Artificial Intelligence in Language and Literature Education Under FYUGP: Opportunities and Challenges

Raya Fathima

Department of Arabic and Islamic History, Farook College (Autonomous), Kozhikode, Kerala, India

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.102000026

Received: 14 October 2026; Accepted: 19 October 2026; Published: 19 November 2026

ABSTRACT

The increasing use of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) is creating new opportunities and challenges for higher education, particularly in disciplines centred on language, writing, interpretation, and communication. This study examines the use, perceptions, perceived benefits, and challenges of artificial intelligence (AI) among undergraduate students enrolled in language- and literature-related programmes within the context of India's Four-Year Undergraduate Programme (FYUGP). The study is situated within the broader policy framework of the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, which emphasises multidisciplinary education, technological integration, digital competencies, innovation, and skill development. A descriptive cross-sectional survey was conducted using a structured online questionnaire, and 60 valid responses were analysed using frequencies, percentages, and descriptive Likert-scale statistics. The findings indicate widespread academic use of AI, with 57 respondents (95.0%) reporting that they used AI for academic purposes. Among AI users, 33 (57.9%) reported using AI daily or several times a week. Common applications included grammar correction, text summarisation, translation, assignment writing, presentation preparation, and examination preparation. The most strongly perceived benefit was assistance in understanding literary texts, with 75.4% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that AI helped them understand poems, novels, dramas, and other literary texts more effectively. However, respondents also identified significant concerns, particularly reduced critical thinking, inaccurate information, and overdependence on AI. Furthermore, 70.2% agreed or strongly agreed that excessive AI use could reduce originality and independent thinking, while only 40.4% agreed or strongly agreed that they understood the ethical use of AI in education. These findings indicate an emerging AI adoption–literacy gap: although student engagement with AI is widespread, preparedness for its critical, ethical, and responsible use remains comparatively limited. The study therefore argues for a human-centred approach to AI integration in FYUGP language and literature education, in which AI functions as a supplementary learning tool while students retain responsibility for interpretation, verification, creativity, and authorship. The study recommends strengthening AI literacy, ethical-use guidance, AI-aware assessment practices, faculty development, and critical comparison of AI-generated and human interpretations within language and literature education.

Keywords: Generative artificial intelligence; AI literacy; language education; literature education; FYUGP; NEP 2020; academic integrity; critical thinking; higher education; India

INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence has rapidly become part of contemporary educational practice. The emergence of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI), particularly conversational and text-generating systems, has intensified this development by allowing students to obtain explanations, summaries, translations, writing assistance, ideas and other forms of academic support through natural-language interaction. The increasing accessibility of such tools has consequently altered traditional relationships between students, teachers, writing and knowledge.

The implications are particularly important for language and literature education. Language learning involves the development of vocabulary, grammar, communication and writing skills, while literature education requires close reading, textual interpretation, contextual understanding, critical thinking, creativity and independent

argumentation. GenAI can potentially support all of these activities. At the same time, excessive or uncritical dependence on AI can undermine the very skills that language and literature education seeks to develop.

This issue has become particularly relevant in Kerala following the introduction of the Four-Year Undergraduate Programme (FYUGP). The Kerala FYUGP framework was introduced from the 2024–25 academic year and incorporates critical thinking, creativity, skills development, interdisciplinary learning and learner-centred approaches. These objectives make the responsible use of AI especially significant. If students use AI merely to produce assignments, the technology may conflict with the programme's emphasis on independent intellectual development. Conversely, if students are taught to critically evaluate and appropriately employ AI, it can potentially complement the objectives of FYUGP.

International research similarly indicates that GenAI is becoming increasingly embedded in university student life. Johnston et al. (2024), in a survey of 2,555 university students, found that more than half had used or considered using generative AI for academic purposes. Their findings also demonstrated an important distinction between assistive uses and complete outsourcing of academic work: students were considerably more supportive of tools such as Grammarly than of using ChatGPT to produce an entire essay.

UNESCO has advocated a human-centred approach to GenAI in education, emphasising ethical, safe, equitable and meaningful use, while drawing attention to issues such as privacy, regulation, human agency and pedagogical suitability. Recent research also identifies academic integrity, assessment, AI literacy and responsible institutional policy as central concerns in higher education.

Despite the growing international literature, there is a need for context-specific research on student experiences of AI within newly implemented undergraduate programmes. In particular, comparatively limited attention has been given to students studying language and literature within the Kerala FYUGP context. The present study therefore examines how students use AI, what they perceive as its benefits and limitations, and how they view the inclusion of AI literacy and ethical AI practices within the FYUGP curriculum.

LITERATURE REVIEW

FYUGP, NEP 2020 and the Changing Higher Education Context

The Four-Year Undergraduate Programme (FYUGP) marks an important change in undergraduate education in Kerala. It provides greater flexibility in curriculum design and gives importance to multidisciplinary learning, skill development, research orientation and broader graduate competencies. The Kerala model also places emphasis on critical thinking, creativity, vocational skills and entrepreneurship [1].

These changes are part of the wider educational reforms introduced through the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020, which promotes multidisciplinary education, flexibility, skill development, critical thinking and the effective use of technology in teaching and learning [2]. The University Grants Commission (UGC) has further supported this direction through the Curriculum and Credit Framework for Undergraduate Programmes, which promotes a flexible and student-centred approach to undergraduate education [3].

The implementation of FYUGP is taking place alongside the rapid spread of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI). Students are therefore experiencing changes not only in the structure of their undergraduate education but also in the ways they access information, complete academic tasks and develop knowledge. This makes the responsible use of AI particularly relevant to the FYUGP context.

Students need to understand not only how AI tools work but also when their use is appropriate, how information generated by AI should be checked and how these tools can be used without reducing independent learning. AI literacy can therefore become an important part of the broader competencies expected from undergraduate students.

Generative AI in Higher Education

Generative AI has introduced new possibilities into higher education because it can produce text, explanations and other forms of content in response to natural-language instructions. Students can use these tools for summarising information, generating ideas, improving written work, translating texts, preparing presentations and understanding difficult topics.

A systematic review of empirical research on ChatGPT in education found that the technology has considerable potential for teaching and learning, while also raising concerns about its limitations and appropriate use [4]. Similarly, a systematic review of GenAI in higher education identified opportunities related to personalised learning, creativity and student engagement, while emphasising the continuing importance of teachers, curriculum design and institutional support [5].

UNESCO recommends a human-centred approach to the use of GenAI in education and research. Its guidance recognises the possible benefits of these technologies while drawing attention to concerns related to privacy, equity, human agency and academic practices [6]. UNESCO has also highlighted both the opportunities and challenges created by generative AI in education, particularly the need to ensure that technological development supports rather than weakens meaningful teaching and learning [7].

An important concern is the reliability of AI-generated information. AI systems can produce responses that appear clear and convincing but may contain factual errors, incomplete explanations or misleading information. Students therefore need to check AI-generated content against reliable sources rather than accepting it without evaluation.

Johnston et al. [8], in a survey of 2,555 university students, found widespread awareness and use of generative AI. Their findings showed that students were generally more accepting of AI as an academic support tool than as a replacement for independent academic work. The study also found considerable support among students for clear institutional guidance on appropriate AI use.

Generative AI in Language Education

Language education is particularly affected by GenAI because many commonly used AI systems are based on language processing. Students can use AI tools to identify grammatical errors, improve vocabulary, translate texts, practise communication and receive suggestions for improving written work. These applications may be useful for students who need additional language support outside the classroom.

However, language learning involves more than correcting grammatical mistakes or producing polished sentences. Students also need to develop their own ideas, make appropriate stylistic choices and communicate according to context and audience. Excessive dependence on AI-generated writing may reduce opportunities for students to practise these skills independently.

Research on tertiary-level English language learners has also reported growing use of AI tools for language learning, while raising concerns about excessive dependence on these technologies [9]. This suggests that the educational value of AI depends not simply on how frequently students use it but on the purpose and manner of its use.

The role of AI becomes more complex when it is applied to literature. Literary texts often contain ambiguity, symbolism, cultural references and multiple possible interpretations. Understanding literature therefore requires close reading, textual evidence and personal interpretation rather than simply retrieving information.

AI can support students by explaining difficult passages, summarising narratives, identifying possible themes, comparing characters and suggesting questions for further discussion. Studies examining the use of ChatGPT in undergraduate literature courses also suggest that AI can be incorporated into literature education as a tool for discussion and reflection [10]. Classroom-based work has similarly identified practical applications of AI in language and literature education [11].

At the same time, an AI-generated interpretation should not be treated as an authoritative reading of a literary text. Students need to return to the original work, examine the relevant passages and determine whether an AI-generated interpretation is supported by textual evidence. In this sense, AI can provide possibilities for exploration, while the responsibility for interpretation remains with the student.

Academic Integrity, Originality and Critical Thinking

The growing availability of GenAI has created new challenges for academic integrity. Students can now generate essays, summaries and other academic responses with relatively little visible effort. This raises questions about whether submitted work accurately represents a student's own understanding, reasoning and writing ability.

Bittle and El-Gayar [12], in a systematic review of 41 studies on GenAI and academic integrity in higher education, found that GenAI can improve educational engagement and efficiency but also creates significant risks of academic dishonesty. They emphasise the importance of digital literacy, institutional strategies and responsible approaches to AI use.

The issue is particularly important in language and literature education because writing and interpretation are themselves important learning outcomes. If students routinely ask AI to produce complete assignments, they may lose opportunities to develop their own arguments, writing skills and understanding of literary texts.

Originality is another concern. AI-generated responses can be fluent and well organised even when they do not reflect the student's own thinking. Responsible use therefore requires students to remain actively involved in the learning process and to acknowledge AI assistance where appropriate.

Critical thinking is equally important. Students should question AI-generated responses, identify possible errors, compare information with other sources and decide whether a particular answer is supported by evidence. AI should consequently be used as a resource that encourages further thinking rather than as a substitute for it.

AI Literacy, Ethics and Human-Centred Use

The increasing use of AI in education makes AI literacy an important part of undergraduate learning. AI literacy is not limited to knowing how to use AI applications or formulate effective prompts. It also involves understanding the capabilities and limitations of AI, evaluating the reliability of generated information, recognising possible bias, protecting personal information and making informed decisions about its use.

UNESCO emphasises the importance of maintaining human agency in the use of AI for education. Its work on the future of learning stresses that AI should contribute to meaningful educational development without replacing human judgement [13]. Similarly, UNESCO's guidance for policy-makers highlights the need for educational systems to prepare both learners and teachers to respond effectively to the opportunities and challenges created by artificial intelligence [14].

For undergraduate students, AI literacy therefore requires both practical knowledge and critical judgement. Students should be able to verify AI-generated information, compare it with reliable sources, recognise inaccurate or misleading responses, protect personal data and acknowledge the use of AI when required. These practices can help students make productive use of AI while retaining responsibility for their own academic work.

Institutions also have an important role in developing responsible AI practices. Clear and practical guidelines can help students understand when AI assistance is acceptable and when it may undermine academic integrity or learning outcomes. Institutional policies related to assessment, academic integrity and responsible technology use, together with relevant UGC initiatives, can provide students with clearer boundaries for AI-assisted learning [15]. In this way, AI literacy can support the responsible integration of technology while preserving the central role of human judgement, creativity and independent learning.

Research Gap

Research on generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in higher education has grown rapidly, covering areas such as academic writing, language learning, student support and academic integrity. Studies have shown that university students are increasingly aware of and using GenAI for academic purposes, while their attitudes towards the technology are not entirely positive or negative. Johnston et al. [8], for example, found widespread student awareness and use of GenAI and reported that students generally viewed it more favourably as a support tool than as a replacement for their own academic work. Concerns about academic integrity and excessive dependence have also been highlighted in recent research [12].

Despite this growing body of research, some important gaps remain. First, much of the existing research considers higher education as a whole, while comparatively less attention has been given to the specific experiences of students in language and literature education. This is important because writing, interpretation, communication and critical reading are central to these disciplines, and these are also areas in which generative AI can directly influence students' academic practices.

Second, there is limited empirical research on the use and perception of GenAI within the newly implemented Four-Year Undergraduate Programme (FYUGP) in Kerala. FYUGP places emphasis on multidisciplinary learning, skill development, critical thinking and broader graduate competencies [1]. The rapid spread of GenAI during this curricular transition creates a need to understand how students are actually using these tools and how they perceive their role in learning.

Third, existing discussions often focus mainly on students who use AI, with comparatively less attention to students who do not use these tools. Non-use is also meaningful because students may avoid AI because of concerns about originality, academic integrity, reliability, loss of independent thinking, lack of familiarity or a preference for completing academic work without technological assistance. Understanding both users and non-users can therefore provide a more complete picture of students' attitudes towards AI.

The present study addresses these gaps by examining the use and perceptions of AI among undergraduate students, with particular attention to language and literature-related programmes under FYUGP. It considers students' patterns of AI use, the purposes for which they use AI, the benefits and challenges they perceive, their views on originality and independent thinking, their awareness of ethical AI use, and their attitudes towards introducing AI literacy into the curriculum. The study also considers the responses of students who do not currently use AI, thereby providing a broader understanding of student perspectives.

Objectives of the Study

The study aims to:

1. Examine the extent and frequency of AI use among undergraduate students in the FYUGP context.
2. Identify the major academic purposes for which students use AI in language and literature-related studies.
3. Examine students' perceptions of the educational benefits of AI-assisted learning.
4. Identify the major challenges and concerns students associate with the use of AI for academic purposes.
5. Examine students' perceptions of the influence of AI on originality, creativity and independent thinking.
6. Assess students' awareness of ethical and responsible AI use in academic work.
7. Examine students' views on the inclusion of AI literacy and ethical AI practices in FYUGP, including the perspectives of both AI users and non-users.

Research Questions

The study seeks to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: To what extent and how frequently do undergraduate students use AI for academic purposes?

RQ2: What are the major academic purposes for which students use AI in language and literature-related studies?

RQ3: What educational benefits do students perceive from using AI in their academic learning?

RQ4: What challenges and concerns do students associate with the use of AI for academic purposes?

RQ5: How do students perceive the influence of AI use on originality, creativity and independent thinking?

RQ6: To what extent are students aware of ethical and responsible AI use in academic work?

RQ7: Do students support the inclusion of AI literacy and ethical AI practices in FYUGP, and how do the views of AI users and non-users differ?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study employed a **descriptive, cross-sectional survey design** to examine undergraduate students' use and perceptions of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in the context of FYUGP. A descriptive survey design was considered appropriate because the study aimed to document students' current patterns of AI use, perceived benefits, concerns and attitudes rather than to establish causal relationships between AI use and learning outcomes.

Primary data were collected through a structured online questionnaire prepared using Google Forms. The questionnaire included demographic questions, questions on AI use and frequency of use, multiple-choice and multiple-response items, five-point Likert-scale statements, and open-ended questions. The instrument was designed to capture both students who currently use AI and those who reported that they did not use AI.

Research Instrument

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire developed in Google Forms. The questionnaire covered several aspects of students' experiences with AI, including:

- respondent characteristics;
- awareness and use of AI tools;
- frequency of AI use;
- academic purposes for using AI;
- perceived educational benefits;
- challenges and concerns associated with AI use;
- perceived effects on originality, creativity and independent thinking;
- awareness of ethical and responsible AI use;

- attitudes towards the inclusion of AI literacy in the curriculum; and
- overall perceptions of the impact of AI on learning.

Several questions used **five-point Likert scales**, while multiple-response questions allowed respondents to select more than one option where applicable. Additional questions were included for respondents who reported that they did not currently use AI, allowing the study to examine reasons for non-use and related perceptions.

Data Collection and Ethical Considerations

The questionnaire was administered online through Google Forms. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed that their responses would be used for academic research purposes. The analysis and reporting focused on aggregate responses rather than individual participants.

Personally, identifying information, including respondents' names and email addresses, was excluded from the analysis and publication of the findings. The study reports the survey data as collected. No claim regarding formal institutional ethics approval is made unless such approval was obtained separately.

Participants and Sampling

The final dataset consisted of **60 valid responses** from undergraduate students under the Four Year Undergraduate Programme. Participants were drawn primarily from language and literature-related programmes under FYUGP and represented three years of undergraduate study.

Participants were recruited through an online questionnaire distributed to students, and participation was voluntary. Since the respondents were selected through voluntary participation rather than probability sampling, the study used a **non-probability convenience sampling approach**. Consequently, the findings are intended to describe the participating respondents and should not be statistically generalized to all FYUGP students in Kerala.

Year of Study	**Number**	**Percentage**
First Year	23	38.3%
Second Year	6	10.0%
Third Year	31	51.7%
Total	**60**	**100%**

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents by Year of Study

Third-year students formed the largest group, accounting for **51.7%** of the sample, followed by first-year students (**38.3%**). Second-year students accounted for **10.0%** of the respondents.

Discipline	Number
B.A. English Language & Literature	28
B.A. Malayalam	17
B.A. Arabic and Islamic History	7
B.A. Arabic	2
Other disciplines	6
Total	**60**

Table 2. Distribution of Respondents by Major Discipline

The sample was predominantly composed of students from language and literature-related programmes. B.A.

English Language & Literature constituted the largest group (**28 respondents**), followed by B.A. Malayalam (**17 respondents**) and B.A. Arabic and Islamic History (**7 respondents**).

Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed primarily using **descriptive statistical methods**. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for categorical variables, including demographic characteristics, AI-use patterns and responses to multiple-choice questions.

For multiple-response questions, the number and percentage of respondents selecting each option were calculated. Since respondents could select more than one option, the percentages for these questions were not expected to sum to 100%. For questions relating specifically to AI use, the number of AI users (**n = 57**) was used as the denominator where appropriate, while questions answered by the full sample were analysed using **n = 60**.

Responses to five-point Likert-scale statements were coded from **1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree)**. Response distributions and mean scores were used to summarise students' perceptions. The overall perceived impact of AI was similarly examined using its five-point response distribution and mean score.

Open-ended responses were reviewed qualitatively to identify recurring views, concerns and explanations expressed by participants. These responses were used to complement the quantitative findings and provide additional context to students' perceptions of AI.

Given the relatively small, non-probability sample, the analysis was intentionally descriptive. The study does not attempt to make statistically representative claims about all FYUGP students in Kerala. Instead, it provides an empirical account of the experiences and perceptions reported by the participating undergraduate students.

RESULTS

Respondent Profile and Academic Use of AI

The study received 60 valid responses from undergraduate students. The respondents were distributed across the first, second and third years of study. Third-year students formed the largest group, with 31 respondents (51.7%), followed by first-year students with 23 (38.3%) and second-year students with 6 (10.0%).

Variable	Category	n	%
Year of study	First year	23	38.3
	Second year	6	10.0
	Third year	31	51.7
Academic use of AI	Yes	57	95.0
	No	3	5.0

Table 1. Profile of the respondents (N = 60)

A large majority of the respondents reported using AI for academic purposes. **Fifty-seven students (95.0%)** indicated that they used AI, while only **three students (5.0%)** reported that they did not, 52.6% show a neutral response towards AI use . Thus, AI use was common among the students who participated in the survey.

This high level of use is important in understanding the remaining findings, as most of the questions concerning frequency, purposes, benefits and challenges were answered by the 57 AI users.

Frequency of AI Use

The frequency of AI use was examined among the 57 students who reported using AI for academic purposes.

Frequency	**n**	**%**
Daily	13	22.8
Several times a week	20	35.1
Once a week	3	5.3
Occasionally	16	28.1
Rarely	5	8.8
Total	**57**	**100.0**

Table 2. Frequency of AI use among AI users (n = 57)

The most common pattern was using AI **several times a week**, reported by 20 students (35.1%). Another 13 students (22.8%) reported using AI daily. Together, these two groups account for **33 students (57.9%)**, indicating that more than half of the AI users engage with these tools on a regular basis.

At the same time, 16 students (28.1%) used AI occasionally, while 5 (8.8%) reported rare use. Only 3 students (5.3%) used AI once a week. The results therefore show variation in frequency, although regular use was common among the respondents.

Academic Purposes for Using AI

The respondents reported using AI for several academic activities. Since the question allowed multiple responses, the percentages are calculated against the 57 AI users and do not add up to 100%.

Purpose	**n**	**% of AI users**
Grammar correction	31	54.4
Summarising texts	29	50.9
Translation	28	49.1
Assignment writing	28	49.1
Presentation preparation	28	49.1
Examination preparation	28	49.1
Research	23	40.4
Literature analysis	23	40.4
Creative writing	17	29.8
Vocabulary learning	15	26.3

Table 3. Academic purposes of AI use among AI users (n = 57)

Grammar correction was the most frequently reported use of AI, selected by 31 students (54.4%). This was followed by **summarising texts**, reported by 29 students (50.9%).

Translation, assignment writing, presentation preparation and examination preparation were each reported by 28 students (49.1%). Research and literature analysis were reported by 23 students each (40.4%). Creative writing and vocabulary learning were less frequently reported, at 29.8% and 26.3%, respectively.

The results show that students use AI for both language-related support and broader academic tasks. Some uses, such as grammar correction, vocabulary learning and summarisation, are mainly supportive in nature. Others, particularly assignment writing, are more closely connected with the production of academic work. The latter does not by itself indicate inappropriate AI use, since the survey did not examine how much of the AI-generated material was retained or submitted by students. However, the relatively high use of AI for assignment writing points to the importance of clear guidance on acceptable academic use.

Perceived Educational Benefits of AI

The students were asked to rate several statements about the possible benefits of AI in their academic work. The responses were measured on a five-point scale.

Statement	Mean	Agree/Strongly Agree (%)
AI has improved my language learning.	3.49	43.9
AI helps me understand literary texts more effectively.	3.93	75.4
AI has increased my creativity and confidence in academic writing.	3.33	42.1
AI saves time and improves my academic productivity.	3.54	52.6
AI has created better learning opportunities for FYUGP students.	3.54	59.6

Table 4. Students' perceptions of the educational benefits of AI

The highest level of agreement was found for the statement that **AI helps students understand literary texts more effectively**. A total of **75.4%** of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, and the mean score was **3.93**, the highest among the five statements.

This finding suggests that students particularly value AI when they need help understanding literary material. AI may provide explanations, simplified versions of difficult passages or alternative ways of approaching a text. However, the survey measures students' perceptions and does not establish whether AI actually improves their literary understanding.

The results also show moderate agreement regarding the wider learning opportunities provided by AI. **59.6%** agreed or strongly agreed that AI had created better learning opportunities for FYUGP students. Similarly, **52.6%** felt that AI saves time and improves academic productivity.

The response concerning creativity was less positive. Only **42.1%** agreed or strongly agreed that AI had increased their creativity and confidence in academic writing. The mean score was 3.33. This suggests that students may find AI more useful for assistance and efficiency than for developing their own creative abilities.

AI Use, Originality and Independent Thinking

The study also examined students' views about the possible effect of excessive AI use on originality and independent thinking.

Response	n	%
Strongly disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	2	3.5
Neutral	15	26.3

Agree	20	35.1
Strongly agree	20	35.1
Total	**57**	**100.0**

Table 5. Perceptions of excessive AI use and independent thinking

A total of **40 students (70.2%)** agreed or strongly agreed that excessive use of AI could reduce originality and independent thinking. The mean score for the statement was **4.02 out of 5**.

Only two students (3.5%) disagreed, while 15 students (26.3%) selected the neutral response.

This result shows that many students who use AI are also aware of the possibility of becoming too dependent on it. The finding is particularly relevant to language and literature education, where independent writing, interpretation and the development of personal arguments are important parts of learning.

Challenges Associated with AI Use

Students were asked to identify the challenges they associated with the use of AI. Multiple responses were allowed.

Challenge	**n**	**% of AI users**
Reduced critical thinking	29	50.9
Inaccurate information	29	50.9
Overdependence on AI	27	47.4
Privacy concerns	16	28.1
Lack of AI knowledge	12	21.1
Internet dependency	11	19.3
Plagiarism concerns	11	19.3
Difficulty writing prompts	10	17.5

Table 6. Challenges associated with academic AI use (n = 57)

The most frequently reported challenges were **reduced critical thinking** and **inaccurate information**, each selected by 29 students (50.9%). Overdependence on AI was reported by 27 students (47.4%).

Privacy concerns were reported by 16 students (28.1%). Smaller proportions identified lack of AI knowledge (21.1%), internet dependency (19.3%), plagiarism concerns (19.3%) and difficulty in writing prompts (17.5%).

These responses indicate that students are aware of several concerns surrounding AI use. The concerns are not limited to technical difficulties; they also relate to the quality of information, independent thinking, dependence on technology, privacy and academic integrity.

The concern about inaccurate information is particularly relevant to language and literature studies. Students may encounter incorrect explanations, quotations, references or interpretations in AI-generated responses. This makes checking information against the original text and reliable academic sources an important part of responsible AI use.

Understanding of Ethical AI Use

Students were asked whether they understood the ethical use of AI in education, including responsible use, verification of AI-generated information and avoidance of plagiarism.

Response	n	%
Strongly disagree	0	0.0
Disagree	4	7.0
Neutral	30	52.6
Agree	19	33.3
Strongly agree	4	7.0
Total	**57**	**100.0**

Table 7. Students' understanding of ethical AI use

Only **23 students (40.4%)** agreed or strongly agreed that they understood ethical AI use. The mean score was **3.40**. The largest group, 30 students (52.6%), selected the neutral response.

This finding is worth considering alongside the high level of AI adoption found in the study. While **95.0% of all respondents reported using AI academically**, fewer than half of the AI users expressed agreement that they understood its ethical use.

The result may indicate that familiarity with AI tools does not necessarily mean that students are equally confident about issues such as verification, plagiarism, authorship and responsible use. This difference between **use and ethical understanding** is an important finding of the study.

Support for AI Literacy in FYUGP

Students were also asked whether AI literacy and ethical AI practices should be included in the FYUGP language and literature curriculum.

Response	n	%
Strongly disagree	1	1.8
Disagree	1	1.8
Neutral	23	40.4
Agree	26	45.6
Strongly agree	6	10.5
Total	**57**	**100.0**

Table 8. Support for including AI literacy and ethical practices in FYUGP

More than half of the respondents (**56.1%**) agreed or strongly agreed that AI literacy and ethical AI practices should be included in the FYUGP language and literature curriculum. The mean score was **3.61**.

Only two respondents (3.6%) expressed disagreement. However, 23 students (40.4%) remained neutral.

The finding suggests that there is general support among the respondents for providing formal guidance on AI. At the same time, the sizeable neutral group indicates that students may have differing views about what AI literacy should include and how it should be incorporated into their academic programmes.

Overall Perception of AI

Students were asked to give an overall rating of the impact of AI on language and literature education under FYUGP.

Rating	n	%
1	2	3.5
2	2	3.5
3	34	59.6
4	13	22.8
5	6	10.5
Total	**57**	**100.0**

Table 9. Overall perceived impact of AI among AI users (n = 57)

The mean overall rating was **3.33 out of 5**. The most common response was a rating of **3**, selected by 34 students (59.6%). Thirteen students (22.8%) gave a rating of 4, while six (10.5%) gave the highest rating of 5.

The overall response can therefore be described as **moderately positive**. Students generally appear to recognise the usefulness of AI, but the distribution does not suggest strong or unquestioning enthusiasm. Their concerns about inaccurate information, overdependence and independent thinking may help explain why the overall rating remained close to the middle of the scale.

Responses of Students Who Did Not Use AI

Only **three students (5.0%)** reported that they did not currently use AI for academic purposes. Because of the small number of non-users, their responses were not subjected to statistical comparison with the AI-user group.

Nevertheless, their responses provide some useful context. The reasons given for non-use included concerns about **reduced critical thinking, distrust of AI-generated information, loss of independence, lack of familiarity with AI tools and uncertainty about how to use AI effectively**.

The three students did not appear to reject AI completely. All indicated that AI could be useful when used responsibly and supported the inclusion of AI literacy and ethical practices in the curriculum.

Although these responses cannot be generalised because of the very small subgroup, they suggest that non-use may be associated with concerns about **trust, independence, familiarity and responsible use**, rather than with a complete opposition to AI.

Overall Pattern of the Findings

Taken together, the results show that the students in this study have a fairly active but cautious relationship with AI. **AI use is widespread**, and for many students it has become a regular part of academic work. The most common uses are related to grammar correction, summarisation, translation and other forms of academic assistance, although almost half of the AI users also reported using it for assignment writing.

Students generally viewed AI positively as a means of understanding literary texts, accessing learning support and saving time. At the same time, they identified reduced critical thinking, inaccurate information and overdependence as important concerns. The finding that **70.2% believed excessive AI use could reduce originality and independent thinking** is particularly relevant to language and literature education.

Another important finding is the difference between **AI adoption and ethical understanding**. Although 95.0% of respondents reported academic use of AI, only 40.4% of AI users agreed or strongly agreed that they understood ethical AI use. More than half selected the neutral response. This suggests that regular exposure to AI does not necessarily provide students with sufficient knowledge about responsible academic use.

Finally, **56.1% supported the inclusion of AI literacy and ethical AI practices in the FYUGP curriculum**. The findings therefore point towards a need for practical guidance that helps students use AI without giving up their own responsibility for reading, writing, interpretation, verification and critical judgement.

Overall, the results do not present AI as either wholly beneficial or wholly harmful. Instead, students' responses show a more balanced view: **AI is useful when it supports learning, but its educational value depends largely on how it is used and how much responsibility remains with the student.**

DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has already become a significant part of students' academic practices within the study sample. **95.0% of respondents reported using AI for academic purposes**, and 57.9% of AI users reported using it daily or several times a week. This suggests that AI is no longer an emerging or occasional technology for these students, but an increasingly routine academic resource. However, the high level of adoption should not be interpreted as evidence of improved academic achievement, as the present study examined self-reported use and perceptions rather than learning outcomes.

Students used AI for a wide range of activities, including grammar correction, summarisation, translation, assignment writing, presentation preparation and examination preparation. This indicates that AI functions both as a **learning-support tool and as a means of academic production**. While uses such as grammar correction and vocabulary support may assist learning, the relatively high use of AI for assignment writing raises questions about authorship, academic integrity and the boundary between assistance and substitution. Clear, discipline-sensitive institutional guidance is therefore necessary.

The strongest perceived benefit was **support for understanding literary texts**, with 75.4% of AI users agreeing or strongly agreeing with this statement (M = 3.93). This suggests that students value AI for explaining difficult texts, summarising content and exploring interpretations. However, AI-generated interpretations should remain subject to verification because fluent responses may contain factual or interpretive errors. In language and literature education, AI is therefore more appropriately viewed as a **scaffold for learning rather than an authoritative source**.

The findings also reveal an important tension between usefulness and independent learning. Although students recognised AI's benefits for productivity and learning opportunities, **70.2% agreed or strongly agreed that excessive AI use can reduce originality and independent thinking (M = 4.02)**. Reduced critical thinking, inaccurate information and overdependence were among the most frequently reported challenges. These findings should not be interpreted as evidence that AI necessarily causes reduced critical thinking; rather, they demonstrate that students themselves recognise the risk of cognitive dependence.

A particularly important finding is the gap between **AI adoption and AI literacy**. Although 95.0% of respondents used AI academically, only **40.4% of AI users agreed or strongly agreed that they understood ethical AI use**, while 52.6% remained neutral. This suggests that students may be adopting AI faster than they are developing the knowledge required to use it responsibly. The finding strengthens the case for integrating AI literacy into FYUGP, particularly in relation to verification, plagiarism, authorship, privacy, disclosure and responsible use.

The finding that **56.1% supported the inclusion of AI literacy and ethical AI practices in the FYUGP curriculum** further reinforces this need. The overall impact rating of AI (**M = 3.33/5**) also indicates that students hold a moderately positive but cautious view rather than an uncritically positive attitude. The three non-users, although too few for statistical comparison, similarly viewed AI as potentially beneficial when used responsibly. Thus, non-use appears to reflect concerns about trust, independence or familiarity rather than complete rejection of AI.

Overall, the findings support a **human-centred approach to AI integration**. AI can assist with explanation, language support, brainstorming, summarisation and research preparation, but students should retain responsibility for interpretation, verification, critical thinking and final authorship. This approach is consistent with UNESCO's emphasis on human agency, responsible use and safeguards in educational applications of GenAI.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION

Based on the findings, the following measures are recommended for FYUGP language and literature education:

Integrate AI Literacy into FYUGP

AI literacy should be incorporated into existing courses or introduced through a short interdisciplinary module covering:

- basic GenAI concepts and limitations;
- effective and responsible prompting;
- verification of AI-generated information;
- plagiarism, authorship and disclosure;
- bias and misinformation; and
- privacy and data protection.

Develop Clear AI-Use Guidelines

Institutions should clearly distinguish between **acceptable assistance**—such as grammar correction, brainstorming and feedback—and **unacceptable substitution**, such as submitting AI-generated assignments as original student work. Guidelines should be transparent and regularly updated.

Redesign Assessment

Assessment should place greater emphasis on students' learning processes rather than only final written products. Useful approaches include **annotated drafts, portfolios, reflective writing, oral presentations, viva voce, classroom writing and close-reading activities**.

Teach Verification and Critical Evaluation

Students should be trained to compare AI-generated information with primary texts, scholarly sources and reliable databases. AI-generated literary interpretations can also be used as classroom material for identifying errors, unsupported claims and alternative interpretations.

Provide Faculty Development

Teachers need training in GenAI tools, ethical use, verification, AI-aware assessment and discipline-specific applications. Faculty development is essential for translating institutional AI policies into effective classroom practice.

Protect Linguistic and Cultural Diversity

Particular attention should be given to translation accuracy, cultural representation and language-specific limitations, especially in multilingual programmes involving English, Malayalam and Arabic. Human interpretation and cultural knowledge should remain central.

Support Responsible Choice

Students who currently do not use AI should not be disadvantaged. They should nevertheless receive AI literacy and guidance so that their decision to use or not use AI is informed rather than based on unfamiliarity or uncertainty.

Proposed Human-Led AI-Assisted Learning Model for FYUGP

Based on the findings of the present study, a **Human-Led AI-Assisted Learning Model** is proposed for language and literature education.

Stage 1 – Understand

Students learn what GenAI can and cannot do, including its limitations, biases and possibility of inaccurate output.

Stage 2 – Use

Students use AI selectively for appropriate activities such as brainstorming, language practice, explanation, summarisation and feedback.

Stage 3 – Verify

Students independently check AI-generated information against primary texts and reliable academic sources.

Stage 4 – Evaluate

Students critically assess the accuracy, relevance, bias and limitations of the AI response.

Stage 5 – Create

Students develop their own argument, interpretation, written response or creative work using verified information and their own intellectual judgement.

Stage 6 – Disclose

Students acknowledge meaningful AI assistance in accordance with institutional and course-level requirements. The central principle is that **AI may assist the learning process, but the student remains responsible for thinking, judgement, interpretation and authorship**.

The proposed model has several limitations. First, it has not been tested through classroom implementation or evaluated using student learning outcomes. Second, the survey was exploratory and was not designed to establish the effectiveness of a particular sequence of AI-assisted learning activities. Third, the model may require adaptation to different languages, literary traditions, course objectives and institutional AI-use policies. Future research could pilot the model in selected language and literature courses, obtain feedback from students and teachers, and assess changes in students' verification practices, critical engagement and understanding of responsible AI use. Such evaluation would help determine whether the proposed stages are practical, effective and appropriate for the FYUGP context.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the use and perceptions of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) among undergraduate students in language- and literature-related programmes within the context of the Four-Year Undergraduate Programme (FYUGP). The findings demonstrate that GenAI has already become a significant part of students' academic practices, with **95.0% of respondents reporting academic use** and **57.9% of AI users using it daily or several times a week**. Students employed AI for diverse purposes, including grammar correction, text summarisation, translation, assignment and presentation preparation, examination preparation, research, and literature analysis.

The findings present a balanced picture of AI adoption. Students perceived AI as particularly useful for **understanding literary texts, with 75.4% agreeing or strongly agreeing** that it improved their understanding. However, reduced critical thinking, inaccurate information, and overdependence were identified as important challenges. Notably, **70.2% agreed or strongly agreed that excessive AI use could reduce originality and independent thinking**, highlighting the potential tension between technological assistance and the development of core intellectual abilities.

A key finding is the gap between **AI adoption and AI literacy**. Although 95.0% of respondents used AI academically, only **40.4% agreed or strongly agreed that they understood its ethical use**, while 52.6% remained neutral. At the same time, **56.1% supported including AI literacy and ethical AI practices in the FYUGP curriculum**. These findings indicate a clear need for structured guidance on responsible AI use, verification, academic integrity, privacy, and appropriate authorship.

The study therefore concludes that the educational challenge is not whether AI should be accepted or rejected, but **how it can be integrated without compromising students' independent thinking, creativity, originality, and academic responsibility**. The study also gives a proposed conceptual framework for future testing. AI should function as a supplementary learning tool for language development, literary comprehension, research, and productivity rather than as a substitute for students' intellectual work.

Accordingly, FYUGP should promote a **responsible, human-centred and critically informed approach to AI integration**, supported by AI literacy, ethical-use guidelines, faculty development, source verification, and AI-aware assessment practices. Ultimately, students should be empowered to **use AI effectively, question and evaluate its outputs, verify information independently, and retain ownership of their academic and creative work**

REFERENCES

1. Sudheendran, K. (2024). Four-Year Undergraduate Programme Curriculum Framework: A Kerala Model. Higher Education for the Future, 11(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/23476311241268981
2. Government of India, Ministry of Education. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. Government of India.
3. University Grants Commission. (2022). Curriculum and Credit Framework for Undergraduate Programmes. University Grants Commission, New Delhi.
4. Albadarin, Y., Saqr, M., Pope, N., & Tukiainen, M. (2024). A systematic literature review of empirical research on ChatGPT in education. [Bibliographic details should be verified against the final journal/database record before submission.]
5. Mapping Tomorrow's Teaching and Learning Spaces: A Systematic Review on GenAI in Higher Education. (2025). Trends in Higher Education, 4(1), 2.
6. Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research. UNESCO, Paris.
7. UNESCO. (2023). Generative Artificial Intelligence in Education: What Are the Opportunities and Challenges? UNESCO.

8. Johnston, H., Wells, R. F., Shanks, E. M., Boey, T., & Parsons, B. N. (2024). Student perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence technologies in higher education. International Journal for Educational Integrity, 20, 2. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-024-00149-4
9. Al Amin, N., & Mahjabeen, N. (2025). Artificial intelligence usage patterns and dependency in English language learning among tertiary-level students. European Journal of English Language Studies, 5(4), 205–219.
10. Bellot, A. R., Gutiérrez-Colón Plana, M., & Baran, K. A. (2025). Redefining literature education: The role of ChatGPT in undergraduate courses. International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education, 35(6), 3185–3201.
11. Fernández Cifuentes, M. Á. (2024). Artificial intelligence in language and literature education: Practical classroom applications. EDULEARN24 Proceedings.
12. Bittle, K., & El-Gayar, O. (2025). Generative AI and academic integrity in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda. Information, 16(4), 296. https://doi.org/10.3390/info16040296
13. UNESCO. (2024). Artificial Intelligence and the Futures of Learning. UNESCO.
14. Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2021). AI and Education: Guidance for Policy-Makers. UNESCO.
15. University Grants Commission. (2023). Guidelines and Initiatives Related to Academic Integrity, Multidisciplinary Education and Higher-Education Reform. University Grants Commission, New Delhi.
16. Bobula, M. (2023). Generative artificial intelligence (AI) in higher education: A comprehensive review of challenges, opportunities, and implications. Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education.