AI, parang nababago yung process… they skip that part." (Participant 8)

"It feels like you're caught in between… you want to adapt because AI is already there, but at the same time, you don't want to lose what makes literature teaching meaningful." (Participant 14)

This tension reflects a broader pedagogical challenge in contemporary education, where teachers must balance innovation with tradition. In literature teaching, this balance is particularly delicate, as the subject is deeply rooted in human experience and interpretive engagement. The implication is that educators must find ways to integrate AI without losing the core essence of literature instruction, potentially by redefining the role of AI as a supplementary rather than dominant tool in the learning process.

Overall, the findings revealed that English teachers experienced multiple, interconnected challenges in teaching literature in the presence of artificial intelligence. These challenges ranged from diminished student engagement in deep literary interpretation and increased reliance on AI-generated outputs to difficulties in maintaining academic integrity and adapting instructional strategies. Additionally, teachers reported a lack of preparedness in terms of AI literacy, which further complicated their ability to effectively manage AI use in the classroom. A significant tension also emerged between traditional literature teaching practices and AI-mediated learning, highlighting the need for educators to continuously negotiate between preserving pedagogical values and embracing technological advancements. Collectively, these findings suggest that the integration of artificial intelligence in literature education is not merely a technical shift but a pedagogical transformation that affects how meaning is constructed, how learning is assessed, and how teaching is enacted. While AI offers potential benefits, it also introduces challenges that require thoughtful adaptation, professional development, and pedagogical innovation on the part of teachers.

Research Question 2:
How do English teachers cope with the challenges associated with the use of artificial intelligence in literature instruction?

Theme 1: *Reinforcing Critical Thinking through Guided Discussion*
A prominent coping strategy identified was the reinforcement of critical thinking through guided discussions and questioning techniques, reported by 13 out of 15 participants. Teachers emphasized the importance of returning to discussion-based instruction, where students were encouraged to explain, defend, and expand their interpretations beyond AI-generated responses. Rather than prohibiting AI use, teachers required students to critically engage with the outputs by asking follow-up questions such as "Do you agree with this interpretation?" or "Can you provide your own perspective?". This was shown in the participants' responses:

"Even if they use AI, I always ask them to explain… like, 'Do you really agree with that interpretation?' So napipilitan silang mag-isip." (Participant 3)

"I bring it back to discussion… I let them share their own understanding first before we even consider what AI says." (Participant 12)

This approach suggests that teachers are not rejecting AI but are instead repositioning it within the learning process. The implication is that guided discussion remains a powerful pedagogical tool in ensuring that students actively construct

meaning, even in the presence of AI. It reinforces the idea that interpretation should be dialogic and reflective, rather than simply accepted from external sources.

Theme 2: *Modifying Assessment Strategies to Ensure Authentic Learning*
Another key coping mechanism involved modifying assessment practices to address issues related to AI use. This was reported by 12 out of 15 participants, who indicated that they shifted from traditional take-home written tasks to more controlled and process-oriented assessments. Examples included in-class writing, oral recitations, reflective journals, and performance-based tasks that required immediate demonstration of understanding. This was apparent in the participants' responses:

"I started doing more in-class writing… kasi at least I know that what they write is really from them." (Participant 6)

"Mas nag-focus na ako sa recitation and oral explanation… because written outputs are not always reliable now." (Participant 9)

These adjustments highlight the need for more authentic and varied forms of assessment in AI-integrated classrooms. The implication is that teachers are becoming more intentional in designing evaluation methods that capture genuine student learning. By focusing on process and real-time performance, teachers can better ensure that students' outputs reflect their own understanding rather than AI-generated content.

Theme 3: *Establishing Clear Guidelines on AI Use*
A third theme that emerged was the establishment of clear classroom policies and guidelines regarding the use of AI, as reported by 10 out of 15 participants. Teachers shared that they explicitly discussed with students when and how AI tools could be used appropriately. Some allowed AI for brainstorming or initial comprehension but prohibited its use in final outputs, while others required students to disclose if AI was used in their work. This was highlighted in the participants' responses:

"I tell them clearly when AI is allowed and when it's not… para may boundaries sila." (Participant 2)

"I require them to be honest… if they used AI, they have to say it. It's about responsibility na rin." (Participant 14)

This strategy reflects an effort to promote responsible and ethical use of technology rather than enforcing outright restriction. The implication is that clear communication and boundary-setting are essential in managing AI use in the classroom. By setting expectations, teachers help students understand the role of AI as a support tool rather than a substitute for learning.

Theme 4: *Integrating AI as a Supplementary Learning Tool*
Another coping strategy identified was the intentional integration of AI as a supplementary rather than primary learning tool, as reported by 11 out of 15 participants. Teachers allowed students to use AI for initial understanding—such as clarifying difficult passages or generating ideas—but emphasized that final interpretations must come from the students themselves. Some participants incorporated AI into activities where students compared their own analyses with AI-generated responses to identify similarities, differences, and limitations. This became clear in the participants' responses:

"I allow them to use AI for initial ideas… but I always remind them, the final interpretation should still be theirs." (Participant 5)

"Sometimes I let them compare their answer with AI… then we discuss which one makes more sense." (Participant 11)

This approach suggests that teachers are reframing AI as a scaffold for learning rather than a replacement for thinking. The implication is that when used strategically, AI can support comprehension while still preserving the interpretive and reflective nature of literature learning. It highlights the importance of guided integration, where technology enhances rather than diminishes student engagement.

Theme 5: *Engaging in Self-Directed Learning to Improve AI Literacy*
Participants also coped with AI-related challenges by engaging in self-directed learning to improve their technological and AI literacy, reported by 9 out of 15 participants. Teachers shared that they explored AI tools independently, attended webinars, or learned from colleagues and online resources to better understand how these technologies functioned. This initiative allowed them to stay informed about emerging trends and better manage AI use in their classrooms. This was demonstrated in the participants' responses:

"I had to learn it on my own… watching videos, trying the tools, just to understand what my students are using." (Participant 7)

"Wala talaga kaming formal training… so I try to explore it myself so I can guide them better." (Participant 10)

This finding underscores the proactive role of teachers in adapting to technological change. The implication is that continuous professional learning is essential in AI-integrated education. However, it also points to a need for stronger institutional support, as reliance on self-directed efforts alone may lead to uneven levels of competence among educators.

Theme 6: *Fostering Student Awareness on Responsible AI Use*
The final theme identified was the promotion of student awareness regarding the ethical and responsible use of AI, reported by 12 out of 15 participants. Teachers emphasized discussions on academic honesty, originality, and the limitations of AI-generated content. Some incorporated short orientations or reflective activities where students examined the strengths and weaknesses of AI tools, encouraging them to use technology critically rather than blindly.

"I talk to them about the risks… that AI is helpful, but they shouldn't depend on it too much." (Participant 1)

"I make them reflect… like, 'Did you really learn from that, or did AI just do it for you?'" (Participant 13)

This strategy reflects a shift from control-based approaches to awareness-based practices. The implication is that developing students' sense of responsibility and critical awareness is key to managing AI use effectively. Fostering ethical understanding, teachers empower students to make informed decisions about when and how to use AI in their learning.

Overall, the findings revealed that English teachers employed a range of adaptive strategies to cope with the challenges posed by artificial intelligence in literature instruction. These strategies included reinforcing critical thinking through discussion, modifying assessment practices, establishing clear guidelines, integrating AI as a supplementary tool, improving personal AI literacy, and promoting responsible AI use among students. Collectively, these responses demonstrate that teachers are not passively affected by AI but are actively negotiating its role in the classroom. The findings further suggest that coping with AI-related challenges involves both pedagogical and professional adaptation. Teachers continuously adjust their instructional approaches while also developing new competencies to keep pace with technological change. This highlights the importance of flexibility, innovation, and ongoing learning in sustaining effective literature teaching in AI-mediated educational environments.

Research Question 3:
How do teachers negotiate the balance between traditional literature teaching practices and AI-mediated learning environments?

Theme 1: *Balancing AI Use with Traditional Discussion-Based Instruction*
A central theme that emerged was the intentional balancing of AI use with traditional discussion-based teaching, reported by 13 out of 15 participants. Teachers shared that while they allowed students to use AI tools, they ensured that classroom time remained focused on dialogue, questioning, and shared interpretation. AI was often positioned as a starting point, but discussions were used to deepen, challenge, or expand upon generated ideas. This was observed in the participants' responses:

"I still prioritize discussion… AI can give answers, but the real understanding happens when we talk about it in class." (Participant 4)

"I let them use AI, but not all the time… we always go back to discussion so they can explain things in their own way." (Participant 9)

This finding suggests that teachers continue to view discussion as the core of literature teaching. The implication is that AI does not replace traditional pedagogy but coexists with it, with teachers acting as mediators who guide students from surface-level understanding toward deeper interpretation.

Theme 2: *Reasserting the Value of Human Interpretation and Personal Response*
Another prominent theme was the reaffirmation of human interpretation as central to literature learning, expressed by 12 out of 15 participants. Teachers emphasized that while AI can provide explanations, it cannot replicate personal insight, emotional response, and lived experience. As a result, they encouraged students to connect texts to their own perspectives,

backgrounds, and feelings, reinforcing the importance of subjective interpretation. This was revealed in the participants' responses:

"AI can explain the text, but it cannot feel it… I always tell my students, your interpretation matters because it's personal." (Participant 6)

"I encourage them to relate the text to their own experiences… kasi doon nagiging meaningful yung literature, not just the explanation." (Participant 12)

This highlights a critical pedagogical stance: literature teaching remains inherently human-centered. The implication is that teachers are actively preserving the essence of literary study by prioritizing personal engagement over purely informational understanding, even in technologically advanced classrooms.

Theme 3: *Redesigning Learning Activities to Combine AI and Interpretive Tasks*
Teachers also navigated AI integration by redesigning classroom activities that combine AI use with interpretive and critical tasks, as reported by 10 out of 15 participants. For example, some required students to critique AI-generated interpretations, compare them with their own analyses, or identify inaccuracies and limitations. These tasks shifted AI from being an answer-provider to a subject of analysis. This was evident in the participants' responses:

"Sometimes I let them use AI, then I ask them to critique it… like, what do you agree or disagree with?" (Participant 2)

"I design tasks where they compare their answer with AI… so they can see the difference and think more deeply." (Participant 15)

This approach suggests a pedagogical shift toward more reflective and evaluative learning. The implication is that AI can be used not only as a tool but also as a learning object, helping students develop critical awareness and deeper analytical skills when engaging with literary texts.
Theme 4: *Positioning the Teacher as the Central Facilitator of Meaning-Making*
A final theme that emerged was the reassertion of the teacher's role as the central facilitator of meaning-making, reported by 14 out of 15 participants. Despite the presence of artificial intelligence, teachers emphasized that their role remained crucial in guiding interpretation, clarifying misconceptions, and deepening students' understanding of literary texts. Participants described themselves not as sources of information alone, but as facilitators who help students question, reflect, and construct meaning beyond what AI can provide. They highlighted that while AI can generate responses, it lacks the ability to contextualize learning, respond to students' emotions, and adapt to classroom dynamics.

"Even with AI, I still guide them… because they need someone to help them understand beyond what the tool gives." (Participant 8)

"AI can give information, but the teacher is still important… we help them process and make sense of everything." (Participant 11)

This finding underscores the enduring importance of the teacher in literature instruction. The implication is that AI does not replace the teacher but instead reinforces the need for strong pedagogical guidance. Teachers play a critical role in ensuring that learning remains meaningful, interpretive, and human-centered. Overall, the findings revealed that English teachers navigated the integration of artificial intelligence in literature teaching through a process of balance, adaptation, and reaffirmation of pedagogical values. Rather than fully adopting or rejecting AI, teachers strategically incorporated it alongside traditional approaches, particularly through discussion-based instruction and interpretive activities. They emphasized the importance of maintaining human-centered learning by encouraging personal response, critical reflection, and active engagement with literary texts. Additionally, teachers demonstrated flexibility in redesigning instructional tasks that allowed students to interact with AI while still developing their own interpretations. Central to this navigation was the continued role of the teacher as a facilitator of meaning-making, ensuring that learning remained guided, contextualized, and reflective. These findings suggest that effective integration of AI in literature teaching does not involve replacing traditional practices but rather recontextualizing them within evolving technological environments.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study explored how English teachers experienced and responded to the integration of artificial intelligence in literature teaching. The findings revealed that AI has significantly influenced not only instructional practices but also the nature of literary engagement, assessment, and classroom interaction. Rather than functioning solely as a technological tool, AI emerged as a pedagogical condition that reshaped how literature is taught and understood. Teachers were not passive recipients of this change; instead, they actively navigated its complexities by adapting their strategies, redefining their roles, and maintaining the humanistic core of literature instruction.

The findings indicated that English teachers experienced multiple, interconnected challenges in teaching literature within the context of artificial intelligence. These included diminished student engagement in deep interpretation, overreliance on AI-generated responses, difficulty in ensuring academic integrity, limited AI literacy among teachers, and challenges in adapting instructional strategies. Additionally, a significant tension emerged between traditional literature teaching practices and AI-mediated learning. These challenges demonstrated that AI integration affects not only technical aspects of teaching but also the fundamental processes of meaning-making and literary engagement.

The challenges identified in this study imply the need for institutional support and policy development that address the realities of AI integration in education. Schools and universities should provide structured training programs to enhance teachers' AI literacy and equip them with strategies for managing AI-related issues such as academic integrity and student overreliance. Additionally, there is a need to revisit traditional assessment methods, particularly in literature teaching, to ensure that they remain valid and effective in evaluating authentic student learning.

In response to these challenges, teachers employed a range of adaptive and strategic coping mechanisms. These included reinforcing critical thinking through guided discussions, modifying assessment practices to ensure authenticity, establishing clear guidelines on AI use, integrating AI as a supplementary tool, improving their own AI literacy, and promoting responsible use among students. These strategies reflected teachers' active role in managing AI integration, showing that they were capable of adapting their practices while maintaining instructional goals. Coping, therefore, was not merely reactive but involved deliberate pedagogical adjustments.

The coping strategies employed by teachers suggest that effective AI integration requires pedagogical flexibility and innovation. Educators should be encouraged to adopt varied instructional and assessment approaches that promote critical thinking and active engagement. Furthermore, fostering a culture of responsible AI use among students is essential. This implies that AI should not be treated solely as a threat but as a tool that can be integrated meaningfully when guided by clear policies and ethical considerations.

The findings further revealed that teachers navigated the integration of AI by balancing innovation with tradition. They maintained discussion-based instruction, reaffirmed the value of human interpretation, redesigned learning activities to critically engage with AI, and positioned themselves as facilitators of meaning-making. This navigation process highlighted that literature teaching remained deeply rooted in human experience, even within AI-mediated environments. Teachers did not abandon traditional practices but instead recontextualized them alongside emerging technologies.

The ways in which teachers navigated AI and traditional literature teaching highlight the importance of preserving the humanistic and interpretive nature of literature education. Educational institutions should support approaches that integrate technology without compromising core pedagogical values. This includes promoting discussion-based learning, reflective thinking, and student-centered interpretation. The findings also imply that the role of the teacher remains central, not diminished, in AI-mediated classrooms, reinforcing the need to strengthen teachers' capacity as facilitators of learning.

Acknowledgement

This research received no external funding from any public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agency, and no organization provided financial support for the conduct of the study, authorship, or publication of this article.

Funding

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this article.

Competing Interests Statement

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this article.

Data Availability Statement

The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. Access to these data is subject to ethical guidelines and the protection of participants' confidentiality.

References

Baron, N. S. (2021). How we read now: Strategic choices for print, screen, and audio. Oxford University Press.
Beach, R., & O'Brien, D. (2015). Using apps for learning across the curriculum. Routledge.
Biri, A. K. A., Arilin, A. T., Traigo, M. L. M., Jaji, G. T., Salasain, R. J., & Abdilla, A. Y. (2025). AI dilemma in schoolwork: Student anxiety and fairness perceptions in AI schoolwork accusations. Journal of Education and Practice, 16(11).10.7176/JEP/16-11-01
Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2023). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. Innovations in Education and Teaching International. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148
Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., Baabdullah, A. M., Koohang, A., Raghavan, V., Ahuja, M., Albanna, H., Albashrawi, M. A., Al-Busaidi, K. A., Balakrishnan, J., Barlette, Y., Basu, S., Bose, I., Brooks, L., Buhalis, D., … Wright, R. (2023). So what if ChatGPT wrote it? Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges, and implications of generative conversational AI. International Journal of Information Management, 71, 102642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642
Eaton, S. E. (2023). Artificial intelligence and academic integrity: The ethics of teaching and learning with AI. International Journal for Educational Integrity, 19(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00143-5
Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning. Center for Curriculum Redesign. https://doi.org/10.58863/20.500.12424/4276068
Holmes, W., & Tuomi, I. (2022). State of the art and practice in AI in education. European Journal of Education, 57(4), 542–570. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12533
Ifenthaler, D., & Schumacher, D.-K. (2023). Student perceptions of artificial intelligence in higher education. Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 4, 100124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100124
Joo, Y. J., Lim, K. Y., & Kim, E. K. (2016). Online university students' satisfaction and persistence. Computers & Education, 57(2), 1654–1664. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.02.008
Kasneci, E., Sessler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., & Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274
Kim, H., Sefcik, J. S., & Bradway, C. (2017). Characteristics of qualitative descriptive studies: A systematic review. Research in Nursing & Health, 40(1), 23–42. https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.21768
Lancaster, T. (2020). Artificial intelligence, plagiarism, and academic integrity. Journal of Academic Ethics, 18(4), 351–364.
Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education. Pearson.
Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge. Teachers College Record, 108(6), 1017–1054. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x
Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet trustworthiness criteria. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 16(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847
Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative research. Administration and Policy in Mental Health, 42(5), 533–544. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y
Patton, M. Q. (2015). Qualitative research & evaluation methods (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978). The reader, the text, the poem. Southern Illinois University Press.
Selwyn, N. (2019). Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education. Polity Press.
Sharples, M. (2023). Automated essay writing and AI in education. Educational Technology Research and Development.
Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., Ragu-Nathan, T. S., & Ragu-Nathan, B. S. (2011). Technostress: Causes and consequences. Communications of the ACM, 54(9), 113–120. https://doi.org/10.1145/1995376.1995403
UNESCO. (2021). AI and education: Guidance for policy-makers. UNESCO Publishing.
Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). AI in higher education: A systematic review. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16(1), 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0

Appendices

No appendices are attached to this study.