

# Exploring Saudi EFL Learners' Engagement With AI Generative Tools in Educational Settings: Perceptions, Practices, and Pedagogical Outcomes

Faris Salim Allehyani

Department of Languages and Translation, University College of Umluj, University of Tabuk, Saudi Arabia

Fatimah Albedah

English Language and Translation Department, College of Science & Theoretical Studies, Saudi Electronic University, Saudi Arabia

Mohammad Jamshed\*

English Department, College of Science & Humanities, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

Wahaj Unnisa Warda

Department of English, College of Science & Humanities (Female Campus), Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

**Abstract**—The study explored EFL learners' engagement with AI generative tools, their perceptions and practices, and the pedagogical implications in the Saudi Arabian context. 182 students from undergraduate programs at different universities were randomly selected. To obtain data from respondents, a questionnaire was used, which included self-designed items as well as items from existing studies. The data was assessed quantitatively using descriptive statistics. It was found that Saudi EFL learners strongly supported AI generative technologies for language education and learning. It was also revealed that Saudi EFL students utilized these tools to learn new words and vocabulary, write assignments, develop new ideas and concepts, punctuation and spelling, corrections to grammar and feedback, and translate texts. The findings also revealed that Saudi Arabia's tech-savvy youth found AI-powered learning and training more captivating and stimulating. Therefore, the study offers many pedagogical implications.

**Index Terms**—captivating and stimulating, language acquisition and instruction, punctuation and spelling, self-designed items, tech-savvy youth

## I. INTRODUCTION

The last few years have witnessed increased technology integration, particularly AI-powered tools in EFL classrooms. While technology usage was common even before Covid 19, the unusual situations and socially altered conditions accelerated the usage of technology at a level never utilized before (Jamshed et al., 2024). Nowadays, there is a great deal of research on automated and technology-enhanced approaches, and the way the use of technology is revolutionizing almost every aspect of life (Rukiati et al., 2023; Sharadgah, 2022). Incorporating technology in education is often referred to as AIED, which represents integrating AI technology or applications in education to improve language instruction and acquisition methods. Both instructors and students gained from digital tools in and out of class. AI has changed how language learners use ICT, particularly in computer-assisted language acquisition. Computer-mediated knowledge responds to learners' ways, schedules, and contexts (Almehmadi, 2024). AI-driven language learning has revolutionized English learning and instruction. Tech-savvy teachers assist learners to reach their potential and prosper in their careers (Jamshed et al., 2024).

Multiple studies have demonstrated that AI tools' capabilities are exceptionally advantageous in language instruction, offering teachers unparalleled chances to teach many different kinds of student demographics more efficiently and individually (Mananay, 2024; Rusmiyanto et al., 2023). Xu and Wang (2024) conducted a meta-analysis of AI-powered tools' impact on English learning outcomes. The study found that students who employed AI excelled those who received traditional schooling. Dai and Liu (2024) undertook a phenomenological study to examine the beneficial and detrimental aspects of AI in EFL classrooms from Chinese EFL students' perspectives. It was found that using AI in

---

\* Corresponding Author.

EFL lessons could offer tailored learning, fast feedback, comprehensive educational resources, and a stimulating learning atmosphere. Tiwari (2024) examined the perspectives and experiences of university teachers with a special focus on how AI tools in EFL classrooms. The study findings revealed a mixture of both expectations and concerns. Al-Khresheh (2024) investigated both the benefits and disadvantages of employing ChatGPT in the instruction of English and the impact of these potential applications for English language learning and instruction. It was found that ChatGPT could promote customized and engaging educational interactions, but teachers were concerned about linguistic precision, excessive reliance on the program, and creative repression.

Using AI-powered tools represents great pedagogical opportunities in Saudi Arabia's higher education. Students studying English as a foreign language have frequently found it difficult to become competent and master the language. AI-powered tools offer immense potential to empower such students and facilitate English language instruction. As universities are well equipped with modern advanced technology, the tech-savvy younger generation responds more actively to technology-powered learning and instruction.

#### A. *Research Problem*

The utilisation of AI tools in the world in general and Saudi Arabia, in particular, is growing. Both the teachers and learners are moving away from conventional methods towards AI-powered methods of language learning and instruction. As the motivation to learn a language is shaped by one's perceptions and perspectives, this study seeks to examine how Saudi EFL learners view the integration of AI generative tools in EFL classrooms.

#### B. *Research Purpose*

This study aims to investigate Saudi EFL learners' perceptions and practices, and the pedagogical implications of the utilisation of AI tools for both language learning and instruction.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Mohammad et al. (2024) examined the perspectives of EFL learners and instructors regarding utilizing QuillBot to enhance paraphrasing skills. The study used a descriptive questionnaire and random selection method to select 115 learners and 44 instructors. Additionally, 13 students were interviewed in a semi-structured manner to collect their perspectives on QuillBot usage. Both instructors and learners thought QuillBot could enhance paraphrasing, and students outperformed teachers in QuillBot usage. Students' gender and teachers' qualifications and experience had no impact on their responses. The study offers many implications for both teachers and students. The study recommends more diverse and larger samples from numerous educational and geographic settings to confirm and expand these findings. Alzubi (2024) investigated the generative AI literacy of language students in EFL writing. Using a descriptive survey method, 278 participants answered three partially structured questions from the interview along with completing a 30-item questionnaire. It was revealed that language learners possessed a medium level of literacy in generative AI tools for EFL writing and their responses were impacted by GPA and proficiency using generative AI technologies for EFL writing, rather than specialty. The findings suggest that EFL instructors should use AI tools. Future studies should investigate how AI tools affect writing skills over time. Aljabr and Al-Ahdal (2024) examined AI's ethical and pedagogical potential and teachers' reluctance to technological integration into conventional classrooms. This study utilized hybrid methods to collect data from fifty Ha'il University English, Translation, and Linguistics instructors. A questionnaire and personal discussions were utilized to examine their collective and personal perspectives on ethical and educational issues. The findings revealed that language instructors had a high sense of the ethical use of AI in their teaching and of its implications for education. It was also found that teachers were one of the ways to ensure the maintenance of ethics. The study suggests that both EFL instructors and learners be conscious of how to use AI safely in learning. Alghamdy (2023) examined both the positive aspects and the drawbacks of incorporating AI into EFL instruction. This literature study conducts an exhaustive review of studies, journals, research articles, and academic research on AI in EFL contexts, incorporating risk and ethical concerns. The findings demonstrated a substantial impact of AI tools on EFL learners. Despite potential obstacles, the study encourages utilizing AI to accelerate EFL learners into new educational frontiers.

Cong-Lem et al. (2024) investigated Vietnamese EFL instructors' perspectives on academic honesty issues posed by AI, chatbots such as ChatGPT for foreign language acquisition. The open-ended survey asked 31 Vietnamese EFL instructors about AI-based academic dishonesty, its causes, sanctions for plagiarizing students, and their instructional strategies. It was found that instructors mostly blamed AI-driven plagiarism on pupils' lack of innovative ideas, learning motivation, and linguistic skills. As AI overuse hindered critical thinking and linguistic skills, teachers called for more restrictions, AI-based plagiarism detection, and AI instruction to combat academic dishonesty. Sumakul et al. (2022) examined the instructor's perspectives on AI in their EFL classrooms. The data was collected from interviews with four Indonesian university EFL instructors who implemented AI into their methods of instruction. The survey revealed that all teachers were strongly in favor of incorporating AI into their courses, believing it could improve teaching and learning. The study offers multiple pedagogical implications for the incorporation of technology in EFL classrooms. As the study has limited data, it suggests wider data in different contexts to have a deeper understanding of this issue. Dai and Liu (2024) conducted a phenomenological study to assess Chinese EFL students' perspectives on AI's strengths and

weaknesses in EFL classrooms. From different institutions, 45 Chinese EFL students were chosen utilising criterion sampling. The data was collected using an open-ended questionnaire. 15 of 45 respondents were randomly selected for a follow-up interview for triangulation. Participants' AI possibilities and challenges were examined using MAXQDA (2023). The study revealed that AI in EFL lectures could offer specialized learning, rapid feedback, rich teaching resources, and an interactive learning environment. The study implies that teachers and policy makers could use these findings to overcome AI's classroom challenges. Pham and Lee (2024) explored Vietnamese tertiary EFL instructors' perspectives on AI's impact on language learning creativity. Nine Vietnamese language instructors from two universities participated in semi-structured interviews representing rookie, mid-career, and near-end careers. Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) and Creativity in Language Learning Framework (CLLF) were employed as theoretical bases. The analysis revealed some important themes such as AI's apparent impact on innovative language practice, obstacles with AI-creative pedagogy integration, student autonomy, and traditional methods of instruction and instructor duties. While AI is meant to foster creativity, it could restrict it and conventional education.

Hieu (2024) studied Vietnamese tertiary-level EFL instructors' utilization of ChatGPT in fantastical narrative recounting assignments. Nineteen Vietnamese university language instructors were interviewed in semi-structured interviews at the beginning, middle, and conclusion of their occupations for the qualitative study. The technology acceptance model (TAM) and constructivist learning theory were used to analyze language instruction technology integration. Theme analysis revealed ChatGPT integration problems and potential in language instruction. AI overuse, societal and contextual inconsistencies, integration with educational techniques, linguistic correctness, creativity, technology obstacles, and ethics are crucial. The study suggests balancing AI incorporation into language instruction with individualized, engaging instruction and teacher professional growth.

### **Research Questions**

1. How do Saudi EFL learners view engaging with AI generative tools for language learning and instruction?
2. What are the practices/strategies for using AI generative tools in Saudi EFL classrooms?
3. What are the pedagogical implications of engaging with AI generative tools?

## III. METHODOLOGY

### *A. Research Design*

This study adopted a quantitative, descriptive method to more fully understand the perspectives of Saudi students, their practices/strategies, and the pedagogical prospects for language learning and instruction offered by AI generative tools. Analyzing data encompassing figures and statistics involves using a quantitative methodology, according to Creswell and Creswell (2017).

### *B. Participants' Description*

The study chose undergraduate EFL students from different Saudi Arabian universities. They are enrolled in undergraduate programs at different stages. They have been learning English for almost last 10 years as a compulsory subject. All of them are native Arabic speakers and are currently studying and speaking English as a foreign language. A simple random selection approach was used to choose 182 respondents. Out of the total participants, 102 are male, 77 are female, and 3 responders didn't mention their gender. Table 1 summarizes the demographic information provided by the respondents.

TABLE 1		
Variables	Frequency	Percentage
<b><i>Gender</i></b>		
Male	102	56%
Female	77	42.30%
Others	3	1.70%
<b><i>Year/Level of study</i></b>		
6th to 8th Level	28	15.30%
4th to 5th Level	33	18.10%
1st to 3rd Level	121	66.50%
<b><i>Profession of the participants' parents</i></b>		
Government Job	113	62.10%
Private Job	16	8.80%
Self-employment/Business	16	8.80%
No job/employment	37	20.30%

### *C. Data Collection Tools*

The questionnaire was designed following an extensive review of a substantial number of previous research studies. While some of the items were self-developed, other ones were derived from previous research (Aljabr & Al-Ahdal, 2024; Alzubi, 2024; Jamshed et al., 2024; Kristiawan et al., 2024; Mohammad et al., 2024). The initial section of the questionnaire comprises six inquiries regarding the respondents' personal information. The first seven items deal with Saudi EFL learners' views regarding AI generative tools, the next seven deal with their practices/strategies, and the last

seven ones with the pedagogical implications of engaging AI generative tools in the Saudi Arabian context. The respondents were advised to rate their opinion on a five-point Likert scale (5 = strongly agree, 4 = agree, 3 = neutral, 2 = disagree, and 1 = strongly disagree).

#### D. Validity

As the research study respondents lacked English competence, questionnaire items were made accessible in Arabic and English. Two English-Arabic experts verified the translation. A pilot study validated the questionnaire and its different components. The experts' feedback and suggestions were incorporated.

#### E. Data Collection Method

The data was collected from the research respondents utilising a questionnaire. Both course instructors and students who registered provided a link to the questionnaire. Along with the addition to the English text, the Arabic translation was given to the respondents to facilitate a more precise representation of their opinions. They were advised to meticulously examine the guidelines for each section. The participants were given assurance that their answers would remain entirely confidential and used solely for research and educational purposes, therefore enabling them to express their particular tastes.

#### F. Data Interpretation

Having collected adequate responses, the data was downloaded from a Google Form to an Excel spreadsheet. After assigning numerical codes to the responses (5= strongly agree, 4= agree, 3= neutral, 2= disagree, and 1= strongly disagree), the data was loaded into SPSS. As the questionnaire contained only closed-ended questions, the data gathered was rigorously categorized and assessed utilizing qualitative methods. For statistical analysis, the most recent version of SPSS was employed. Descriptive statistics were applied to determine the data's means, frequency, and standard deviation. Table 2 shows the criteria used for categorizing the level of respondents' perceptions and opinions.

TABLE 2

Mean Square	Level
3.1-4.50	High
1.51-to 3.00	Moderate
1.00-1.50	Low

## IV. RESULT AND FINDINGS

### Representing Saudi EFL learners' perceptions, practices, and the pedagogical implications of engaging with AI generative tools

TABLE 3

Questions/items	Overall Means
1. Representing Saudi EFL learners' perceptions regarding engaging with AI generative tools	4.06
2. Representing Saudi EFL learners' practices of engaging with AI generative tools	4.10
3. Representing the pedagogical implications of engaging with AI tools	4.07
<b>Overall</b>	<b>4.07</b>

Table 3 illustrates Saudi EFL students' favorable perceptions of AI generative tools as an important means of language learning and instruction. It was also found that Saudi EFL learners use these tools for different purposes such as learning new words, vocabulary building, assignment writing, developing new ideas and concepts, learning spelling and punctuation, grammar correction and feedback, and translating texts. It was also revealed that Saudi Arabia's tech-savvy younger generation found AI-powered learning and instruction more appealing and motivating. Thus, AI-powered classrooms and instruction offer great pedagogical prospects for empowering Saudi EFL learners.

TABLE 4

ANALYZING SAUDI STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS REGARDING AI TOOLS FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING AND INSTRUCTION

statements/items	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean	Level
1	90(49.5%)	63(34.6%)	25(13.7%)	2(1.1%)	2(1.1%)	4.29	High
2	71(39%)	78(42.9%)	30(16.5%)	2(1.1%)	1(0.5%)	4.17	High
3	69(37.9%)	68(37.4%)	39(21.4%)	4(2.2%)	2(1.1%)	4.08	High
4	83(45.6%)	72(39.6%)	24(13.2%)	2(1.1%)	1(0.5%)	4.27	High
5	59(32.4%)	61(33.5%)	47(25.8%)	14(7.7%)	1(0.5%)	3.89	High
6	66(36.3%)	68(37.4%)	38(20.9%)	8(4.4%)	2(1.1%)	4.12	High
7	47(25.8%)	55(33.2%)	53(29.1%)	20(11%)	7(3.8%)	3.63	High

Table 4 shows a statistical analysis of the 7 items dealing with Saudi students' perceptions regarding AI tools for language education. In response to item no. 1, 84.1% (SA 49.5% & A 34.6%) of the respondents said that AI tools were useful for enhancing English proficiency. While 13.7% stayed neutral, 2.2% (D 1.1% & SD 1.1%) of the respondents rejected the assertion. The average mean score is 4.29, which is high based on the parameters used in

the research method. In the next item no. 2, 81.9% (SA 39% & A 42.9%) of the study participants believed that AI generative tools promote customized and self-learning. 16.5% of respondents expressed neutrality, and 1.6% (D 1.1% & SD 0.5%) opposed the statement. The average mean score 4.17. Regarding item no.3, 75.3% (SA 37.9% & A 37.4%) of the respondents said that AI generative tools stimulated EFL students' self-confidence and activated the learning process. While 21.4% were neutral, 3.3% (D 2.2% & SD 1.1%) expressed disagreement with the idea. In item no 4, 85.2% (SA 45.6% & A 39.6%) of the respondents said that AI generative tools enabled learners to experiment with different methods of learning. 13.2% stayed neutral and 1.6% (D 1.1% & SD 0.5%) opposed the opinion. The average score is 4.27. Concerning item no 5, 65.9% (SA 32.4% & 33.5%) of the participants believed that AI generative tools undermined the relationship between students and instructors. While 25.8% did not express their opinion, 8.2% (D 7.7% & SD 0.5%) of the respondents didn't agree with the assertion. The average mean is 3.89. In item no. 6, 73.7% (SA 36.3% & A 37.4%) of the respondents accepted that AI generative tools made learning a dynamic and stimulating experience. 20.9% stayed neutral and 5.5% (D 4.4% & SD 1.1%) disapproved of the statement. The mean is 4.12. In the final component in this category, 59% (SA 25.8% & A 33.2%) of the respondents said that AI generative tools disregarded creativity and devalued human skills. While 29.1% stayed neutral, 14.8% (D 11% & SD 3.8%) rejected the assertion. The average means is 3.63. With an overall mean of 4.06, all of the items in this group fall under rigorous criteria. This analysis responds the first research question of the study.

TABLE 5  
ANALYZING SAUDI STUDENTS' PRACTICES REGARDING AI TOOLS FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING AND INSTRUCTION

statements/items	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean	Level
8	67(36.8%)	78(42.9%)	32(17.6%)	4(2.2%)	1(0.5%)	4.13	High
9	73(40.1%)	75(41.2%)	23(12.6%)	10(5.5%)	1(0.5%)	4.14	High
10	66(36.3%)	66(36.3%)	39(21.4%)	10(5.5%)	1(0.5%)	4.02	High
11	69(37.9%)	78(42.9%)	28(15.4%)	6(3.3%)	1(0.5%)	4.14	High
12	62(34.1%)	66(36.3%)	43(23.6%)	10(5.5%)	1(0.5%)	3.97	High
13	74(40.7%)	69(37.9%)	33(18.1%)	4(2.2%)	2(1.1%)	4.14	High
14	83(45.6%)	64(35.2%)	29(15.9%)	3(1.6%)	3(1.6%)	4.21	High

Table 5 shows the statistical analysis of Saudi EFL students' practices and strategies for engaging with AI generative tools. In item no. 8, 79.7% of participants (SA 36.8% & A 42.9%) stated that they engaged generative AI tools to gain skills to use new words. 17.6% stayed neutral, and 2.7% (D 2.2% & 0.5%) opposed the statement. The mean score is 4.13. In the next item no. 9, 81.3% (SA 40.1% & A 41.2%) of the respondents said that they used AI generative to enhance their vocabulary and develop word power. While 12.6% of the respondents maintained neutrality, 6% (D 5.5% & SD 0.5%) disagreed with the assertion. The mean score is 4.14. Regarding the item no. 10, 72.6% (SA 36.3% & A 36.3%) of the participants said that they utilized generative AI for writing assignments. 21.4% of the respondents remained neutral, and 6% (D 5.5% & SD 0.5%) objected to the statement. The mean score is 4.02. Concerning item no. 11, 80.8% (SA 37.9% & A 42.9%) of the respondents said that they used generative AI tools to develop new ideas and concepts. 15.4% of the respondents maintained their neutrality, and 3.8% (D 3.3% & SD 0.5%) of the participants dismissed the statement. The average mean score is 4.14. Regarding item 12, 70.4% (SA 34.1% & A 36.3%) of survey participants said that they used generative AI tools to learn spelling and punctuation. While 23.6% chose neutrality, 6% (D 5.5% & SD 0.5%) of the survey participants opposed the assertion. The mean score is 3.97. In the next item no. 13, 78.6% (SA 40.7% & A 37.9%) of the respondents said that they utilized generative AI tools for grammar correction and feedback. 18.1% stayed neutral, and 3.3% (D 2.2% & SD 1.1%) rejected the opinion. The mean score is 4.14. In item no 14, which is the last item of this category, 80.8% (SA 45.6% & A 35.2%) of the respondents stated that they utilized generative AI-powered tools to translate texts. While 15.9% of respondents stayed neutral, 3.2% (D 1.6% & SD 1.6%) differed with assertion. 4.21 is the mean score. The mean score for all the items in this group is 4.10, which qualifies as high. This analysis responds to the second research question of the study.

TABLE 6  
ANALYZING SAUDI STUDENTS' OPINIONS ABOUT THE PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF ENGAGING WITH AI GENERATIVE TOOLS

statements/items	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean	Level
15	66(36.3%)	72(39.6%)	39(21.4%)	2(1.1%)	3(1.6%)	4.06	High
16	71(39%)	72(39.6%)	32(17.6%)	4(2.2%)	3(1.6%)	4.12	High
17	71(39%)	62(34.1%)	36(19.8%)	8(4.4%)	5(2.7%)	4.02	High
18	70(38.5%)	66(36.3%)	37(20.3%)	8(4.4%)	1(0.5%)	4.07	High
19	60(33%)	60(33%)	44(24.2%)	14(7.7%)	4(2.2%)	3.86	High
20	84(46.2%)	71(39%)	22(12.1%)	3(1.6%)	2(1.1%)	4.27	High
21	72(39.6%)	72(39.6%)	34(18.7%)	1(0.5%)	3(1.6%)	4.14	High

Table 6 shows the statistical analysis of Saudi EFL students about the pedagogical implications of engaging with AI generative tools. In item no. 15 which is the first item under this category, 78.6% (SA 36.3% & A 39.6%) of the respondents said that AI generative tools offer customized instruction for learners. While 21.4% of the respondents maintained neutrality, 2.7% (D 1.1% & SD 1.6%) opposed the assertion. The mean score is 4.06. In the next item, no 16, 78.6% (SA 39% & 39.6%) of the participants believed AI tools enhanced student engagement and participation. 17.6% stayed neutral, and 3.8% (D 2.2% & SD 1.6%) of the participants disagreed with the contention. The mean score is 4.12.

Regarding item no. 17, 73.1% (SA 39% & A 34.1%) of the respondents said that AI generative tools enhanced students' learning motivation and enthusiasm. While 19.8% maintained neutrality, 7.1% (D 4.4% & SD 2.7%) opposed the idea. The mean is 4.02. About item no 18, 74.8% (SA 38.5% & A 36.3%) said that AI tools helped students become independent learners. 20.3% of the respondents maintained neutrality, and 4.9% (D 4.4% & SD 0.5%) disagreed with the contention. And the mean score is 4.07. Concerning item no. 19, 66% (SA 33% & A 33%) of the respondents said that AI generative tools promoted collaborative education. While 24.2% of the participants chose to be neutral, 9.9% (D 7.7% & SD 2.2%) opposed the claim. The mean score is 3.86. In the next item, 20, 85.2% (SA 46.2% & A 39%) of the participants believed that AI tools could address student questions and difficulties more effectively. 12.1% of the respondents stayed neutral, and 2.7% (D 1.6% & SD 1.1%) differ with the assertion. The mean score is 4.27. In item no 21 which is the last item of this category, 79.2% (SA 39.6% & A 39.6%) of the respondents said that AI tools offered customized grammar suggestions and feedback tailored to learners' needs. While 18.7% of the respondents stayed neutral, 2.1% (D 0.5% & SD 1.6%) of the respondents opposed the assertion. A 4.14 mean score is obtained. The total score for all items in this category is 4.07, which is high according to the specified criteria. The explanation provided addresses the study's third research question.

## V. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

The study was undertaken to explore the perceptions of Saudi EFL learners, their practices, and the pedagogical implications and educational opportunities offered by AI generative tools. It was found that Saudi EFL learners had exceptionally positive perceptions of engaging with AI-powered methods. This finding is supported by Hartono et al. (2023) who found that the participants enjoyed AI-based English instruction as it promoted language skills and personalized education. Mananay (2024) revealed that educators regarded AI to be successful in a variety of contexts. It illustrated how the adoption of AI applications in language instruction was rapidly growing. In addition, Mushthoza et al. (2023) highlighted the potential of AI for English classrooms, but they also stressed the need for cautious implementation and constant evaluation to guarantee fair and ethical procedures. One more study carried out by Tiwari (2024) examined the perspectives and experiences of university teachers with a special focus on how AI tools in EFL classrooms. However, this study revealed a mixture of both expectations and concerns. Similarly, one study carried out by Fošner (2024) found that students recognised AI tools' efficacy but expressed anxiety about its effects on learning and academic integrity, highlighting the need for appropriate and suitable incorporation of AI in education for successful outcomes. Zulkarnain and Yunus (2023) also highlighted that language instructors appreciated AI technology adoption despite its drawbacks because of its dynamic nature and effectiveness. The study also examined the practices and strategies of engaging with AI generative tools among Saudi students. It was found that Saudi EFL learners also utilize these tools for learning new words, and vocabulary, writing homework, generating novel concepts and ideas, punctuation and spelling, corrections for grammar and feedback, and translating texts. This finding that AI tools assist students in different ways is corroborated by Cai et al. (2024) who found that AI tools assisted students in customizing their self-evaluation through social and technical engagement and effective communication, enhancing motivation, involvement with learning, and instructional support, resulting in improved academic achievement, student growth, and development. Mananay (2024) also found that AI-powered interactive simulations, adaptive learning, and individualized feedback improved language instruction. It highlighted that, despite technology and pedagogical constraints, intentional AI use had increased student engagement, competency, and autonomy. The investigation also found that AI tools offered great pedagogical prospects and educational opportunities for empowering language learners. This finding is supported by many studies. For example, Sharifuddin and Hashim (2024) found that AI-powered technologies offered great and potential opportunities for enhancing EFL/ESL education. Sharadgah and Sa'di (2022) also found that AI in ELT offered exciting prospects in terms of increasing English language competence, assessment, translation, recognition, attitude, and satisfaction. Al-Raimi et al. (2024) also concluded that AI technologies in EFL classrooms enhanced instruction and learning, enabling students to acquire useful skills. Similarly, Rusmiyanto et al. (2023) found that AI could enhance English language students' interpersonal skills by offering customized and engaging learning experiences. One more study carried out by Dai and Liu (2024) also revealed that AI in education promoted tailored learning, fast feedback, rich resources for instruction, and an interactive classroom.

## VI. CONCLUSION

The study was conducted to examine Saudi EFL learners' perceptions, practices, pedagogical implications, and educational opportunities for engaging with AI generative tools in Saudi Arabia. It was found that Saudi EFL students had highly enthusiastic perspectives on AI generative tools as an important means of language instruction and learning. It was additionally found that Saudi EFL students utilized these tools for a variety of goals, including learning new words, expanding their vocabulary, writing assignments, generating new ideas and concepts, learning spelling and punctuation, offering feedback on grammar, and translating content. It was additionally shown that Saudi Arabia's tech-savvy younger generation preferred AI-powered learning and instruction. Thus, AI-powered classrooms and instruction offer tremendous pedagogical opportunities for empowering Saudi EFL learners. Future studies may include diverse background students and instructors to add credence to the study.

## APPENDIX

	SA	A	N	D	SD
1. AI-generating technology is very useful for enhancing English proficiency.					
2. AI generative tools promote customized and self-learning.					
3. AI generative tools stimulate EFL students' self-confidence and activates learning process.					
4. AI generative tools enable learners to experiment with different methods of learning.					
5. AI generative tools undermine the relationship between students and instructors.					
6. AI generative tools make learning a dynamic and stimulating experience.					
7. AI generative tools disregard creativity and devalue human skill.					
8. I utilize generative AI tools to learn the usage of new words.					
9. I use AI generative to enhance my vocabulary.					
10. I utilize generative AI for writing assignments.					
11. I use generative AI tools to develop new ideas and concepts.					
12. I use generative AI tools to learn spelling and punctuation.					
13. I utilize generative AI for grammar correction and feedback.					
14. I utilize generative AI powered tools to translate texts.					
15. AI generative tools offer customized instruction for learners.					
16. I believe AI tools enhance student engagement and participation.					
17. AI generative tools enhance students' learning motivation and their enthusiasm.					
18. AI tools help students become independent learners.					
19. AI generative tools promote collaborative education.					
20. AI tools can address student questions and difficulties more effectively.					
21. AI tools offer customized grammar suggestions and feedback tailored to learners' needs.					

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study is supported via funding from Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University project number (PSAU/2025/R/1446).

## REFERENCES

- [1] Alghamdy, R. Z. (2023). Pedagogical and Ethical Implications of Artificial Intelligence in EFL Context: A Review Study. *English Language Teaching*, 16(10), 87-98. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v16n10p87>
- [2] Al-khreshah, M. H. (2024). Bridging technology and pedagogy from a global lens: Teachers' perspectives on integrating ChatGPT in English language teaching. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 100218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100218>
- [3] Almeahadi, W. S. (2024). Exploring the potential of A I techniques in teaching English as a foreign language: A systematic literature review. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Management Studies*, 11(2), 22-31. 10.20448/ajssms.v11i2.5576
- [4] Aljabr, F. S., & Al-Ahdal, A. A. M. H. (2024). Ethical and pedagogical implications of AI in language education: An empirical study at Ha'il University. *Acta Psychologica*, 251, 104605. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2024.104605>
- [5] Al-Raimi, M., Mudsh, B. A., Muqaibal, M. H., & Al-Yafaei, Y. (2024). To What Extent Has Artificial Intelligence Impacted EFL Teaching and Learning? A Systematic Review. *Jurnal Arbitrer*, 11(3), 399-412. <https://doi.org/10.25077/ar.11.3.399-412.2024>
- [6] Alzubi, A. A. F. (2024). Generative Artificial Intelligence in the EFL Writing Context: Students' Literacy in Perspective. *Qubahan Academic Journal*, 4(2), 59-69. <https://doi.org/10.48161/qaj.v4n2a506>
- [7] Cai, L., Msafiri, M. M., & Kangwa, D. (2024). Exploring the impact of integrating AI tools in higher education using the Zone of Proximal Development. *Education and Information Technologies*, 1-74. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13112-0>
- [8] Cong-Lem, N., Tran, T. N., & Nguyen, T. T. (2024). Academic integrity in the age of generative AI: Perceptions and responses of Vietnamese EFL teachers. *Teaching English with Technology*, 24(1), 28-47.
- [9] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- [10] Dai, K., & Liu, Q. (2024). Leveraging Artificial Intelligence (AI) in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Classes: Challenges and Opportunities in the Spotlight. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 108354. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2024.108354>
- [11] Fošner, A. (2024). University Students' Attitudes and Perceptions towards AI Tools: Implications for Sustainable Educational Practices. *Sustainability*, 16(19), 8668. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16198668>
- [12] Hartono, W., Nurfitri, N., Ridwan, R., Kase, E., Lake, F., & Y. Zebua, R. (2023). Artificial Intelligence (AI) Solutions in English Language Teaching: Teachers-Students Perceptions and Experiences. *Journal on Education*, 6(1), 1452-1461. <https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v6i1.3101>
- [13] Hieu, H. H. (2024). Exploring the Impact of AI in Language Education: Vietnamese EFL Teachers' Views on Using ChatGPT for Fairy Tale Retelling Tasks. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(3), 486-503. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.3.24>
- [14] Jamshed, M., Almashy, A., Albedah, F., & Warda, W. U. (2024). Assessing the Efficacy of Artificial Intelligence-Enabled EFL Learning and Teaching in Saudi Arabia: Perceptions, Perspectives, and Prospects. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 15(6), 1931-1940. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1506.18>
- [15] Jamshed, M., Allehyani, B., Albedah, F., & Banu, S. (2024). Analyzing ChatGPT's Sustainability as a Language Learning Tool: Saudi EFL Learners' Perspectives, Problems and Pedagogical Prospects. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 14(12), 3836-3844. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1412.18>

- [16] Kristiawan, D., Bashar, K., & Pradana, D. A. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in English Language Learning: A Systematic Review of AI Tools, Applications, and Pedagogical Outcomes. *The Art of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TATEFL)*, 5(2), 207–218. <https://doi.org/10.36663/tatefl.v5i2.912>
- [17] Mananay, J. A. (2024). Integrating Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Language Teaching: Effectiveness, Challenges, and Strategies. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(9), 361-382. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.9.19>
- [18] Mohammad, T., Alzubi, A. A., Nazim, M., & Khan, S. I. (2024). Paraphrasing prowess: Unveiling the insights of EFL students and teachers on QuillBot mastery. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, 14(5), 642-650.
- [19] Mushthoza, D., Syariatun, N., Tahalele, O., Telussa, S., Rasmita, R., & Mokodenseho, S. (2023). Analyzing The Impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) On the Future of English Language Teaching and Learning. *Journal on Education*, 6(1), 1549-1557. <https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v6i1.3115>
- [20] Pham, T. T., & Le, T. T. (2024). Exploring the Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Student Creativity in Vietnamese Tertiary EFL Classrooms: Teacher Perspectives. *Jurnal Komunikasi Pendidikan*, 8(2), 116–128. <https://doi.org/10.32585/jurnalkomdik.v8i2.5052>
- [21] Rukiati, E., Wicaksono, J. A., Taufan, G. T., & Suharsono, D. D. (2023). AI on Learning English: Application, Benefit, and Threat. *Journal of Language, Communication, and Tourism*, 1(2), 32–40. <https://doi.org/10.25047/jlct.v1i2.3967>
- [22] Rusmiyanto, R., Huriati, N., Fitriani, N., Tyas, N., Rofi'i, A., & Sari, M. (2023). The Role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) In Developing English Language Learner's Communication Skills. *Journal on Education*, 6(1), 750-757. <https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v6i1.2990>
- [23] Sharadgah, T. A., & Sa'di, R. A. (2022). A systematic review of research on the use of artificial intelligence in English language teaching and learning (2015-2021): What are the current effects? *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, 21, 337-377. <https://doi.org/10.28945/4999>
- [24] Sharifuddin, N. S., & Hashim, H. (2024). Benefits and Challenges in Implementing Artificial Intelligence in Education (AIED) in ESL Classroom: A Systematic Review (2019-2022). *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 14(1), 146-164. <http://dx.doi.org/10.46886/IJARBSS/v14-i1/9394>
- [25] Sumakul, D. T., Hamied, F. A., & Sukyadi, D. (2022). Artificial intelligence in EFL classrooms: Friend or foe? *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 15(1), 232-256.
- [26] Tiwari, H. P. (2024). Artificial intelligence in the classroom: Revolutionizing English language teaching. *Journal of English Teaching and Linguistics Studies (JETLi)*, 6(1), 42-59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.55215/jetli.v6i1.9757>
- [27] Xu, T., & Wang, H. (2024). The effectiveness of artificial intelligence on English language learning achievement. *System*, 125, 103428. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103428>
- [28] Zulkarnain, N. S., & Yunus, M. M. (2023). Primary Teachers' Perspectives on Using Artificial Intelligence Technology in English as a Second Language Teaching and Learning: A Systematic Review. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 12(2), 861–875. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v12-i2/17119>

**Faris Salim Allehyani** got his Ph.D. degree in 2020 from Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge, UK. His areas of interest include Discourse Analysis, ESL/EFL teaching and Intercultural communication. He is currently working as an Assistant Professor at the Department of Languages and Translation, University of Tabuk, 71491, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

**Fatimah** received her PhD degree in Education from Western Sydney University. Fatimah is currently an assistant professor at Saudi Electronic University (SEU). Her research focuses on mobile Assisted Language Learning, self-managed learning, and learning technologies.

**Mohammad Jamshed** got his Ph.D. degree in 2018 from Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, UP (INDIA). His area of interest includes postcolonial literature, travel writings, comparative studies, and ESL/EFL teaching. He has presented papers at conferences and published many articles in journals of repute both in literature and ESL/ESL teaching. He is currently working as an Assistant Professor, Department of English, College of Science & Humanities, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Al Kharj, 11942, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

**Wahaj Unnisa Warda** has been working in the Department of English Language and Literature, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia for the past ten years. Before that, she worked as a senior lecturer in India for thirteen years. She has presented and published papers at various international conferences and journals in London, India, Australia, and Saudi Arabia. She is a member of various national and international organizations besides being a reviewer for international journals. Her areas of interest are psychoanalysis, Classical Mythology, and detective fiction of the 19th century.